

### RMA Form 6

## Further submission – Proposed Porirua District Plan

Clause 8 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Porirua City Council

Email to: <a href="mailto:dpreview@poriruacity.govt.nz">dpreview@poriruacity.govt.nz</a>
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: <a href="https://www.poriruacity.govt.nz/proposeddistrictplan">www.poriruacity.govt.nz/proposeddistrictplan</a>

Further Submitter Contact Details							
Full Name	Last Name		First Name				
- Can Marine							
	Fig. a. st. a. delitic seed a	····· 'f ···     1					
	[insert additional rows if needed]						
Or Company/Organisation Name	Carrus Corporation Ltd						
Contact Person	Linda Bruwer						
Email Address for Service	Linda.bruwer@cuttriss.co.nz						
Address	Level 2 Cuttriss House, 191 High Street Lower Hutt						
	City		Postcode				
	Lower Hutt P.O. Box 30429		5040				
Mail Address for Service	1 .O. DOX 30423						
if different							
Phone	Mobile	Home	Work				
	022 391 8106						
Attendance and wish to be heard at the hearing: you must fill in both rows below							
✓ I do not wish							
To be heard in support of my further submission (Please tick relevant box)							
✓ I will □ I will not							
consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar further submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)							
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):
I represent Carrus Corporation Ltd that is the developer of the Aotea area. The PDP has an impact of the developer further development of the area and other development in Porirua going forward.
<ul> <li>I am acting in my capacity as a Resource Management Planner with over 20 year of experience in the Planning field.</li> </ul>

#### 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 @poriruacity.govt.nz.

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

Date 11 May 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 Number [See submission contact list]	Submitter Address/Email [if provided]	Support or Oppose [Only choose support or oppose]	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: [clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]	The reasons for my support or opposition are: [give reasons]	Allow or disallow [Only choose allow or disallow]	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed: [give precise details]
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Submission 81.1	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	Agree that the Proposed district Plan should enable the NPS-UD and the associated higher density housing in Porirua District.	This is an alternative way to deal with submission 68.1	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submission 81.35	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	We agree with the reasoning stated in Submission 81.35	Apartments may have units at ground floor dependent on the location	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submission 81.930	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	We agree with the entire reasoning stated in Submission 81.930	The transport chapter requires a review.	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submissions 81.363	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	We agree with the entire reasoning stated in Submission 81.363	Policy should allow guidance and should not be a rule.	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submissions 81.384-389	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	We agree with the points made and the remedy sought by the submitter	The Transport Chapter is promoting unrealistic standards that will not have good environmental outcomes.	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submissions 81.396	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	We agree with the points made in the submission.	We agree with the points made in the submission.	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submission 81.523 & 81.524	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	Carrus agrees with these submissions	We agree with the points made in the submission.	Allow	
Kāinga Ora — Homes and Communities Submission 81.580	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Support	Carrus agrees with the general thrust of this submission and that the PDP should enable the NPSUD.	We agree with the points made in the submission.	Allow	

# 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 Number [See submission contact list]	Submitter Address/Email [if provided]	Support or Oppose [Only choose support or oppose]	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: [clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]	The reasons for my support or opposition are: [give reasons]	Allow or disallow [Only choose allow or disallow]	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:  [give precise details]
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Submission 81.638	developmentplanning @hnzc.co.nz KWilliams@propertygr oup.co.nz	Oppose	Most of the submission is acceptable, however, we do not agree that the outdoor living space should be accessed through the kitchen.	Outdoor living space from the kitchen does not ensure a quality outcome. It can only be allowed through very a high-quality design rational, otherwise these outdoor spaces will only be accessed through a small kitchen door with no sense of integration into the unit's design.	Disallow	I seek that <u>or kitchen</u> requested under 2.b be removed.
Kenepuru Limited Partnership Submission 59.13, 59.15 and 59.17	brett.gawn@calibregro up.com	Support	We agree with the entire reasoning stated in Submission points 59.13, 59.15 and 59.17.	Supports my submission point 68.13	Allow	
Kenepuru Limited Partnership Submission 59.11 and 59.16	brett.gawn@calibregro up.com	Support	We agree with the entire reasoning stated in Submission points 59.11 and 59.16	Supports my submission point 68.12 and 68.19	Allow	
Kenepuru Limited Partnership Submission 59.6 and 59.7	brett.gawn@calibregro up.com	Support	We agree with the entire reasoning stated in Submission points 59.6	Supports my submission point 68.20 and 21	Allow	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Submission 82.45	Consentsandapprovals @nzta.govt.nz Claudia.Jones@nzta.g ovt.nz	Oppose	Oppose the additional point 8 That states "8. Require developers to fund the upgrade of Regionally Significant Infrastructure that is required as a result of subdivision, use and development."	Regionally Significant Infrastructure – by it's very name – serves the whole of the wider region and needs to be funded from taxes and rates. Developers should not be required to fund upgrades triggered by their development. However, should developers wish to contribute as it will open up land and it works with their business case they should be able to do so. Thus, the wording should be changed to:  "8. Require Allow for developers to fund/contribute to the upgrade of Regionally Significant Infrastructure that is required/enable subdivision, use and development of land."	Disallow	Carrus opposes the proposed wording for extra clause 8 that requires developers to fund regionally significant infrastructure upgrades.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency 82.69	Consentsandapprovals @nzta.govt.nz Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose	Submitter supports the matters of which Council has control for INF-R27. This will include INF-S23 That required compliance with INF-Table 1.	We oppose this standards as it requires roads to be 21m wide wide at a minimum. Compliance with 4404 will be significanly more practile and environmentally friendly and will allow for a wider avariety of road designs.	Disallow	Request that part of the submission seeking the re-zoning of the area I have highlighted in the attached map is disallowed.
Porirua City Council Submission 11.32	dpreview@pcc.govt.nz	Oppose	The provision is already to restrictive in some areas – see Kainga Ora submission 81.396. So this submission makes it even more difficult to work with. In tight areas – drivers are able to do multiple point turns	With housing needs at an all time high developments should optimize space and should not be car focused.	Disallow	Keep the original wording.