

Minutes of PRA Committee Meeting with Nic Etheridge, General Manager Policy, Planning & Regulatory Services, PCC & Mike Mendonca, General Manager Infrastructure, PCC

4 November 2025

In attendance:

Nic Etheridge, Mike Mendonca

Mayor & Councillors: Anita Baker, Ross Leggett, Josh Trlin, Moira Lawler, Phil Rhodes (GWRC)

PRA: Ken McAdam, Richard Bourne, Mary Jones, Lisa Dymond, Sam Dearsly, Diane Strugnell

Apologies: Jo Cross, Steph Manning, Micky Reilly, Cr Nathan Waddle

Council processes

The Notice of Motion from the 2025 AGM was “that Pāuatahanui Residents Association lobby Porirua City Council to work with Pāuatahanui Residents Association to develop a clear process for residents to resolve any inaccuracies in information Porirua City Council holds on properties including on flood hazard mapping.”

The need for a process was brought to attention due to the lack of accurate flood hazard mapping in some parts of the rural zone resulting in inaccurate information on a LIM. It was noted that, whilst flood hazard mapping is very topical now, any process needs to be available for other times when residents need to work with Council to resolve differences associated with the accuracy of information held by Council.

It will be good to

- to have a “reset”
- for Council to be able to “front foot” issues
- to have opportunities for PRA and Council to discuss issues/potential concerns rather than just when these become contentious
- to have the opportunity when an issue is flagged, for more information to be available, including onsite visits, meetings with Council staff and PRA

A possible pathway is for an issue to be elevated through PRA to Nic (or the person holding her position).

There was agreement to establish a formal process. Nic will draft a proposal, and once it is agreed upon, it could be issued as a formal letter from Wendy to PRA.

Esplanade Reserves or Strips

PRA had shared a discussion document prior to the meeting which included a number of questions.

Mike noted that the questions within this would be answered in writing.

Nic noted that the RMA prefers Esplanade Reserves and that the District Plan is consistent with this i.e. giving a preference to the creation of an Esplanade Reserve when a subdivision for less than 4ha involves a waterway.

However the District Plan does allow for an Esplanade Strip as a discretionary activity, putting in place a “higher bar” that must be met by the landowner undertaking a subdivision

There is a recommendation for landowners wishing to do a subdivision to use the “pre-app” meeting with Council as an opportunity to “test their thinking” and to find out what the requirements may be - these could include additional information, consultants, costs

It was noted that, from the outset, a clear method is needed to determine whether a stream or waterway meets the criteria for inclusion as a reserve or strip.

An information sheet on this topic is needed, as it is clear that the options available to landowners also need to be communicated to the consultants or professionals assisting them through the subdivision process.

Some landowners may share the preference for an Esplanade Reserve, placing ownership and responsibility for maintenance with Council.

Overall PRA considers that esplanade strips may offer a greater “win-win” outcome for Council, landowners, and the environment, given that ownership remains with the landowner, thereby encouraging a stronger sense of responsibility for ongoing maintenance and care.

PRA will work with Council to support the provision of clear information and understanding regarding the relevant sections of the District Plan and their implications for landowners considering subdivision within the rural zone. This may include an information sheet and content on PRA's website, similar to the guidance already provided on Sections 71–74 of the Building Act 2004.