Pauatahanui-Judgeford

STRUCTURE PLAN
Summary of public presentation held on 14 February 2012
Hosted by Porirua City Council
Indicative ideas for discussion

This presentation illustrates indicative ideas for discussion only. Technical proposals and estimates are provisional only and will be verified.

A draft report will be presented to council for consideration which will be followed by formal public consultation.

If you wish to offer informal comment at this stage please email Andrew Guerin at:

Andrew.D.Guerin@mwhglobal.com
Pauatahanui Structure Plan

PROGRAMME

• Start November
• Focus Groups and Public Session
• Options development
• Public Presentation/Workshop (14 Feb 2012)
• Proposed Structure Plan (June 2012)
• Formal Consultation (Mid July 2012)
• Public Open Day (Mid July 2012)
• Formal Adoption (December 2012)
FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS November 2011

In addition to the open public meetings the following groups were consulted:

- BRANZ
- Village Business Owners
- NZ Wind Energy Association
- Guardians of Pauatahanui Inlet
- Pauatahanui Inlet Community Trust
- Pauatahanui Residents Association
- Te Runanga o Toa Rangatira Inc
NATURAL CHARACTER
salt marsh vegetation | pockets of bush | distinct landforms | open space

RURAL AMENITY
roads | building types, set back and separation | ‘productive’ landuse | open outlook | rural elements - other structures/ planting

THE VILLAGE
Historic features | Community Centre
Pauatahanui Inlet Drainage Catchments

Pauatahanui Stream catchment = 4309 Ha
Ration Creek catchment = 681 Ha

Flighty’s Road is partly in PS catchment and partly in RC catchment

Some of the land around the Village is the lower reaches of the Ration Creek catchment
Map showing strategic pa and routeways circa 1839, R McClean 1997 research for Waitangi Tribunal
Map showing strategic pa and routeways circa 1839, R McClean 1997 research for Waitangi Tribunal
Matai-Taua Pa, located under the site of St. Alban’s Churchyard

REFERENCES.

A. Two rows of palisades. The outer one rather weak, the inner strengthened by two lines of wood, 10 inches square.

B. Ditch six feet wide and five deep.

C. Holes. Communication had been cut under-ground from four of the houses to the ditch, and was intended throughout.

D. Rongkorekora’s where and a large hole dug in the ground intended for a hut for the same chief.

E. Open yard.

F. Native chapel.

G. Entrance to the Pa.

H. Position occupied by the militia when taking possession.

I. Mouth of the north arm of Corinna Bay.

Reference should be made to Major Tates dispatches, for an accurate description of the position and strength of Tahuturau.

The above sketch represents the outer palisades. The height about fifteen feet.

I and K represent square holes, meant either for firing through from the ditch, or as a means of escape in case of accident.
Taylor Stace Cottage
Former State Highway 58, Pauatahanui

Thomas Hollis Stace Cottage
State Highway 58, Pauatahanui
Transmission Gully

- Median divided
- Gazetted motorway
- No direct access
- Two intermediate interchanges – SH58 and James Cook
- Two PCC link roads
- One SH link road - Kenepuru
TRANSMISSION GULLY AT LANES FLAT

Viewpoint 6
Laning South from Greenwood Substitution

Proposed Road and SH58 Interchange – with Mitigation
- Viewpoint 6
- Landscape mitigation planting shown at approximately 10 years growth
- Scale: 1:2000
- Computer model elevation: 20m

NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY
WAKA KOTAHI
New Zealand Government
THE CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES
Coastal Inundation
(Assumed 0.8m Mean Sea Level Rise by 2090)
Coastal Inundation - Village Close-up
(0.8m MSLR 2090)
Liquefaction potential
landscape character, vegetation and flatter areas
landscape character, vegetation and moderate slopes
landscape character, vegetation and steeper slopes
Also with hazards and riparian
CLUES estimates of current terrestrial sediment (kt/yr)
(excludes earthworks)
LEVERAGING WATER QUALITY GAINS OFF RURAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
MAKING REVEGETATION WORK

- 50% sedimentation reduction targeted by the Porirua Harbour Strategy.
- Pauatahanui stream catchment contributes a quarter of the total sedimentation.
- 300 ha revegetation of streams and steep land will reduce the Pauatahanui stream’s catchment sedimentation contribution by 10%
- 1-2 ha of revegetation will cost approx $30,000-60,000 (to be confirmed)

Options to consider with new subdivisions:

- Revegetate 1 ha for each new lot
- or retire and manage an area greater than 1 ha
- or a $ contribution toward revegetation or for other water quality measures elsewhere within the harbour catchment
RURAL RESIDENTIAL GROWTH OPTIONS
OPTIONS

1. Status quo 5ha
2. No further 2.5ha
3. Landscape responsive, sediment benefit
4. No on-site servicing, sediment benefit

Number of lots

Options

- no sediment benefit
- legally vulnerable, no sediment benefit
- landscape responsive, sediment benefit
- 3,000m² min lot size
OPTION 3 – 2.5ha avg.
OPTION 4 –
3000m² min in green
2.5ha avg. in yellow
## OPTIONS EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heritage</th>
<th>Water Quality</th>
<th>NZTA</th>
<th>Local Transport</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Social Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status quo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no further subdivision</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5ha avg. (1&amp;2ha minimum) in green and orange areas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3ha minimum in green, 2.5ha avg. (2ha minimum) in orange</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Add-on A**   |          |               |      |                 |         |            |           |                   |            |                      |
| logistics centre |          |               |      |                 |         |            |           |                   |            |                      |

| **Add-on B**   |          |               |      |                 |         |            |           |                   |            |                      |
| hamlet         |          |               |      |                 |         |            |           |                   |            |                      |

**Add-on A** with sports hub

**Add-on B** with services

- **Acceptable**
- **Less acceptable**
- **Undesirable**
THE EVALUATION FAVOURS OPTION 3

Least constrained land (GREEN): 2.5ha avg, 1-2ha min

Mildly constrained land (ORANGE): 2.5ha avg, 2ha min

Erosion-prone land (RED): 5ha (4ha?) min

COLOURS REFER TO OPPORTUNITY AND CONSTRAINTS MAPS
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING

CONCEPT DIAGRAM - BUILDINGS, ROADS/ACCESSWAY & VEGETATION FRAMEWORK

KEY
[EXISTING SITE FEATURES]
- GRASS
- EXOTIC FOREST
- SPECIMEN TREES
- NATIVE BUSH
- WATERWAYS
- EXISTING BUILDING

[PROPOSED FEATURES]
- NATIVE REVEGETATION (on steeper slopes)
- RIPARIAN PLANTING (along existing waterways)
- SPECIMEN/SHELTER TREES (native/exotic)
- PROPERTY BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED DWELLING LOCATION
- STUDY AREA

OVERALL AREA: 65 hectares
NEW UDF: 11.76%
AVERAGE OF SITE: 2.3ha
RANGE: 1 - 17.44ha
BLACK AREA: 24ha (riparian buffer/revegetation focus and no-build zones)
RED AREA: 0.25ha (revegetation focus)
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING

3D ANALYSIS - BUILDING AND ROAD/ACCESSWAY LOCATION

HOUSE SITING EXAMPLE WITHOUT REVEGETATION

View to the north - showing possible bridle trail along ridgeline through to Moonshine Rd

PAUATAHANUI-JUDGEFORD STRUCTURE PLAN
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING

3D ANALYSIS - BUILDING AND ROAD/ACCESSWAY LOCATION

HOUSE SITING EXAMPLE WITHOUT REVEGETATION

View to the east across existing residential properties

PAUATAHANUI-JUDGEFORD STRUCTURE PLAN
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING
SITE DIAGRAM (A)

Retain areas of open space/pasture on more gentle sloping land to provide for rural activities and recreation, solar gain for housing and to ensure important views are maintained.

Retain and enhance existing native vegetation patterns with an emphasis on existing ecosites, riparian areas, steep land and priority areas identified in district wide vegetation framework plans.

Revegetate other areas (gentle to moderate sloped land) with native plants to provide shelter and screening for buildings/home operated businesses.

Plant exotic trees to complement patterns in the rural environment such as shelter belts and clusters of landmark trees rather than lines of street trees.

PAUATAHANUI-JUDGEFORD STRUCTURE PLAN
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING
LOT DIAGRAM (B) - PART 02

- Retain and enhance existing native vegetation patterns with an emphasis on existing ecosites, riparian areas, steep land and priority areas identified in district wide vegetation framework plans.
- Orientate residential buildings to maximise views and solar gain.
- Vary setbacks to maximise privacy and views.
- Locate buildings against a backdrop (landform/vegetation) - avoid skyline ridges.
- Locate buildings on naturally occurring platforms and use balanced cut and fill.

PAUATAHANUI-JUDGEFORD STRUCTURE PLAN
OPTION 3 INDICATIVE EXAMPLE ONLY

RURAL - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN PLANNING

ROAD, ACCESSWAY AND PATHWAY DESIGN - public road

Limit the use of street lighting & ensure lighting levels, scale and design (style) is consistent with that of the rural area.
Provide for a range of transportation options, including pedestrian, cycleways and accessways with links to a wider network.
Retain areas of pasture/open space & views of rural landscape in some areas.

Ensure scale of carriageways complements that of existing roads and minimises earthworks.
Use chip seal or loose road metal.
Align roads to follow the contour of the topography, avoiding prominent bill faces and ridges.
Avoid the use of a raised concrete kerb and channel.
Provide swales for stormwater runoff, either planted or graveled with aggregate.
Use fencing types that complement the rural character and increase sense of open space. Such as post & rail or post & wire fencing - 1.5m.

PAUATAHANUI-JUDGEFORD STRUCTURE PLAN
PAUATAHANUI VILLAGE
PAUATAHANUI VILLAGE
PAUATAHANUI VILLAGE OPTION
(Feb 2012 version)

LEGEND
- Red: Existing businesses: apply new commercial zoning
- Blue: Existing community facilities
- Maroon: Proposed option for commercial development
- Orange: Existing residential
- Gray: Option to allow conversion to commercial or home-occupation
- White: Potential opportunity for rural-residential development with 1ha minimum lot size with onsite sewerage, indicative only, and to meet requirements of Coastal Environment and Landscape Character Area overlays.
ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

Small businesses that don’t compete with city options.

No large format retail.

Strengthen Pauatahanui Village.

Possible small Hamlet at Judgeford.

Employment uses at Lanes Flat Compound?

Logistics centre?
Transmission Gully creates new network connections that may make a logistics hub viable here. Any proposal will require extensive further investigation.
JUDGEFORD HAMLET
Judgeford Hamlet Option (Feb 2012 version)
Judgeford Hamlet

This is a small concentration of rural residential lots, small shops and employment uses.

- Local employment benefits
- Benefits from one or two small convenience, arts or craft shops
- On-site wastewater disposal
- Subdivision triggers contributions to environmental improvements
- Concentration of development leaves more land open
- Increased social interaction within rural community
- Increased surveillance of BRANZ property
LANES FLAT
LANES FLAT COMPOUND
SH58

PROPOSED LANES FLAT COMPOUND

TRANSMISSION GULLY
LANES FLAT COMPOUND OPTIONS

Public reserve or recreation use

Or, light commercial or highway related service centre (fuel and food), other than retail and offices that detract from the CBD.

→ Only if considered acceptable given the tsunami risk.
→ Only if visual effects acceptably addressed
→ Only if possible adverse environmental effects acceptably addressed

Residential development regarded as unacceptable because of the tsunami risk