

## 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](mailto: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](http://www.porirua.govt.nz/proposeddistrictplan)

Further Submitter Contact Details			
Full Name	Last Name		First Name
	[insert additional rows if needed]		
Or Company/Organisation Name <i>if applicable</i>	Milmac Homes Ltd		
Contact Person <i>if different</i>	Grant Binns		
Email Address for Service	grant@mrbuilders.co.nz		
Address	11 Westhaven Grove		
	City Palmerston North		Postcode 4412
Mail Address for Service <i>if different</i>			
Phone	Mobile	Home	Work
	0274 433 099		
<b>Attendance and wish to be heard at the hearing:</b> <i>you must fill in both rows below</i>			
<input type="checkbox"/> I do not wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I wish <b>To be heard in support of my further submission</b> <i>(Please tick relevant box)</i>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I will <input type="checkbox"/> I will not <b>consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar further submission, at a hearing.</b> <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): “**

*Submissions listed below and in particular submission 209, impact directly or indirectly on the property at 405 Paekakariki Hill Road (lot 6 DP 28478) and Lot 2 DP 554290 which are now owned by Milmac Homes Ltd.*

**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](mailto:dpreview@porirua.govt.nz).*

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

Grant Binns for Milmac Homes Ltd

10/5/21 .....

Date

(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 <i>[See submission contact list]</i>	Submitter Address/Email <i>[if provided]</i>	Support or Oppose <i>[Only choose support or oppose]</i>	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: <i>[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]</i>	The reasons for my support or opposition are: <i>[give reasons]</i>	Allow or disallow <i>[Only choose allow or disallow]</i>	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed: <i>[give precise details]</i>
Sub 237: Mclaughlan	63 Paekakariki Hill Road, RD1, Pauatahanui, Porirua, 5381	Support	237.2 - Submitter has requested RLZ rules and standards allow a 1ha minimum lot size and a 2ha average lot size across the subdivision area. 237.3/4 – Submitter has requested that the SAL overlays be removed, or the NFL provisions provide a less restrictive framework for subdivision development within a SAL. 237.13 – Submitter has requested amendments to the proposed subdivision rules in the General Rural, Rural Lifestyle and settlement zones.	We support this as most lifestyle owners are looking for a bit of space but don't actually want a farm. Those that do could purchase the larger sized areas.  We support this as subdivision is the only way to obtain a return on General Rural Zone land, Councils section 32 report states that farming is no longer profitable in the area.  We support the submitter and believe the proposed amendments will allow for innovative subdivision design.	Allow	237.2, 237.3, 237.4, 237.13 be allowed
Sub 126: Director General of Conservation	Tchristie@doc.govt.nz	Oppose	126.13 – Submitter states that policies should not encourage subdivision and development within SNAs  126.36 – Controls on Plantation forestry in SALS.	We oppose this as some form of development may be the only way to obtain an economic return from the land. The other option is for the DGC to purchase the land in question. We oppose this as it potentially takes away another option for obtaining a return from the land we own.	Disallow	We believe subdivision with suitable controls is appropriate within SALs especially when there is no other option for achieving a profitable return on the land. We also note elsewhere in this submission that only 27 wetlands have been identified out of 222. While we agree wetland are important some common sense needs to be applied to the way they are controlled on private land and the impact these controls have on the landowner and their ability to earn a living. We believe an economic impact assessment should be carried out on the effects of the classification on the land and the owners prior to any kind of classification being placed on the land using the District Plan. This would create a validation situation to determine if the view is worth the cost of compensation.
Sub 169: Douglas	adriandouglasnz@gm ail.com	Support	169.1 – The submitter has requested that Significant Natural Areas be deleted from the Planning maps.	We support this request. The identification of a SAL is objective to say the least and it has been done with little or no consultation with the landowners. The process also takes now account of the impact such a classification will have on the owner of the land. We agree with the submitter, if the classification has a major impact on the landowner, Council or Government need to purchase the land.	Allow	We believe an economic impact assessment should be carried out on the land and the impacts on the owners prior to any kind of classification being placed on the land using the District Plan. This would create a validation situation to determine if the view is worth the cost of compensation.
Sub 177: Foothed	chris@inconstruction. co.nz	Support	177.1 – The submitter has requested that no Significant Natural Areas are created on private land	We support this submission because we agree.	Allow	We believe an economic impact assessment should be carried out on the land and the owners prior to any kind of classification being placed on the land using the District Plan. This would create a validation situation to determine if the view is worth the cost of compensation.
Sub 42: McGavin	mcgavinsremote@gm ail.com	Support	42.2/3 – Submitter seeks a minimum size for rural lifestyle properties to be 1Ha	We support this submission because we agree	Allow	We support the submitter and believe the proposed amendments will allow for innovative subdivision design. We also believe a 2ha average across a subdivision is acceptable.

## 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 <i>[See submission contact list]</i>	Submitter Address/Email <i>[if provided]</i>	Support or Oppose <i>[Only choose support or oppose]</i>	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: <i>[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]</i>	The reasons for my support or opposition are: <i>[give reasons]</i>	Allow or disallow <i>[Only choose allow or disallow]</i>	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed: <i>[give precise details]</i>
Sub 35: Parker	crakars@hotmail.com	Support	54.1 Submitter seeks to apply an average size when subdividing in the Rural Lifestyle Zone	We support this submission because we agree	Allow	We support the submitter and believe the proposed amendments will allow for innovative subdivision design. We believe a 2ha average across a subdivision with a 1ha minimum is acceptable.
Sub 241: The Neil Group & Gray Family	bryce@landmatters.nz	Support	241.9 Submitter seeks to amend objective NFL-02 to reflect the context of a growing city. 241.10 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P3 to reflect the context of a growing city. 241.11 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P5 to reflect the context of a growing city. 241.12 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P6 to reflect the context of a growing city. 241.14 Submitter seeks to amend rule NFL-R1 to reflect the context of a growing city. 241.15 Submitter seeks to amend rule NFL-R12 to reflect the context of a growing city.	We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.	Allow  Allow  Allow  Allow	Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.
Sub 253: Press	bryce@landmatters.nz	Support	253.2 Submitter seeks to apply an average size when subdividing in the Rural Lifestyle Zone  253.9 Submitter seeks to amend objective NFL-02 to reflect the context of a growing city. 253.10 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P3 to reflect the context of a growing city. 253.11 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P5 to reflect the context of a growing city. 253.12 Submitter seeks to amend policy NFL-P6 to reflect the context of a growing city. 253.14 Submitter seeks to amend rule NFL-R1 to reflect the context of a growing city. 253.15 Submitter seeks to amend rule NFL-R12 to reflect the context of a growing city.	We support this submission because we agree.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.	Allow  Allow  Allow  Allow  Allow	We support the submitter and believe the proposed amendments will allow for innovative subdivision design. We also believe a 2ha average across a subdivision with a 1ha minimum is acceptable. Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Include the proposed recommendation and wording.
Sub 233: Quest Projects	bryce@landmatters.nz	Support	233.2 Submitter seeks to apply an average size when subdividing in the Rural Lifestyle Zone 233.3 Submitter seek to remove the Significant Amenity landscape area requirement or modify them.	We support this statement and the proposed amendment.  We support this statement and the proposed amendment.	Allow  Allow	Include the proposed recommendation and wording.  Either remove the SAL requirement from the plan or modify as suggested.
Sub 225: Royal Forest & Bird	a.geary@forestandbird.org.nz	Oppose	225.4 The submitter requests Where rural or residential zones have SNA overlays, recognise this in the zone purpose character and value objectives.  225.23 The submitter has requested a 100m setback for earthworks from a wetland.	If this is appropriate, then the purpose and value objectives of the individual landowner/s should also be included especially in the rural (and perhaps some rural lifestyle) zones because these sites have operational and long-term management requirements to achieve which also need to be considered.  With modern earthworks management and sediment runoff controls etc a 100m setback for earthworks isn't required.	Disallow  Disallow	Perhaps this is another good example of where the validation test could be applied: Are the impacts of the SNA and subsequent changes in operation or loss of production worth the cost of compensation.  To have an arbitrary setback is unwarranted and unfair and will lead to a loss of resource. A building platform on a

## 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 <i>[See submission contact list]</i>	Submitter Address/Email <i>[if provided]</i>	Support or Oppose <i>[Only choose support or oppose]</i>	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are: <i>[clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal]</i>	The reasons for my support or opposition are: <i>[give reasons]</i>	Allow or disallow <i>[Only choose allow or disallow]</i>	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed: <i>[give precise details]</i>
			<p>225.29 The submitter states that Porirua's rural environment is at serious risk of being swallowed up by housing. The RE section needs more explicit emphasis of Council's requirements under s6 to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, given that the vast majority are currently found in Porirua's rural environment.</p> <p>225.46 Submitter supports SALs and their current land use such as grazing but does not support farming intensification or intensive horticulture.</p>	<p>Any setback requirements would be determined by the scale of the earthworks and the slope and nature of the ground.</p> <p>It is our view that these are separate issues. The section 32 report states that farming is no longer profitable in the Porirua area due to a wide range of factors. The only way to get an economic return is to subdivide and at present there is high demand.</p> <p>Protecting vegetation etc is a very different exercise to retaining rural character but there could be a compromise that work for both objectives.</p> <p>The Councils section 32 report states that farming is no longer profitable in the Porirua area due to a wide range of factors. Long term grazing etc is not an economic option for many.</p>	Disallow	<p>relatively flat slope with sediment control fencing etc should be able to be constructed within 5m of the edge of a wetland without issue.</p> <p>Protecting areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna can not be linked to retaining the rural environment, other compromise solutions need to be developed to match the goals of rural land owners and the requirements of Council.</p> <p>We believe subdivision with suitable controls is appropriate within SALs especially when there is no other option for achieving a profitable return on the land.</p> <p>We believe an economic impact assessment should be carried out on the effects of the classification on the land and the owners prior to any kind of classification being placed on the land using the District Plan.</p>
Sub 209 Gray	andrew.stewart@morrisonkent.com	Support	<p>209.1 The submitter has requested a change in zone from General Rural to Rural Lifestyle.</p> <p>209.2 The submitter has requested that the Special Amenity Landscape overlays be removed from the property.</p> <p>209.3 The submitter has requested that SNA 193 is removed from the property.</p> <p>209.4 The submitter has requested that amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns regarding the sustainable management of the property, including the minimum allotment size of 40 hectares in the General Rural Zone if that zoning is retained for some or all of the property</p>	<p>We fully support submission 209 from Joy Gray in every aspect (209.1, 209.2, 209.3, 209.4).</p> <p>The Councils own section 32 report acknowledges that farming in the area is no longer a profitable exercise but for some reason the new plan proposes to place more restrictions and cost on the landowners and proposes to make alternative economic options for the landowners, more difficult to achieve.</p>	Allow	<p>The new plan needs to include rules and processes that make the conversion of land from General Rural to Rural Lifestyle (5 hact) easier to achieve and remove the Special Amenity Landscape overlay and the Significant Natural Area 193 from Lot 2 DP 554290.</p>