

1. Submitter details:

Full Name	<i>Last</i>	<i>First</i>	
Company/Organisation <i>if applicable</i>	Porirua Pacific Services Network		
Contact Person <i>if different</i>	Caroline Mareko		
Email Address for Service	c/- Caroline.mareko@wmkindergartens.org.nz		
Address	c/- Whanau Manaaki Kindergartens, Unit F, 15 John Seddon Drive, Todd Park, Wellington		
	<i>City</i> Porirua	<i>Postcode</i>	
Address for Service <i>if different</i>	<i>Postal Address</i>		<i>Courier Address</i>
Phone	<i>Mobile</i> 021446843	<i>Home</i>	<i>Work</i> 042323069

2. This is a **submission** on the **Proposed District Plan** for Porirua.

3. I could I could not
 gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
(Please tick relevant box)

If **you could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete point four below:

4. I am I am not

directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
 (a) adversely affects the environment; and
 (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.
(Please tick relevant box if applicable)

Note:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

5. I wish I do not wish
 To be heard in support of my submission
(Please tick relevant box)

6. I will I will not
 Consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar submission, at a hearing.
(Please tick relevant box) We are requesting for an hour to present and join other Pacific perspectives who have asked to make an oral submission.

Ngā mihi,

Louise White

Intermediate Policy Planner
 Kaihanga Kaupapahere Māhuri



Tel: 04 910 5490
poriruacity.govt.nz

From: Caroline Mareko <Caroline.Mareko@wmkindergartens.org.nz>

Sent: Friday, 20 November 2020 4:00 PM

To: dpreview <dpreview@poriruacity.govt.nz>

Cc: Vanessa Masoe <Vanessa.Masoe@poriruacity.govt.nz>; Jason Ataera <principal@tairangi.school.nz>; Seanoa Faraimo <seanoa@taeaomanino.org.nz>; Virginia Tangatatai <Virginia.Tangatatai@emergeaotearoa.org.nz>; siaosi.anamani@compasshealth.org.nz

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Pacific Submission on the Porirua City Council District Plan

Talofa lava

As the current chairperson, on behalf of the Porirua Pacific Services Network and members of the Pacific Community residing in Porirua City we would like to submit our submission on the Porirua City Council's proposed District Plan. We would also like to indicate to you for that we would like the opportunity to make an oral submission. We understand that your process only allows for 15 minutes to make an oral submission but ask that you consider an hour for the Pacific voice in Porirua to be heard. This is the first time that Pacific peoples in Porirua are engaging in your consultation process and in this case the District plan. This is our collective input in writing but it will also be beneficial for us to

contribute in a face to face approach by making an oral submission. Pacific voices from the community is important in this process.

la manuia

Lealamanu'a Aiga Caroline Mareko, MNZM, JP
Senior Manager: Community & Participation

DDI: 04 232 1748
Mobile: **021 446 843**



Whānau Manaaki Kindergartens
Unit F 15 John Seddon Drive, Elsdon, Porirua 5022
P.O. Box 50-743 Porirua 5240
www.wmkindergartens.org.nz

Please consider the environment before printing this email

Disclaimer

The content of this email is confidential, may be legally privileged and is intended only for the person named above. If this email is not addressed to you, you must not use, disclose or distribute any of the content. If you have received this email by mistake, please notify the sender by return email and delete the email. Thank you.

SUBMISSION

BY THE

PACIFIC COMMUNITY OF

PORIRUA

TO THE

PORIRUA CITY COUNCIL

ON THE

Proposed District Plan

1. Introduction

2. Recommendations

3. Current state the Pacific Porirua Resident lives in

4. Implications of this Plan on the Pacific Community of Porirua

1. Introduction:

A significant increase in the numbers of Pacific peoples coincided with the huge development of State Housing Projects in Porirua East in the 1960s. In the intervening fifty years, this population has become integral to the development of a diverse, exciting and innovative community that has become a hallmark of the city of Porirua. Our community elders became respected City Councillors, our young people became renowned champions in their respective sporting endeavours. Second and third generational cohorts of Pacific families have remained and put their roots down into this place that first gave shelter and comfort to our first settler parents, grandparents and now great grandparents. For some Pacific communities, such as the Tokelauan community, Porirua is home to the largest population of Tokelau people in the world.

Along with tangata whenua, Pacific people have also experienced the degradation and barriers to high achievement resulting from institutional racism and negative stereotyping, resulting in lower than average employment statistics and lower than average household incomes. These barriers, along with the fact that Pacific populations are much younger than Pakeha populations.

It is too easy to focus on the negative stereotyping that sometimes characterises the high Pacific population who have called Porirua home. This negative labelling was all too frequently the narrative of those who were outsiders. In our submission regarding the Porirua City Council Development Plan, it is disappointing to note the biased perspective within this Plan and the lack of development that addresses the *inequities, accessibility and affordability* of a Pacific Porirua resident. Alongside the rejection of these concerns, it is clear that this plan will further perpetuate poor life outcomes for Pacific people. This submission aims to bring these principles of equity, accessibility and affordability to the forefront of the development plan to implore the Porirua City Council to revise the current Porirua Development Plan. These principles have guided our deliberations on what is important to Pacific for the development process of Porirua. Due to the absence of a Pacific strategic plan we have used these principles as they have been integral in all Pacific responses. These are our findings through ethnic specific engagement in the last 50 years.

This submission responds to the changes that are being proposed in Porirua and the effects that it will have on our Pacific population. The issues, stories and recommendations come from the Pacific voices within Porirua which make up a large part of the culture of the City. This submission will outline the current inequities present in Porirua as well as the implications this development plan will have on

Pacific Porirua Residents. These will be supported by recommendations from our community, with the aim to advocate and represent the Pacific population of Porirua.

2. Recommendations:

These Recommendations span across all Issues which have been acknowledged in this Submission. These recommendations work together in order to develop Porirua into an equitable, accessible and affordable city for Pacific Porirua Residents.

- **General Aspects of the Development Plan to be Revised:**
 - a. To combat the negative health implications of this development plan, introduce *No Go Zones*. These zones will be areas where there would be limited access to alcohol, tobacco and unhealthy food. These No Go Zones would be present throughout the whole city, especially where our people are most vulnerable.
 - b. The denial of further liquor licenses for outlets within the suburbs.
 - c. Creation of socialisation spaces in Commercial spaces to promote local businesses. Seats and shade will be created in Porirua City on the corridor of shops between the Metro Bar and North City entrance, in the Lydney Place, South entrance. These spaces will be created to be connecting spaces for both commercial and community access.
 - d. Incentivising and educating small business owners and commercial entities on how they can diversify their products to be healthier. Also provide education on how their business impacts Climate Change.
 - e. Invest into a new community hub which is accessible to the community of Porirua within the suburbs. It would be fit for purpose in that the facilities would be of a high standard and would be a multi-purpose facility for Education, community building and recreational use. This facility would also be financially accessible to the community so we do not have to outsource to Wellington City.
 - f. Investment into the Recreational Spaces in the suburbs. Ensure that the recreational facilities in Eastern Porirua are met with the same maintenance as Aotea Lagoon and Whitby.

- g. Appropriate fencing added to the Calliope Park to make it a safe environment for play. This same process is to be implemented across Porirua in parks beside main roads.
- h. Development into the recreational areas in Porirua. Make physically and intellectually engaging for parents and youth using them. The development of these areas would also look like the inclusion of exercise equipment for general public use.
- i. Develop rules and regulations to allow for the removal of inorganic waste management and maintenance of the streets in the suburbs
- j. Completely revise the housing development plan by considering the three principles of equity, accessibility and affordability for Pacific Residents with co-design support from the Pacific Community
- k. Consult with Pacific to ensure that these houses being built are fit for purpose and not in conflict with Human Rights
- l. To ensure protection of the Pacific culture in Porirua, consult with the Pacific community to bring at least 7 Pacific street names to the City

- **Housing Aspects of the Plan to be redeveloped:**

In Part A 5 – G5, the Design Guides proposes to *“Consider driveways as main entrances and parking spaces as multi-functional spaces”*. The purpose was said to be *“to create visual interest and variation in parking and vehicle circulation areas”*.

- a. The proposed parking space idea is not just for parking but they want to use it for “multi-functional purposes” such as a main entrance, rather than for the sole purpose of being a space to park the car. Seems unnecessary to add in visual interest as another purpose, almost burdensome on residents to make sure they follow that purpose when they really just want a space to park their car/cars.
- b. Not ideal for residents with multiple vehicles
- c. Driveways are the busiest and the most dangerous area. To mix them up with pedestrian entrances will increase the risk, especially for the safety of the children.
- d. It is submitted that ‘visual interest’ should not be placed ahead of the safety concerns.

In the same part, the Design Guides seem to suggest that the driveways are multi-functional, i.e. they are both served for parking and pedestrian entry. *“Large developments may also require a separate pedestrian access”* implies that only large developments would have separate pedestrian access and the smaller developments will have a mixed access of pedestrian and vehicles.

- a. We ask the Council to clarify what they mean by “driveways being multi-functional”. If it means that driveways are used for both vehicles and pedestrians, we have reservations for this design.
- b. This creates inconvenience to a house with multiple families living in it where many people may come out and get in.
- c. The mixing up of pedestrian access with vehicle access will create a hazard for the pedestrians.

A picture of the carpark designed can be seen in Part A5 – G5 saying that *“Frontage landscaping successfully integrates parking pads into a development.”* On the picture, a pavement runs between the house and the main road. So, every driver who wants to park at the parking space will unavoidably drive the car across the pedestrian. This increases the risk of running over the pedestrians who are walking past the house on the pavement. The risks double when the driver tries to back her/his car out to the main street as s/he will not be able to see clearly the pedestrian behind her. What makes it worse, is that, unlike traditional driveways where the pedestrian can hear the beeping of the backing vehicles, in this design, there is no space between parked vehicles and the pavement, therefore the pedestrians would have no pre-warning and might get a fright from the car which suddenly reversed onto the pavement, out of a blue. This design may work in a posh region like Ahuriri, in Napier, where the pedestrians are scarce and the drivers are cautious. In a busy region such as Porirua with a large portion of its residents being the working class who fall under the lower socioeconomic group, this design is impractical.

In the same part, the Guides admit that the multi-functional designs have *“potential conflict between driveway / parking areas and places where small children have access and are likely to play.”*

We think that the risk is especially big in Porirua where Maori/Pacific families tend to have many children. The multi-functionality where there is a crossover between parking areas and children playground is particularly hazardous. The proposed plan to safeguard the children is by building low fences; this essentially relies on the drivers to keep an eye but the driver may be just a visiting guest who might be unaware of the fact that there will be children playing around. The safer choice should be a separation between parking and other areas that can be used by children as playground (the separation should apply to all houses not just the larger developments as proposed by the Design Guides) so that all that the children need to know is to keep away from the carparks/driveways and they will be safe.

Experts say that there is more risk of a driveway run-over on a driveway that is shared with other properties, and where the driveway is also the pedestrian access to the house. Reversing is the most dangerous manouver – 68% of driveway run-overs occur when reversing. Although modern cars have reversing sensors and/or a reversing camera which will reduce the risk, most Maori/Pacifica families don't necessarily have a reversing camera or sensor installed on their cars.

PART B – ALL TOWNHOUSES AND DETACHED HOUSING

Place garaging generally beside or behind the house and **restrict the amount of parking in any front yard**. Garage doors should generally be set back further from the street edge than the front face of the building. In general it is desirable to place garages to the south of the dwelling allowing for habitable rooms to be on the sunny sides of the dwelling.

Carparks dominating street edges have serious negative **visual amenity** and **streetscape effects**. They limit potential for planting in the front yard, and often signal **low quality development** and compromise the **image** for the local neighbourhood. Also, multiple vehicle crossings typically associated with this compromise pedestrian amenity and safety.

- a. Visual amenity and the use of variation of materials to achieve that interest seems to be the dominant consideration of the design of the Council. As Council has condemned carparks by saying that “**carparks dominating street edges have serious negative visual amenity and streetscape effects**. They limit potential for planting in the front yard, and often signal low quality development and compromise the image for the local neighbourhood. (B4 – G4)” This attitude inevitably clashes with the residents’ interest in utility of the houses and their need for more parking spaces.
- b. In the same paragraph (Part B – G4), the Design Guide mentions several times the same concern about the ‘look’ of the dwellings, i.e. “*visual amenity*”, “*streetscape effects*”, “*low quality development*”, “*the image for the local neighbourhood*”; it seems that it is the ‘look’ rather than the ‘utility’ that has preoccupied the mind of the Designers.
- c. It seems that the Council’s main concern is to build high-quality development and uphold the image for a posh neighbourhood. Their primary concern of the visual amenity couples with the belief that more carparks will harm the image or visual amenity. The council prioritises visual amenity over actual utility. The overarching goal is to create an image of high quality development through ‘esthetics’ and ‘visual image’, which is pervasive throughout the Council’s Design Guides. This goal will inevitably hinder the need of the local residents for more parking spaces.

When talking about the 'walls' the Guides explains the importance of 'visual interest' and proposes to achieve this goal by using 'variation of materials". (**G3c - Avoid large, flat blank walls**)

- a. While it is nice to have good looking houses, but it would be closer to the interest of the community to spend the budget on building houses with more space and carparks rather than spending the money on '*variation in materials*' to achieve esthetic interest, which may be secondary to the unity.
 - b. We believe that the only way to find out whether the local residents prefer 'look' to 'utility' is to ask them directly.
- **Co-design responsibility shared with Pacific Community :**

This submission provides the council with a framework on how to engage with the Pacific Community of Porirua. We have provided access to engage with us to ensure the development plan is fit for purpose. We recommend that this plan be integrated into all aspects of town development and planning to ensure that the plans are in fact fit for purpose. All in all, the Council should work side by side with the people all way along, to make sure that every plan is by the people, of the people, and for the people.

The Plan has only half a page for the history of Porirua, namely, "Description of the District" before it jumps straight into the 'Statutory Context' and the technicalities. Council, as local government body, has the duty to be communicative and responsive. I believe they have the duty not only to inform the local residents of their plan, but also to consult them BEFORE they come up with a plan, and work with the local residents all the way through the planning from the beginning to the end. The plan is extremely long and full of jargons. It is 'experts talking to experts', not meant to communicate to the lay people. The Plan is hundreds of pages long, accompanied by Design Guides, etc. If you want to read them all, you will need to spend a week or longer. So, practically, it is not a document that is readable. While engaging with our community, we also submit that the council produce a brief explanation brochure, condensed within 30 pages, which includes the needs and concerns of the local residents. This would include statistics and the needs of the region.

A way to do that would be the creation of different Plans, and engaging with the community within these areas to ensure it is suitable for these people. These different plans would justify the reasons for development in this way. These different plans would also have an explanation on how this budget is being spent.

3. Current state the Pacific Porirua Resident lives in:

A. Health:

The health outcomes for the Pacific population are low. When Pacific children start school 63% of these children have teeth decay within Porirua. As well as this the rate of hospitalisation of Pacific children is more than twice the rate of other populations.¹ Pacific children experience third world incidence levels of Rheumatic Fever, that is a matter of shame for our whole society. Child obesity is also an issue within our communities with negative health outcomes supported by Porirua's high level of access to alcohol, tobacco and unhealthy food options. The availability of these products promote the consumption of them and entrench these unhealthy products into our communities. As well as the physical well-being challenges the Pacific Community face, there are also high levels of Mental Illness within the Pacific Community.

These health issues are not new to us, but they can be minimised through better town planning and creation of fit for purpose homes and neighbourhoods that focus on changing the inequities. The plan also does not look at "inclusion."

B. Housing:

There are a wide range of health issues prevalent in the Pacific community which will be perpetuated by the proposed development plans. These health issues are a direct result of the lack of accessible healthy housing which is fit for purpose. The quality of housing available to many Pacific residents in Porirua is not fit for purpose and is a breeding ground for health issues such as asthma and Rheumatic Fever and the space in housing is inadequate for intergenerational living. Current housing, as well as the proposed housing plans, do not have bathrooms which are suitable and accessible for all members of our communities. These

¹ https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Status_Report_Children_and_Young_Persons_2018.pdf?Expires=1604625001&GoogleAccessId=5407370534-compute%40developer.gserviceaccount.com&Signature=sjxUVd4U5t4SHkfr%2FxoKLXijYq6AG75i%2FGVwRCQm7da%2BvfUw7XbpF2NGRI2kvC%2FDfsr1IR3jNjiUdpZCE7DlemNM7T5k5T5VDjiN7IODnS9mlod7iqhwi8TTDZnINDxC%2FLdW4nRfHS3SDuJ3%2BY2VGqINuOhDjYZdz2ugI97CrVc6ME6B2PFUxSmFRZH84pVE92f6aTNv4bcGe5ghhgm3b%2FWvLFprVqIMjP6OiOApqKBBHp%2FUT3ipe%2FHJDW%2FvIwt5jYmemXZ%2B08%2BvdM7rWG59YQaP1xOmN2hvxhUavZ2HRrayLSmIrHq1wIF9dcz6pcyRjhVCxKp1PTm%2FncZ3huCew%3D%3D page 15

concerns have been reflected in the 2018 Status Report: *Children and young people in Porirua 2018* which stated houses being Damp and Mouldy for 1 in 4 homes and overcrowding being prevalent in our community.² As well as the low quality of housing, there is a high number of Pacific on waiting lists for social housing, which in 2018 grew significantly in a 12 month period.³ Pacific has a higher rate of hospital admissions which would not be necessary if we had the opportunity of early intervention and the improvement of the breeding grounds of these diseases which is within the home. With Pacific being a large and growing population, housing must be upgraded to serve those living in them. This means providing housing that is safe for young families to raise their children in while simultaneously catering to the needs of ageing and disabled. Buildings like this are currently not accessible to Pacific people in Porirua.

C. Safety:

Within many parts of Porirua where development is proposed, the plan promises that there will be insurance that they will have a high level of maintenance and upkeep of public spaces, alleyways and parks. Before this can be implemented in developed areas, there needs to be consideration for the vast parts of the suburbs in Porirua which lack Street lighting in public areas and alleyways. As well as this, the lack of parking spaces available does not increase safety for our people. The lack of parking space leads to our people having to park long distances from their extended families homes which puts their property at risk of being targeted by crime. The

² https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Status_Report_Children_and_Young_Persons_2018.pdf?Expires=1604625001&GoogleAccessId=5407370534-compute%40developer.gserviceaccount.com&Signature=sjxUVd4U5t4SHkfr%2FxoKLXijYq6AG75i%2FGVwRCQm7da%2BvfUw7XbpF2NGRI2kvC%2FDfsr1IR3jNjiUdpZCE7DlemNM7T5k5T5VDjiN7IODnS9mlod7iqhwi8TTDZnINDxC%2FLdW4nRfHS3SDuJ3%2BY2VGqINuOhDjYZdz2ugI97CrVc6ME6B2PFUxSmFRZH84pVE92f6aTNv4bcGe5ghhgm3b%2FWvLFprVqIMjP6OiOApGKBBHp%2FUT3ipe%2FHJDW%2FvIWt5jYmemXZ%2B08%2BvdM7rWG59YQaP1xOmN2hvxhUavZ2HRrayLSmlrHq1wIF9dcz6pcyRjhVCxKp1PTm%2FncZ3huCew%3D%3D page 5

³ https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Status_Report_Children_and_Young_Persons_2018.pdf?Expires=1604625001&GoogleAccessId=5407370534-compute%40developer.gserviceaccount.com&Signature=sjxUVd4U5t4SHkfr%2FxoKLXijYq6AG75i%2FGVwRCQm7da%2BvfUw7XbpF2NGRI2kvC%2FDfsr1IR3jNjiUdpZCE7DlemNM7T5k5T5VDjiN7IODnS9mlod7iqhwi8TTDZnINDxC%2FLdW4nRfHS3SDuJ3%2BY2VGqINuOhDjYZdz2ugI97CrVc6ME6B2PFUxSmFRZH84pVE92f6aTNv4bcGe5ghhgm3b%2FWvLFprVqIMjP6OiOApGKBBHp%2FUT3ipe%2FHJDW%2FvIWt5jYmemXZ%2B08%2BvdM7rWG59YQaP1xOmN2hvxhUavZ2HRrayLSmlrHq1wIF9dcz6pcyRjhVCxKp1PTm%2FncZ3huCew%3D%3D

lack of parking around residential areas is also present within commercial spaces where business owners and workers do not have access to parking.

Alongside the physical aspects of Safety, there is a lack of Cultural Safety within Porirua. Porirua is a diverse city with its culture being inclusive of different ethnic groups.

Because of this, there should be safe spaces for cultural expressions for Pacific, this is often seen within their Churches. Churches should feel safe to express and celebrate their community within their community spaces backlash from an ignorant community. Noise complaints relating to singing or large groups congregating in their spaces should not be imposed upon due to the dwellings around them being inhabited by people who do not understand our cultural expression.

D. Recreational and Social Spaces:

In Porirua the small parks off streets do not serve the communities. They have outdated facilities that are not physically challenging or intellectually stimulating for those who use them. As well as this, the larger spaces which could be used for Cultural Sports such as Kilikiti have been removed, or do not have the means to support those types of sports. There is also a clear disparity within Porirua between the servicing of recreational spaces as well as the quality of equipment. This is seen in the different levels of maintenance in Jasmine Underhill Park in Aotea Block, compared to the Parks within Eastern Porirua. The access to parks such as Cannons Creek Park through public transport is not practical. The bus route does not promote easy access to Cannons Creek Park creating a barrier to it being used by the public. In addition, large parks such as Cannons Creek and Ascot Park have inadequate parking for the high density of sporting or festival events that are held there. For example, consider having a larger car park on the area between Te Kura Māori o Porirua and Ascot Park. There are also green spaces being underused, such as Cannons Creek pond which should be developed to be made safer and more accessible. Cannons Creek pond is not visible from the road and is currently not used due to the lack of visibility and safety precautions. Currently a positive recreation space for our community are *The Cages* in Waitangirua. These are a good concept as they are accessible to our people, but the use of the term *The Cages* carries a stigma which created ghettoised associations with

Porirua. As stated in the 2018 report on Youth in Porirua, there is room for improvement in the recreational and social spaces in Porirua in order to meet the Ministry of Health Guidelines.⁴

As well as the lack of park facilities and the low level of maintenance of the Parks in Eastern Porirua, the facilities within Porirua are too expensive to be accessible, specifically Te Rauparaha Arena. This makes cultural expression and safe spaces for cultural and ethnic expression limited within Porirua. The Pacific community has had to outsource and reach out to Wellington City Council in order to use their facilities as accessible. Furthermore, there are minimal community halls within Porirua that meet the needs of a Pacific cultural gathering. The only space which is capable of supporting these kinds of events is Mungavin Community Hall. *There are also a lack of conference spaces and meeting rooms that are affordable to the community.*

E. Education:

The Education facilities are old, outdated and not fit for purpose. They are not in line with the current teaching pedagogy and do not give our teachers the opportunity to invest in students personal development. This lack of infrastructure in schools is seen in all levels from Early Childhood all the way through to high school level. As stated in the Recreational and Social aspect of this submission, there is a lack of informal education spaces. There are also no recreational, health and wellbeing spaces which could be multipurpose to support our community.

F. Commercial Entities and Small Businesses:

Within Porirua the Commercial Entities and Small business spaces are not structurally created to be conducive with socialisation. This is specifically seen in a corridor of shops between the

⁴ https://storage.googleapis.com/pcc-wagtail-media/documents/Status_Report_Children_and_Young_Persons_2018.pdf?Expires=1604625001&GoogleAccessId=5407370534-compute%40developer.gserviceaccount.com&Signature=sjxUVd4U5t4SHkfr%2FxoKLXijYq6AG75i%2FGVwRCQm7da%2BvfUw7XbpF2NGRI2kvC%2FDfsr1IR3jNjiUdpZCE7DlemNM7T5k5T5VDjiN7IODnS9mlod7iqhwi8TTDZnINDxC%2FLdW4nRfHS3SDuJ3%2BY2VGqINuOhDjYZdz2ugl97CrVc6ME6B2PFUxSmFRZH84pVE92f6aTNv4bcGe5ghhgm3b%2FWvLFprVqIMjP6OiOApqKBBHp%2FUT3ipe%2FHJDW%2FvIwt5jYmemXZ%2B08%2BvdM7rWG59YQaP1xOmN2hvxhUavZ2HRrayLSmlrHq1wIF9dcz6pcyRjhVCxKp1PTm%2FncZ3huCew%3D%3D page 6

Metro Bar and North City entrance in the Lydney Place South entrance. As well as this, entrepreneurship is not uplifted due to the operating costs that small businesses have to combat to function.

G. Climate change Considerations:

Currently the migrant and refugee population are often housed in Porirua. Due to the implications of Climate Change there needs to be added support to meet the needs of these populations. These communities seek autonomy over their own spaces but the spaces which are provided to the Pacific, migrants and refugees lack the opportunity for development and independence of these communities. With the effects of Climate change predominantly affecting the Pacific Islands, these living arrangements are not viable, valid or sustainable for our people.

H. Inorganic Waste Management:

Currently there are no rules around how people store and dispose of inorganic waste. There are no rules around the people of Porirua storing old cars, utilities and other large inorganic waste in their front or back yards. There is also a lack of support, management around the maintenance of lawns, gardens and reserves.

I. Transport:

As expressed in the Recreational Space section of this submission, the Transport system provides an accessible transport system that is safe and adequate. There is a lack of transport options from the suburbs to the greater parts of Wellington. It is isolating for people to not have parking available in the spaces they are commuting to as well as not having the capability to use the Public Transport system to move throughout the City or between cities.

4. Implications of this Plan on the Pacific Community of Porirua:

The overarching implications of this plan will be a protection for the new population of Porirua. There is no prioritisation to address the inequities, accessibility and affordability of our people within Porirua. The large Pacific population who will remain in Porirua will continue to live in homes which contribute to negative health outcomes. The housing created will be inaccessible and not practical to serve the community. The focus on building homes which are multi-level and small will not be liveable. The lack of promise to incentivise or develop the small businesses within Porirua to sell more healthy options or protect the community's access to alcohol and tobacco products will drive our community to the statistics against us to be exacerbated. The houses which our people dwell in will remain unhealthy, perpetuating the sickness and presence of third world diseases within our communities, while the council creates new homes which are not fit for our growing and youthful population. They will not serve the elderly, nor meet the needs of the disabled. All accessible housing options will remain not fit for purpose, while the new developments will create even more impractical housing for us. The lack of housing which is fit for purpose and accessible for our communities is direct breach of human rights. The Human Right's commission states that Adequate Housing has seven standards that must be met. These are:

- ▶ *Security of tenure: Residents should be protected against forced eviction, harassment and other threats including predatory redevelopment and displacement.*
- ▶ *Habitability: Housing must provide residents with adequate space that protects them from cold, damp, heat, rain, wind, and other threats to health, structural hazards, and disease.*
- ▶ *Accessibility: Housing must be accessible to all, and disadvantaged and vulnerable groups – including the disabled – must be accorded full access to housing resources.*
- ▶ *Affordability: Housing costs should be at such a level so as not to compromise the attainment of other basic needs. For example, people should not have to choose between paying rent and buying food.*
- ▶ *Availability of services, materials, facilities and infrastructure: Housing must provide access to services essential for health, security, comfort and nutrition. This includes water and sanitation, power and other essential utilities.*
- ▶ *Location: Housing should not be built on polluted sites or in immediate proximity to pollution sources that threaten the right to the health of residents. The physical safety of residents must likewise be*

guaranteed. Additionally housing must be in a location which allows access to employment, health-care services, schools, child care centres, and other social facilities.

► *Cultural Adequacy: Housing and housing policies must guarantee the expression of cultural identity and diversity, including the preservation of cultural landmarks and institutions. Redevelopment or modernisation programs must ensure that the cultural significance of housing and communities is not sacrificed.*⁵

The development plans do not meet these requirements. They are in conflict with them. If the development plan was to seek to meet these rights, there would be a meaningful investment in our communities and ensure we are offered the opportunity to live with dignity.

The lack of parking and safe spaces to store our belongings will not protect the goods which we own. It will give crime a gateway opportunity to target us. The lack of investment into our community's recreational and social spaces will create more risk for our children, youth and families. The lack of recreational spaces which allow us the chance to have free cultural expression will be limited.

Having read the Plan and the Guides, we cannot help but suspect that they were written by someone who does not have a good understanding of the social and socio-economic status of Porirua. There are no statistics about the social and economic landscape of Porirua. There are no figures on the ethnic makeup of Porirua. There is no survey done inquiring into what the local residents need and want; it is rather the designer imposing what she wants and what she thinks is the best upon the local residents.

There is already stigma present, that our community combats due to the undignified living conditions offered by the Council. This plan seeks to entrench this stigma, creating plans that are inaccessible to our people and ensuring that they have limited opportunities. Pacific people are a community of pride, and this has been seen in the sense of community within Porirua and the community expression seen in a large amount of what Pacific cultures bring to the City. This plan dilutes that, using tokenistic language and no meaningful engagement with the Pacific communities and the aim to dilute our cultural expression and minimise our community's opportunity to flourish.

⁵ https://www.hrc.co.nz/files/4215/1363/5639/2017_07_25_-_Right_to_housing_flyer_-_updated.pdf