

Presentation on Variation 1 to the Porirua PDP and Plan Change 19 to the Operative DP

My submission essentially covers two areas, the first of which relates to wastewater infrastructure and the second relates to traffic, transport and roading. In both cases, I point out the pressures that the proposed developments north of Plimmerton will put on adjoining communities (especially the Paremata community) and have asked that the adverse effects are recognised and addressed.

Wastewater Infrastructure

On this subject, my submission describes how the existing wastewater system along Mana Esplanade is unable to cope at present and the adverse effects this is having on the community and the harbour. I have asked that we be assured that no connections would be made from the Plimmerton Farm or Pukerua Bay developments to the existing system until the capacity of that system has been adequately enhanced.

The officer's recommendation on this matter is to "*accept in part*" that section of my submission, but I'm not sure what that means – is there, for instance, somewhere in the zillions of pages of the proposed plan (or elsewhere) that says it cannot happen?

Certainly the *Infrastructure Report* compiled by Envelope Engineering clearly states that "*Wastewater discharge from the site could not connect to the existing public downstream reticulation without the current capacity issues being addressed*". However, the same report then goes on to state that "*There would be no requirement for Council to undertake immediate wholesale upgrades to the downstream reticulation system*".

So I'm a bit confused and simply ask again for assurances that the existing system will be upgraded sufficiently to cope before any further connections from the new developments are made to it.

Traffic, Transport and Roading

This part of my submission relates to those provisions of Plan Change 19 that are likely to result in additional traffic which could adversely affect adjoining communities, and I ask that those effects not be overlooked.

In response the officer's report [Part B – District – wide matters, para 215] states that "*these concerns are addressed through the provisions of the PDP for connections of sites to the transport network and high trip generating activities*" when resource consents are being assessed.

Leaving consideration of such concerns until developers apply for resource consents does not seem particularly wise, however. As described in previous submissions, the narrow road corridor through Mana was never expected to maintain its current configuration after Transmission Gully opened because of its sub-standard width. We are hopeful that Waka Kotahi will belatedly honour its commitment to remove the clearways and revert to 2 traffic lanes very soon, but if there is a need to provide 4 lanes in the future, the prospect of having to purchase significant amounts of property in order to meet roading standards should not be ignored at present.

As suggested in my submission, it would seem prudent to be increasing setbacks for new buildings on Mana Esplanade at this stage not reducing them – in fact I believe that zoning at least the western side of Mana Esplanade for intensification will prove to be a big mistake.

Based on previous surveys and my knowledge of the area, I don't believe that Mana residents will want 3-storey (or 6-storey) apartment buildings going up next to or opposite them – destroying their privacy, reducing their sun and blocking the views that attracted them to Mana in the first place. Nor do I think that people driving, cycling or walking along Mana Esplanade will welcome the oppressive feeling and lack of sun that will result if 3-storey or 6-storey buildings line the road.

When the Environment Court was asked to approve the construction of the BP service station on the western side of Mana Esplanade, it gave major weight to not obstructing the excellent views of properties on the other side of the road and adjacent slopes. I don't understand why retention of those views is no longer considered a worthy objective. Intensifying housing in already flood prone areas, thus increasing the number of people affected in future events, is also a concern.

During current consultations with interested parties, Waka Kotahi has indicated that it intends (with PCC) to *“prepare a strategic plan for the full SH59 corridor which will consider future growth projects”*. There is a danger that such strategic planning will be compromised by provisions in the District Plan and it could be seen as irresponsible to be promoting new medium or high-density construction within 1.5 metres of Mana Esplanade's road boundaries when there is a possibility that those boundaries may need to be shifted to accommodate widening of the road in the future.

I guess the response to that will be that there is nothing that can be done because such intensification is a Government requirement. I don't pretend to be well informed on such matters, but if nothing else please regard my submission and this presentation as merely another expression of concern about the wisdom of such decrees for these sorts of situations.

Russell Morrison

20 March 2023