

RMA Form 6

Further submission – Proposed Porirua District Plan

Clause 8 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Porirua City Council
Email to: dpreview@porirua.govt.nz
Subject: Further submission - PDP
Post: Proposed District Plan, Environment and City Planning, Porirua City Council, PO Box 50-218, PORIRUA CITY
Delivery: Ground Floor, Council Administration Building, Cobham Court, Porirua City, marked "Attention: Proposed District Plan, Environment and City Planning"

Closing date for further submissions is 5pm Tuesday, 11 May 2021

Submissions, a summary of decisions requested and submitter contact details can be viewed at:

www.porirua.govt.nz/proposeddistrictplan

Further Submitter Contact Details			
Full Name	Last Name		First Name
	Spreo		Robin (Rob)
	[insert additional rows if needed]		
Or Company/Organisation Name	Rob Spreo, previous director of Draycott Property Holdings Ltd		
Contact Person	Rhys Phillips Simplify Planning Ltd		
Email Address for Service	rhys@simplifyplanning.co.nz		
Address	21 Severn St, Island Bay		
	City	Wellington	Postcode
			6023
Mail Address for Service	As above		
Phone	Mobile	Home	Work
	021 0631 999	N/A	021 0631 999
Attendance and wish to be heard at the hearing: <i>you must fill in both rows below</i>			
<input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I wish To be heard in support of my further submission <i>(Please tick relevant box)</i>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I will <input type="checkbox"/> I will not consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar further submission, at a hearing. <i>(Please tick relevant box)</i>			
Relevance - you must select one box that applies to you:			

- I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
- I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has
- I am the local authority for the relevant area

Explain/specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category (you must fill this in):

The submitter is a long-term provider of good quality rental accommodation in Cannons Creek and Waitangirua. As a result, any submission which proposes changes to the residential zone rules and/or the new Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) has the potential to affect my client's ability to provided rental accommodation.

For this reason, we are making a further submission on Submission 81 by Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities.

Note to person making further submission:

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:*
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:*
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:*
- it contains offensive language:*
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.*

Privacy note:

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on the Proposed District Plan this is public information. Please note that by making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you as well as to PCC. There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential please contact the Environment & City Planning Team at dpreview@porirua.govt.nz.

Signature of person making further submission (or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)



Date **11/5/2021**

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.)

Your further submission:

Please complete section below and insert additional rows per submission point or submitter if required by using the enter button
Delete examples provided and enter your own further submission points

Submitter Name/ Submission no.	Submitter Address/Email	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities No. 81	Brendon Liggett Development Planning Manager Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities developmentplanning@hnzc.co.nz Copy to The Property Group Attention: Karen Williams Email: kwilliams@propertygroup.co.nz	Oppose	81.17 - Include additional sites within the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct	<p>In our original submission we expressed concerns that the Urban Design Technical Report (dated 9th June 2020) for the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct (EPRIP) included consideration of land ownership. Land ownership should not be a factor when considering zonings.</p> <p>In our original submission we question the conservative 3 km/ph walking speed used to define the EPRIP. Extending EPRIP as proposed by Kāinga Ora does not take into consideration the very conservative walking speed used in the UDTR.</p> <p>At submission point 81.18 Kāinga Ora proposes that a MDRA that is generally within a 800m (10 minute) walkable catchment of local centers. This walking speed of 80m/min or 4.8km/ph is significantly faster than the 3 km/ph walking speed noted in the UDTR and closer to the 5km/ph we sought in our submission.</p> <p>Any zoning based on, or partially based on, walking speeds should be using a consistent and recognized walking speed.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora is seeking the inclusion of properties which are beyond the 3km/ph walking catchment in the EPRIP. Using a 5km/ph walking speed would more closely align it with the walking speeds used by WCC and NZTA as well as the walking speed recommended by Kāinga Ora for the MDZ. It would also extend the EPRIP catchment, bringing these properties and others which do not meet the four EPRIP criteria into the EPRIP.</p> <p>At paragraph 12 of its submission Kāinga Ora states:</p> <p><i>“From Kāinga Ora’s perspective, the PDP as notified by the Council, has the potential to increase housing supply, but does not sufficiently incentivise the intensification of existing urbanised areas of the district. If Kāinga Ora’s submission on the PDP is adopted, then the current constraints applied by the zoning and the provisions of the PDP in its notified form would be reduced, and additional development capacity for public and affordable dwellings would be provided for on both Kāinga Ora land and across the wider city.”</i></p> <p>From our perspective restricting the EPRIP to largely Kāinga Ora controlled land limits the development potential Eastern Porirua. While it will increase housing supply, it does not sufficiently incentivise the intensification of Eastern Porirua and limits housing supply. If our proposal to extend the EPRIP is adopted the constraints applied by the current EPRIP zoning would be reduced, and additional development capacity for public and affordable dwellings would be provided.</p>	Disallow	Apply the four UDTR’s assessment criteria as set out in the Urban Design Technical Report. including a 5km/ph walking speed, to all land in the area regardless of ownership and create a level playing field for all residents / land owners. This will increase the diversity and supply of housing in Porirua, and helps achieve the goals of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, Porirua City Council and the EPRIPs.

Your further submission:

Please complete section below and insert additional rows per submission point or submitter if required by using the enter button
Delete examples provided and enter your own further submission points

Submitter Name/ Submission no.	Submitter Address/Email	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
		Support in part	81.18 - Kāinga Ora proposes changes to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Kāinga Ora seeks to apply the MRZ to all areas which meet the relevant criteria and as a result seeks extensive rezoning of parts of the city. We agree that the MRZ should be based upon proximity to centers and public transport as required by the NPS-UD and that it should be applied wherever the relevant criteria are met. This same logic should be applied to the EPRIP with all properties which meet the criteria rezoned to EPRIP regardless of their ownership.</p> <p>We agree that zone boundaries should reflect logical zoning extents and roads and other natural features should be used as natural boundaries. As a result some areas of land just beyond the outer extremity of a catchment should logically be included in the adjacent zoning to minimize potential for adverse effects between zones. This was discussed at section c of our submission.</p> <p>We also agree with the 800m (10) minute walkable catchment as this is consistent with our submission. This was discussed at section b of our submission.</p>	Allow	<p>Extend the same logic to the EPRIP by rezoning all properties which meet the four criteria in the Urban Design Technical Report to EPRIP.</p> <p>Use a consistent walking speed across all zones and review the positions of the EPRIP boundaries as in many cases they do not follow roads or other natural features.</p>
		Oppose in part	<p>81.941 – Kāinga Ora proposes extensions to the MDZ.</p> <p>Key principles applied in seeking to provide for opportunities for medium density residential intensification are generally within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 800m (10min) walkable catchment from Local Centres; and 400m (5min) walk of public transport routes, and proximity to, various commercial and community facilities. <u>residential areas that are well serviced by the high frequency public transport bus network (primarily areas of the city serviced by the 220 bus route)</u> <p>These principles should generally apply in determining the zoning of high density residential areas under the PDP to give effect to the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Policy 3(c) of the NPS-UD seeks higher densities within a walkable distance of “existing and planned and rapid transit stops” and Kāinga Ora potential rapid transit options available in Eastern Porirua.</p> <p>As discussed in our submission the 226 bus provides a reliable and frequent service between Porirua CBD and Cannons Creek. The frequency this service will increase as the population of Eastern Porirua and Cannons Creek increases. Zoning land along this route for higher density housing will increase patronage and therefore require a higher frequency service.</p>		PCC should determine which bus routes will/should be high frequency routes and provide additional development potential along these routes in accordance with the Policy 3(c) NPS-UD.
		Support in part & Oppose in part	<p>81.581- Kāinga Ora proposes amendments to the introductory statement.</p> <p><i>Some of the Medium Density Residential Zone in Eastern Porirua has been identified as suitable for higher residential development density, subject to scale and design. These areas are identified as the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct in the planning map layers. They represent areas that are undergoing a master-planned</i></p>	The applicants support the overall intent of the submission as it seeks to align the wording used with the NPS-UD and to simplify provisions. However, we oppose any wording that seeks to make this zoning exclusive to land controlled by Kāinga Ora.	Disallow	<p>We seek to the following wording so that the EPRIP is not limited to land controlled by Kāinga Ora.</p> <p><i>Some of the Medium Density Residential Zone in Eastern Porirua has been identified as suitable for higher residential development density, subject to scale and design. These areas are identified as the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct in the planning map layers. They represent areas that are undergoing a master-planned regeneration process and support a higher intensity planned urban built environment. The precincts, in conjunction with the underlying Medium Density Residential Zone,</i></p>

Your further submission:

Please complete section below and insert additional rows per submission point or submitter if required by using the enter button
Delete examples provided and enter your own further submission points

Submitter Name/ Submission no.	Submitter Address/Email	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
			<i>regeneration process and support a higher intensity <u>planned urban</u> built environment.-The precincts, in conjunction with the underlying Medium Density Residential Zone, support the wider regeneration objectives in Eastern Porirua.</i>			<i>support the wider regeneration objectives in Eastern Porirua.</i>
		<i>Supports</i>	<p>81.585 - Kāinga Ora proposes amendments to the introductory statement.</p> <p><i>The Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct <u>primarily</u> consists of residential activities predominantly in the form of terrace housing and apartment buildings.</i></p>	<p>The applicant supports the intent of this change as it would provide more flexibility for mixed use development. However, as <i>noted in section D of our original submission as the population of the area grows there will be additional demand for commercial and retail users and these need to be provided for.</i></p> <p>Our submission sought a mixed use zone for sites adjacent to the existing centres, which would allow the ground and first floors to be used for commercial and retail purposes.</p> <p>Extending this idea to the entire EPRIP would provide opportunities for businesses which provide for their local community to locate in that community. This could be done either via a mixed use zoning or by amending the provisions of Rule MRZ-R9 to allow a wider range of businesses to operate from the ground floors of properties within the EPRIP.</p> <p>This is in accordance with the NPS-UD Policies 2 and 3.</p>	<i>Allow</i>	<p>Provide a mixed uses zoning for sites adjacent to the existing centers, which allows the ground and first floors to be used for retail and/or commercial purposes.</p> <p>Consider providing for a wider range of businesses on the ground floors of buildings within the EPRIP.</p>
		<i>Support in part</i>	<p>81.587 - Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of MRZ-PREC02-03 which reads:</p> <p><i>Managing scale of development at Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct Interface.</i></p> <p>Because it duplicates MRZ-PREC02-02 which specifies that:</p> <p>MRZ-PREC02-02</p> <p><i>Character and Amenity Values of the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>Use and development within the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct has minimal adverse effects on the amenity values of adjacent sites located outside of the Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>The scale, form and density of use and development in the Eastern Porirua</i></p>	<p>The amenity of properties adjoining the EPRIP needs to be considered. Requiring buildings in the EPRIP to comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements of the adjacent zone is part of this (MRZ-S2). However, robust policies and objectives are also required.</p> <p>The objectives duplicate each other as they both seek to maintain the anticipated character and amenity of the surrounding sites. However, to provide clarity MRZ-PREC02-02 should be amended to read:</p> <p>On-site and off-site Character and Amenity Values of the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct.</p> <p>This would make the wording consistent with MRZ-PREC02-P2 and ensure that people using the plan do not overlook part C and its requirement to consider character and amenity values of the surrounding area as well as those internal to the EPRIP.</p>	<i>Allow</i>	<p>Delete MRZ-PREC02-03</p> <p>Amend MRZ-PREC02-02 to read:</p> <p>On-site and off-site Character and Amenity Values of the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct. ...</p>

Your further submission:

Please complete section below and insert additional rows per submission point or submitter if required by using the enter button
Delete examples provided and enter your own further submission points

Submitter Name/ Submission no.	Submitter Address/Email	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
			<p><i>Residential Intensification Precinct is characterised by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>A built form of predominantly three and four-storey buildings comprising terrace housing and apartment buildings;</i> b) <i>A greater intensity of buildings than anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone, particularly where located adjacent to road intersections and public open spaces; and</i> c) <i>A quality-built environment that provides on-site and off-site residential amenity appropriate to a more intensive living environment and responds positively to the anticipated character and amenity values of the surrounding area.</i> 			
		Supports	<p>81.602 - Kāinga Ora seeks deletion of Policy MRZ-PREC02-P3</p> <p><i>Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct Interface</i></p> <p><i>Ensure buildings are located and designed to minimise dominance, shading and privacy effects on sites located outside of the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct.</i></p> <p>As it duplicates MRZ-PREC02-P2.</p> <p><i>On-site and off-site residential amenity within the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct</i></p> <p><i>Ensure buildings and structures within the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct achieve quality on-site and off-site residential amenity appropriate to the anticipated living environment, by requiring:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Reasonable access to sunlight, daylight and privacy for on-site residents and adjacent residential sites; and</i> 2. <i>Accessible outdoor amenity space, which may include shared amenity space, that is of</i> 	<p>The amenity of properties adjoining the EPRIP needs to be considered. Requiring buildings in the EPRIP to comply with the Height in Relation to Boundary requirements of the adjacent zone is part of this (MRZ-S2). However, robust policies and objectives are also required.</p> <p>The policies duplicate each other as they both seek to maintain the amenity of the surrounding sites. However, Policy MRZ-PREC02-P3 could be interpreted as simply seeking to preserve amenity within the EPRIP. The proposed change to the wording would make it clear that this policy also requires consideration of the potential adverse effects of a development with the EPRIP on a site which is not within the EPRIP.</p>	Allow	<p>Delete Policy MRZ-PREC02-P3</p> <p>Amend Policy MRZ-PREC02-P3 as follows:</p> <p><i>On-site and off-site residential amenity within and immediately adjacent to the Eastern Porirua Residential Intensification Precinct</i></p>

Your further submission:
 Please complete section below and insert additional rows per submission point or submitter if required by using the enter button
 Delete examples provided and enter your own further submission points

Submitter Name/ Submission no.	Submitter Address/Email	Support or Oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my support or opposition are:	Allow or disallow	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
			<i>sufficient size and amenity for residents.</i>			