

Speaking Notes Hearing Panel presentation

05.4.2023

Tēnā Koutou, hello everyone,

1. My name is Lawrence Collingbourne. I am the President of the Onslow Residents Community Association (ORCA). We cover the suburbs of Broadmeadows, Khandallah and Kaiwharawhara. Julie Ward and I have joined together to make a joint presentation in Stream 2, Residential.

Introduction to this session

2. I will start by summarising the structure our presentation in Stream 2. This is a joint session between ORCA and Julie Ward, with testimony from our expert witness, Dr Helm, on how his previous paper in Stream 1 applies to Residential matters in Stream 2.
 - a. I will introduce the structure of our presentation and invite any questions you have about it, and then,
 - b. I will make the ORCA presentation for Stream 2, which is a resident's view of appropriate features we require in the District Plan to support residential development, and then,
 - c. Julie Ward will make her presentation for Stream 2 on what is required to achieve appropriate residential densification, and then,
 - d. Dr Helm will discuss the relevance of housing economics to achieving appropriate residential densification and answer your questions.
 - e. At the end I will make some final comments on our overall joint presentation.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, Julie is an independent submitter but in general ORCA and Julie support each other's submissions.
4. I can now respond to any questions on this structure and then I will move to giving the ORCA presentation for Stream 2.

ORCA Presentation

5. We continue to focus on what will work in our suburbs to achieve the NPS-UD objectives. We want progress and densification proportionate to the needs of both younger and older alike, to respect the amenity and character of our suburbs, and to reflect the realities of our geography and topography. In Stream 2 we add that we want a District Plan that gives us confidence this will be achieved.
6. The process of dividing the review of the PDP into streams is new to us, so please bear with us if we address their interconnections in multiple streams. Points may arise in subsequent streams with implications from, or even for, previous streams. For example we have been surprised by discussion of zone maps in this stream, something we expected in Stream 4. So we hope its ok to revisit past points, albeit briefly, to consider their relevance to decisions required in the current stream, or vice versa.

Major Point 1 – No HRZ along the Johnsonville Railway

7. The first major point in this joint presentation is that putting HRZ along the Johnsonville Rail Line in the hope that it will further the goals of WCC and the NPS-UD to reduce emissions and congestion or will release more development is a mistake. We reiterate our contention that the Johnsonville Line does not meet the criteria required to be a rapid transit service. In the Centres Stream we hope to show that nor do we have the services to support greater densification either.

8. In Support of our first major point, we note:
- a. That the Section 42A reports has also prejudged the decision on the railway, but to opposite effect, by taking their view of the Johnsonville Rail Line to propose HRZ definitions.
 - b. That you have not yet decided on the status of the Johnsonville Line, nor indeed has WCC completed their response to Stream 1. So, we restate where we got to in Stream 1 and urge you to prefer the clear and compelling expert evidence:
 - i. of Mr Cribbens from Waka Kotahi, who stated JVL as it stands is not an RT Service,
 - ii. of Mr Wignall, who says the same, and further *as the lead author Wellington Rail Business Case* says he knows of no intentions to improve the performance of the Johnsonville railway, and
 - iii. the RLTP classification of ONF category PT1 rail transport as RT services, which as the Johnsonville Rail Line is now classed by ONF as a category PT4 service, means *according to the RLTP*, it is *not* an RT Service.
 - c. We contend that WCC has erred in applying NPS-US Policy 3 (c) – and specifically HRZ requirements –to residential development in our suburbs. And we intend to address how NPS-UD Policy 3 (d) applies in the Centres Stream 4.
 - d. Although we are not prepared to discuss zoning in our suburb yet, we suggest that until the Line, the Centre and walking catchments are decided, discussion of the zoning is incomplete, unless like Kāinga Ora you assert that maximum density everywhere is the goal, but that is simply contrary to NPS-UD Policies 2 and 3(a).

Major Point 2 – Defined Plan Outcomes

9. Our second major point is that our residents want the District Plan to give a high degree of confidence and certainty about the future amenity and character of their neighbourhood. We reject vague and undefined outcomes that could be avoided by being clear about what can be developed by permit or with discretionary consent. Too often neighbours in our suburbs have been told by a Council consenting officer that some features of a development outside of the District Plan permitted parameters are “less than minor”, when to them they are blatant breaches of the prescribed limits in the plan, or even of an Environment Court decision, in one case.
10. Regardless of what you decide about the Johnsonville Line, we object to the Section 42A proposed change of the HRZ-01 and HRZ-P2 parameters to “at least” 6-storeys and seek reinstatement of the words “including 6 storey buildings.”. We oppose height extensions being permitted under the residential design guides. (Ref: Section 42A report paras 18, 118, 122, 124, 133, 134, 138, 139, 146, 181, 183 and 185.) “At least” a height is no height limit at all. We understand that the NPS-UD clearly applies the term “at least” to the enablement, not to the height enabled. If the proposed change is accepted, the DP will say nothing about which heights are enabled, so developers could conceivably build to any height as all heights are permitted.
11. With respect to the Design Guides, we support McIndoe Urban’s submission. We want statutory design guides (MU 18), that are fit for purpose (MU 19), easy to use (MU 20), so they achieve defined design outcomes (MU 38). We support their assertion that they must undergo significant restructure and improvement (MU 72) to do so.
12. We also agree with Kāinga Ora and McIndoe Urban that City Outcomes be removed altogether. As McIndoe Urban points out, they do not consider the outcomes of height for neighbouring residents (MU 58). Developers must do the right thing and must not be allowed to do the wrong thing through bribing the Council with freebies. Every developer should be aspiring to well-designed, green buildings that fit the amenity and character of the neighbourhood, within permitted heights, or else they shouldn’t be building at all.

Major Point 3 – Emissions and amenity

13. Our third major point is that Emissions and Amenity are on the same team. MDRS enabled MRZs in our suburbs will stretch congestion and emissions. The proposal to add and unleash the height of HRZs makes these potential outcomes even worse. They are asking our residents to sacrifice amenity to create more emissions and traffic congestion, not reduce it.
14. Dr Helm and the Section 42A reports have shown that extending the densification along the Johnsonville Railway Line does not significantly add capacity nor does it contribute to the other goals of the NPS-UD. Consequently, we assert that protecting our amenity *improves* the City's carbon emissions, as highest density development is moved to where people can use active and public transport to keep emissions low.
15. Amenity to us also means recognising the realities of our geography and its character. Destroying ridge lines, blocking out our green hills, shading out the sun for 6 hours a day, and dominating neighbours all destroy the character and amenity that we love in our Turangawaewae: our standing place, our chosen destination on life's journey, our Khandallah.
16. I offer the following photographs as evidence.



(a) Agra Crescent (b) Agra Crescent + 4 storeys (c) Agra Crescent (d) Agra Crescent + 6-storeys

17. For the avoidance of doubt, we are fundamentally opposed to Kāinga Ora's zoning maps for the reasons in this presentation. We feel they have focused on maximising zoning, not outcomes.

Julie Ward Presentation

18. I will now hand over to Julie Ward to continue our presentation on further points about what is required to achieve appropriate densification in our suburbs.

Presentation Wrap Up

19. Thank you for the opportunity to present to you again in Stream 2. The key points we leave you with are:
 - a. We want no HRZ along the Johnsonville rail Line, there is no infrastructure to support it
 - b. We want vague requirements such as height limits and design features made specific to achieving good outcomes.
 - c. We want developments that increase emissions removed from the District Plan.
 - d. We want the MDRS setbacks restored (as proposed in the Section 42A report).
 - e. We want to development within the established pattern in our neighbourhoods.
 - f. We want permeable section space retained.
 - g. We believe that MDRS fits the bill for a neighbourhood centre such as ours.

Thank you.

Lawrence Collingbourne
President ORCA
27 March 2023