

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Hearing of Submissions and Further Submissions on
the Proposed Porirua District Plan and Plan Change 19
to the Operative Porirua District Plan

JOINT STATEMENT OF URBAN DESIGN EXPERTS

10 March 2023

INTRODUCTION

1. This joint witness statement relates to expert conferencing on the topic of urban design, as directed by Minute 59 – Stream 7 Conferencing. Participants in the conferencing were:
 - a. Graeme McIndoe engaged by Porirua City Council
 - b. Nick Rae engaged by Kāinga Ora
2. This conferencing was held online by Teams on 10 March 2023
3. We confirm that we have read the Environment Court’s Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2023. We have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this joint statement. Except where we state that we are relying on the evidence of another person, this evidence is within our area of expertise. We have not omitted to consider material facts known to us that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

MATTERS CONSIDERED AT CONFERENCING

1. HRZ extension at Kenepuru

- 1.1. We agree that it is appropriate that the area identified at the corner of Raiha Street and Kenepuru Drive is zoned as HRZ as proposed by Kāinga Ora. This is for reasons identified in our respective statements of evidence and as shown on NR’s evidence Attachment F, Map 1 of 13.

2. Extent of potential HRZ at Pukerua Bay if it were to be rezoned as HRZ

- 2.1. We agree that if the Panel were to favour rezoning an area of Pukerua Bay to HRZ, the boundaries proposed by Kāinga Ora as shown on NR’s evidence Attachment F, Map 13 of 13 are acceptable.

3. MCZ expansion to the north

- 3.1. We agree that it would be from an urban design perspective it is appropriate to designate the area of LFRZ to the north of the MCZ as MCZ. This is because while this has a predominance of LFR activities, it is also a desirable location next to the harbour. We consider this justifies a much higher quality built form outcome than has occurred to date.
- 3.2. We also agree that it is desirable to enable high quality residential here because of the amenity value of the harbour edge location and this having excellent proximity to commercial and community activities.
- 3.3. NR considers allowing buildings to rise to 53m (15 storeys) in the area of LFRZ identified by Kainga Ora for rezoning strengthens the residential opportunity. GM considers that the proposed PDP 22m maximum height is appropriate. We are aware of land ownership and cultural sensitivities in this area which will influence the outcome here and on adjacent land to the west and north-west.

4. 36m height limit within 400m of the MCZ

- 4.1. We agree that a 36m maximum height is appropriate at two identified areas at the corner of Kenepuru Drive and south of Titahi Bay Road and the area broadly identified by Kainga Ora to the east of Mungavin Interchange. Both were broadly identified with red hatching on Attachment F to Mr Rae's evidence, sheet 2 of 13. We agree that these should be as per the adjusted boundaries in GM's Supplementary evidence Figures 1 and 2. In particular, the adjustments to the Rainui area were to better coordinate with cadastral and zone boundaries.
- 4.2. At the Mungavin Interchange/Ranui site, enabling high density residential to 36m/10 storeys is a desirable (and acceptable) outcome. It is also desirable at this location to encourage non-residential activities particularly at ground floor given the location in relation to the roading network and surrounding and existing non-residential activities. We consider the zoning should reflect this aspiration. We agree that this can be zoned MUZ with a height variation control over the identified area to allow 36m.

5. Proposed 8m+60° HIRB and provision for six storey buildings in the HRZ

- 5.1. We agree most current small residential lots will not readily provide for six storey development with application of the PDP HIRB. That is because they were originally laid out for much smaller and lower development. Site amalgamation is likely and that would typically enable six storey development.
- 5.2. Comprehensive development is likely in the larger HRZ sites such as in the Kenepuru area.

6. Alternative HIRB

- 6.1. We discussed alternative HIRB, that the two propositions are different and there are various benefits to both. We came to no conclusion on the way forward.

7. Walkable catchment methodology – walking time and distance

- 7.1. We agree that walkable catchments should be based on standard and established methodologies of time and distance considered together. This equates to using accepted industry standard ped-sheds such as 400m for a 5 minute walk, 800m for a 10 minutes walk, and so on. There may be slight adjustments in peoples' willingness to walk based on the quality of the street environment, that is whether it is particularly attractive or not. The gradient of the walkway also influences walkability. These factors may influence how and where a ped-shed might be extended.

8. HRZ at Paremata

- 8.1. GM acknowledges that some of the area identified by Kainga Ora offers opportunity for increased height given walkable distance to the train station. This would be those lots fronting to Paremata Crescent and Papakowhai Road (excluding any which are rear lots with rights of way to the street). This should allow a height increase to 6 storeys. Having discussed this further NR agrees that those areas up the hill and beyond these identified Paremata Crescent and Papakowhai Road lots are marginal and not worth pursuing.
- 8.2. NR then raises the question as to whether MRZ is the correct zoning. GM considers the underlying zoning should remain as MRZ because the 50% site coverage standard should apply here in this particular coastal edge hillside landscape setting.

9. Design guides

- 9.1. We started discussion on the design guides but were unable to go into sufficient depth to form conclusions except for the following points of detail.
- 9.2. GM explained the reason for using the term 'conspicuously' in relation to tall and large buildings, as being 'prominently visible in relation to surroundings', as opposed to any pejorative meaning. The intent is articulation of building form to reduce the apparent bulk, that is visual perceptions of bulk rather than reduce actual building volume. NR accepts this point.
- 9.3. In relation to concerns about the guidelines appearing to permit residential at the street edge in centres where that is not appropriate, we agree that this matter is covered by the standards that apply, including active street frontage requirements. We also agree that at the mid-block and rear of sites in centres zones it may be possible to have residential at ground floor, and it is appropriate therefore that there is content to guide how that might be achieved.
- 9.4. We agree that in the HRZ it is likely that the landscaping in front of large apartment buildings will be street trees in the public realm. The on-site planting in the HRZ is likely to be relatively low scale due to space constriction, except where the façades are further set back. We also agree that the guide contains sufficient guidance with principles for general planting design. NR considers that there should be a further illustration describing an example of large-scale planting at the street frontage.

PARTICIPANTS TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

We confirm that we agree that the outcome(s) of the expert conferencing are as recorded in this statement.

10 March 2023



Graeme McIndoe
for Porirua City Council



Nick Rae
for Kāinga Ora