



PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

9AM, WEDNESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2021
COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH

MEMBERS

Aleisha Rutherford (Chairperson)
Patrick Handcock ONZM (Deputy Chairperson)
Grant Smith (The Mayor)

Brent Barrett	Lorna Johnson
Rachel Bowen	Billy Meehan
Zulfiqar Butt	Bruno Petrenas
Renee Dingwall	Orphée Mickalad
Leonie Hapeta	

AGENDA ITEMS, IF NOT ATTACHED, CAN BE VIEWED AT

pncc.govt.nz | Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square
City Library | Ashhurst Community Library | Linton Library

Heather Shotter

Chief Executive | PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE MEETING

20 October 2021

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Apologies

2. Notification of Additional Items

Pursuant to Sections 46A(7) and 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987, to receive the Chairperson's explanation that specified item(s), which do not appear on the Agenda of this meeting and/or the meeting to be held with the public excluded, will be discussed.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7) must be approved by resolution with an explanation as to why they cannot be delayed until a future meeting.

Any additions in accordance with Section 46A(7A) may be received or referred to a subsequent meeting for further discussion. No resolution, decision or recommendation can be made in respect of a minor item.

3. Declarations of Interest (if any)

Members are reminded of their duty to give a general notice of any interest of items to be considered on this agenda and the need to declare these interests.

4. Public Comment

To receive comments from members of the public on matters specified on this Agenda or, if time permits, on other Committee matters.

(NOTE: If the Committee wishes to consider or discuss any issue raised that is not specified on the Agenda, other than to receive the comment made or refer it to the Chief Executive, then a resolution will need to be made in accordance with clause 2 above.)

5. **Presentation - Ms Georgina Murrow** Page 7

6. **Confirmation of Minutes** Page 9
 "That the minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting of 8 September 2021 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record."

7. **The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street (Former Terrace End Bowling Club) - Deliberations on Submissions** Page 15
 Report, presented by Michael Duindam, Acting City Planning Manager.

8. **Committee Work Schedule** Page 41

9. **Exclusion of Public**

To be moved:

"That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting listed in the table below.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under Section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under Section 48(1) for passing this resolution

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the

relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

Also that the persons listed below be permitted to remain after the public has been excluded for the reasons stated.

[Add Third Parties], because of their knowledge and ability to assist the meeting in speaking to their report/s [or other matters as specified] and answering questions, noting that such person/s will be present at the meeting only for the items that relate to their respective report/s [or matters as specified].

PRESENTATION

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 20 October 2021

TITLE: Presentation - Ms Georgina Murrow

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee receive the presentation for information.
-

SUMMARY

Ms Georgina Murrow, resident of Longburn, will make a presentation on behalf of a group of neighbours and businesses in the area about their concerns on street racing on Works Road.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee Meeting Public, held via an Audio Visual Meeting on 08 September 2021, commencing at 9.01am

Members Present: Councillor Aleisha Rutherford (in the Chair), The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Brent Barrett, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson and Orphée Mickalad.

Non Members: Councillors Susan Baty, Vaughan Dennison, Lew Findlay QSM and Karen Naylor.

Apologies: Councillors Billy Meehan (lateness) and Bruno Petrenas

Councillor Billy Meehan entered the meeting at 9.05am during consideration of clause 29. He was not present for clause 28.

Councillor Zulfiqar Butt momentarily left the meeting due to a connectivity issue during consideration of clause 31. He was not present for sub-clause 31.2.

28-21 Apologies

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 28-21 above was carried 14 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Vaughan Dennison declared an interest in item 7 Draft Support and Funding Policy - Approval for Consultation (sub-clause 31.4-21) and took no part in discussion or debate of this sub-clause.

29-21 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting of 11 August 2021 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 29-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

30-21 Annual Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 Report

Memorandum, presented by Kerry-Lee Probert, Head of Environmental Protection Services, and Ross McDermott, Team Leader - Animal Management & Education.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the report of the Dog Control Policy and Practices for the Palmerston North City Council pursuant to Section 10A of the Dog Control Act 1996 for the period 2020/21, as attached to this memorandum titled 'Annual Section 10A Dog Control Act 1996 Report' presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021, be received.

Clause 30-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

31-21 Draft Support and Funding Policy - Approval for Consultation

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager; Ann-Marie Mori, Policy Analyst, Lili Kato, Policy Analyst; Stephanie Velvin, Acting Community Development Manager; and Bryce Hosking, Manager – Property.

The meeting adjourned at 10.49am.

The meeting resumed at 11.11am.

In discussion it was agreed to approve the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 for consultation, subject to the inclusion of the following

requested amendments:

- To note the Square Edge and Creative Sounds buildings as Out of Scope. Both organisations' lease agreements align more with the out of scope criteria 'Occupancy of Council Cultural Facilities'.
- To remove the suggested exclusions in relation to the Community Development Small Grants fund, listed in sub-clause 31.2 below, as the proposed changes to the criteria would unnecessarily reduce the eligibility of this grant.
- To signal intent within the draft Policy to remove sector-lead organisations in the arts, social and environmental sectors from the contestable funding model and offer them funding contracts instead, in accordance with the strategic direction established in the 10-Year Plan 2021-31.
- To expand the scope of the development contributions subsidy to include building and resource consents costs, to make this already budgeted fund more accessible.
- To include option 2 (status quo) in the draft Policy as the community rental framework option to be consulted on for community occupancy of Council property, because the proposed option 1 could imply a significant cost increase for some community organisations.

Moved Rachel Bowen, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the occupancy of Square Edge and Creative Sounds buildings be noted as Out of Scope.

Clause 31.1-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Moved Renee Dingwall, seconded Lorna Johnson.

2. To amend Part B, section 7, #6 'Community Development Small Grants fund' of the Draft Support and Funding Policy, in order to remove the following new exclusions:
 - Applicants who at the time of applying are, or will be, recipients of Council's strategic priority grant;
 - Applicants whose current assets minus current liabilities are more than two years running costs.

Clause 31.2-21 above was carried 13 votes to 1, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan and Orphée Mickalad.

Against:

Councillor Karen Naylor.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Lorna Johnson.

3. To signal intent within the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 to remove sector-lead organisations in the arts, social and environmental sectors from the contestable funding model and offer them funding contracts instead.

Clause 31.3-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Susan Baty.

4. That the scope of the development contributions subsidy is expanded to include building and resource consents costs.

Clause 31.4-21 above was carried 14 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Note:

Councillor Vaughan Dennison declared a conflict of interest and withdrew from discussion and voting.

Moved Lorna Johnson, seconded Rachel Bowen.

5. That option 2 (status quo) is consulted on for community rental framework for occupancy of Council property.

Clause 31.5-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

6. That the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor be authorised to approve minor amendments to the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 prior to publication.
7. That the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021, included as an attachment to the memorandum titled 'Draft Support and Funding Policy – Approval for Consultation' presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021, be approved for consultation, subject to the agreed amendments.

Clauses 31.6-21 and 31.7-21 above were carried 13 votes to 1, with 1 abstention, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

Against:

The Mayor (Grant Smith).

Abstained:

Councillor Leonie Hapeta.

*Clauses 31.1-21 to 31.7-21 not adopted by Council on 6 October 2021
Clause 122-21*

Note:

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

On a procedural motion: 'That the item of business being discussed lie on the table, and not be further discussed at that meeting, until the following meeting of the Planning & Strategy Committee Meeting in October', so that the Committee could consider an amended version of the draft Support and Funding Policy 2021 before approving it for public consultation.

The motion was lost 5 votes to 10, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Lew Findlay QSM, Leonie Hapeta, Billy Meehan and Orphée Mickalad.

Against:

Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Lorna Johnson and Karen Naylor.

32-21

Draft Stormwater Bylaw - approval for consultation

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy & Policy Manager; Ann-Marie Mori, Policy Analyst; and Robert van Bentum, Chief Engineer.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That the Council approve the draft Palmerston North Stormwater Bylaw 2022 Consultation Document (as attached as attachment one in the report titled "Draft Stormwater Bylaw – approval for consultation" presented to the Planning & Strategy Committee on 8 September 2021) for public consultation.
2. That the Chief Executive be authorised to approve minor amendments to the consultation document prior to publication.

Clause 32-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

33-21 Committee Work Schedule - September 2021

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated September 2021.

Clause 33-21 above was carried 15 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Brent Barrett, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Zulfiqar Butt, Vaughan Dennison, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor and Orphée Mickalad.

The meeting finished at 12.12pm

Confirmed 20 October 2021

Chairperson

REPORT

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 20 October 2021

TITLE: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street (Former Terrace End Bowling Club) - Deliberations on Submissions

PRESENTED BY: Michael Duindam, Acting City Planning Manager

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the future use of 17 Summerhays Street (Former Terrace End Bowling Club) be confirmed for housing.
2. That the Chief Executive be directed to further investigate the need, design and location of any public green space to support the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing as part of the necessary amendments to the District Plan and/or resource consent process.
3. That the Chief Executive be directed to initiate a District Plan change to enable the proposed repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing.
4. That it be noted that should the District Plan be amended to enable the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing, the District Plan change process will include public submissions and an assessment of potential environmental effects, including those identified in submissions received on the Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street Statement of Proposal.
5. That it be noted that should the Council wish to repurpose 17 Summerhays Street for housing in advance of a District Plan change, the Council could consider a resource consent application.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS ANALYSIS FOR 17 SUMMERHAYS STREET

Problem or Opportunity	<p>17 Summerhays Street has recently been vacated by the Terrace End Bowling Club, creating an opportunity for the site to help meet a housing supply shortfall. The Council prepared a statement of proposal on the future use of the 17 Summerhays Street. The proposal was:</p> <p><i>That the Council initiates amendments to the District Plan to enable the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing.</i></p> <p>57 submissions were received. The Council now needs to make decision on the Statement of Proposal.</p>
OPTION 1: THE PROPOSAL	That the Council initiates amendments to the District Plan to enable the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing, including sale, development or lease of the land, noting that no decision has been made by the Council on the preferred delivery mechanism at this time.
Community Views	36 submitters support housing.
Benefits	<p>Housing would assist in meeting growing demand in an area that is already serviced and compatible with the surrounding area. Housing would provide opportunities for revenue or increasing the stock of social housing, and for Council to demonstrate best practice urban design.</p> <p>This option is already accounted for in the 10-Year Plan 2021-31.</p> <p>Aligns with National Policy Statement for Urban Development and the Council's City Growth Plan, which seek to identify opportunities to repurpose underutilised Council land for housing.</p>
Risks	If Council develops the site, housing requires the largest financial and process cost. There is a reduction in green space and opportunities for a new recreational asset are lost.
OPTION 2:	Land-bank the site.
Community Views	One submitter supported land-banking the site.
Benefits	Retain in Council ownership for future needs and opportunities.
Risks	There is a lost opportunity to address housing supply and potential revenue. Land-banking does not align with National Policy Statement for Urban Development or the Council's City Growth Plan, which seek to repurpose underutilised Council land for housing.

OPTION 3:	Develop for recreational purposes.
Community Views	10 submitters supported a green space or park.
Benefits	Recreation use is consistent with the site's historic land-use and allows for enhanced recreation opportunities.
Risks	There is a lost opportunity to address housing supply and potential revenue. The site does not meet reserve development criteria ¹ . The benefit of the additional neighbourhood reserve is limited to a low number of households ² .
OPTION 4:	Retain for community purposes.
Community Views	6 submitters supported retaining the site for a community use.
Benefits	There is an opportunity for a community to identify a use for the site to enhance recreational or cultural opportunities. There is an opportunity for Rangitāne o Manawatū to identify a cultural opportunity for the site. Rental return to Council retained. ³
Risks	There is a lost opportunity to address housing supply and potential revenue. The existing building is due for demolition. The net cost to council is uncertain as it depends on the use.

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY

- 1.1 17 Summerhays Street has recently been vacated by the Terrace End Bowling Club after their amalgamation with the Northern Bowling Club on North Street. There is significant housing demand in Palmerston North. Over the next 10 years, there is a projected demand for 5000 new homes. In the short-term (over the next three years), 55% of growth is targeted to be delivered through intensification opportunities. In the medium term (in four to ten years from now), 45% of growth is targeted to be delivered through intensification opportunities. Summerhays Reserve provides a sizeable opportunity for additional housing within the existing urban area and also has the benefit of being close to employment, education and amenities.

¹ The site fails to meet minimum road frontage requirements, would be isolated to a single sportfield, and former use of pesticides on the site may require soil to be brought in for community gardens or other food growing activities. See Council Memorandum *Summerhays Street Future Consultation* presented 7 April 2021.

² Conversion to a neighbourhood reserve would add 101 more households to the City that are within 500m of a reserve.

³ \$300-1500 in potential annual rental return. The PN Leisure Community Centre already serves that immediate community.

- 1.2 There has been a 19% increase in the median of annual weekly rents from July 2020 to July 2021 in the District. Median annual weekly rents rose from \$380 per week to \$460 per week⁴. Average house prices in the District have risen by 31.7% in the same period, from \$532,980 in July 2020 \$733,722 in July 2021⁵. Increasing housing supply is a key means to addressing housing affordability.
- 1.3 Identifying "Council and Government land to be used for market and affordable housing" has been confirmed as a Council action in the City Growth Plan.
- 1.4 The Council prepared a statement of proposal on the future use of the 17 Summerhays Street to address the reasons above. The proposal was:

"That the Council initiates amendments to the District Plan to enable the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing."
- 1.5 Fifty-seven submissions were received, with one submission being submitted to the 11 August 2021 Planning & Strategy Committee via the chairperson. Six submissions were heard at the 11 August 2021 Planning and Strategy Committee. Council now needs to make decision on the Statement of Proposal.

2. BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS COUNCIL DECISIONS

- 2.1 The City Development Strategy noted that "Council also has a significant property portfolio that can be used to contribute to city growth and development, while also providing revenue. This could include repurposing underutilised land or identifying land where uses can be relocated to enable sustainable housing development and intensification."
- 2.2 The Council passed the following resolutions on 7 April 2021 to implement this action for 17 Summerhays Street:

"That the Council confirms repurposing the land located at 17 Summerhays Street, Palmerston North for housing as the preferred option for the future use of this land, subject to the required consultation process."

"That the Council directs the Chief Executive to prepare a statement of proposal consultation document on the future use of the land located at 17 Summerhays Street, Palmerston North, with repurposing the land for housing as the preferred option."
- 2.3 Alongside greenfield growth, encouraging minor dwellings, development partnerships, enabling intensification, and discouraging land banking, Council has recommended in its latest Housing Capacity Assessment Report to "Undertake council owned housing development and investigate opportunities to repurpose reserves for housing."

⁴ Ministry for Business, Innovation and Employment Rental Bond Database.

⁵ Quotable Value New Zealand House Price Index.

- 2.4 These recommendations were adopted at the 30 June 2021 Planning & Strategy Committee, with the following specific resolution:

"That investigations be undertaken to determine whether under-utilised reserves, including sports fields, could be partially or fully repurposed for housing."

- 2.5 Further background on 17 Summerhays Street was provided in the Statement of Proposal.

3. DESCRIPTION OF OPTIONS

- 3.1 The options were described as follows in the statement of proposal.

Option 1: That the Council initiates amendments to the District Plan to enable the repurposing of 17 Summerhays Street for housing, including sale, development or lease of the land, noting that no decision has been made by the Council on the preferred delivery mechanism at this time.

Option 2: Land-bank the site: No changes to the overall management regime for the reserve. The land is retained by the Council for a use to be determined at some time in the future.

Option 3: Develop for recreational purposes: The reserve is developed by the Council for a recreational purpose such as a park, playground or sports field.

Option 4: Retain for the community to use the site for a recreational, cultural or community purpose.

- 3.2 Taking into account the submissions received, there is also the future ability to adopt a hybrid that provides the potential to deliver on multiple options. This could be further explored as part of District Plan change or resource consent process.

4. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 4.1 A summary of submissions was presented to the August 2021 Planning and Strategy Committee. For ease of reference the summary is also included as attachment one to this report.
- 4.2 The summary of submissions categorised the submissions under a series of issues that are analysed below:

Miscellaneous: The following submission points were not in relation to any particular option preferred by submitters.

Submission Topic	Analysis of Submission
Reuse the existing building. Four submitters were not convinced that the existing building could not be repurposed. Three	The building would require significant investment to make it compliant with the building code, and faces a number of

submitters considered the building to be of heritage and functional value and were interested in more evidence to justify the demolishing of the existing building. One submitter considered the removal and sale of the building to gain revenue.	earthquake, water-tightness, and security issues.
Designated access and egress. Two submitters commented that dedicating each of the two entrances to the site as a single access and single egress would reduce the risk of delays to peak traffic on surrounding streets.	A future plan change and / or resource consent would require a transport assessment to demonstrate the impact and mitigation options available for any new land-use. It is noted that carpark access for Terrace End Bowling Club members would have been via Summerhays Street exclusively.
Impact on the Summerhays Dairy. One submitter noted the negative impact that the bowling club's move from the site has had on the Summerhays Dairy.	Noted. Option 1 has the potential to increase the amount of residents served daily by the dairy. Options 3 and 4 have the potential to attract more residents to the neighbourhood that may shop at the dairy during their visit.
Disagreement with the use of household proximity as a metric. One submitter noted that assessing the number of additional households that meet Council's park proximity measure misses the point of what a unique opportunity a park development could be.	Noted.
Design. One submitter has noted that good design is vital and worth the effort.	Noted. Urban design or landscape evidence would be required to support a District Plan change and / or resource consent.
Innovative consultation approaches. One submitter suggested the use of a neighbourhood 'play street' event to assist in gauging local views about the site.	Noted. While this cannot be considered in the recently closed Special Consultative Procedure for the site, officers can consider this as a tool for future consultation phases depending on the option progressed.
Consider the Horizons One Plan for any development.	Noted.

<p>Option 1 Housing: The following submission points related to the comments regarding Council's preferred option. Note that submitters will overlap across complimentary themes, e.g. housing in general and social housing.</p>	
Submission Topic	Analysis of Submission
<p>Repurposing for housing in general. 37 of the 58 total submissions supported repurposing the site for housing. Submitters believe that the site is suitably close to existing residential neighbourhoods, amenities, public transport, reticulated services and parks. Additionally, submitters consider this an opportunity to gain revenue and address the City's housing shortage. The majority of social media comments were in support of housing on the site.</p> <p>Nine submitters do not support housing on this site. Submitters cite the potential transport impacts with narrow accesses and existing traffic delays at peak times. Submitters state that access to green space will be inevitably more important as the rest of the City intensifies. One submitter suggested that if historical pesticide use is a barrier to community gardens, then it would equally be so for residential use. Some submitters challenged the level of impact that a site of this size will have on housing affordability when compared with privately land-banked sites. One submitter was concerned about the lack of detail regarding the costs of development.</p>	<p>Community feedback aligns well with Council's strategic direction.</p> <p>A future District Plan change and / or resource consent would require a transport assessment to demonstrate the impact and mitigation options available for any new land-use. Access to green space is covered in analysis for Option 3 below. It is likely that a contaminated land report and mitigation options would inform a future District Plan change. Council's Housing Capacity Assessment Report 2021 contains an action to investigate the reuse of underutilised Council and government land.</p> <p>The costs of development would be prepared for the future consideration of Council once the primary land-use is confirmed.</p>
<p>Social housing. 20 submitters supported social housing. Some submitters stated that this is a more suitable site for Council-owned social housing compared to other outlying areas. The site provides an opportunity to show a creative approach to wellbeing. Council should consult experienced social housing groups. A few options were proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A mix of subsidised and non-subsidised rental accommodation owned by Council - A portion of the site sold to fund social 	<p>Community feedback aligns well with Council strategic direction.</p> <p>Council's Connected Communities Plan has a clear understanding of the main tenant groups that Council social housing is to provide for. Submitter comments regarding support services and consultation with social housing groups aligns with Council's action to <i>Provide social housing according to best practice guidance and subject to peer review.</i></p> <p>The 10-Year Plan 2021-31 confirmed Council's role as a social housing provider, and made a commitment to</p>

<p>housing on the balance of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emergency housing for vulnerable people <p>One submitter stated that the support services available to support social housing tenants need to be more than is offered by the Papaioea Place complex.</p> <p>Five submitters did not support social housing. Submitters considered that social housing was not core to Council's activities when compared to community housing providers and Kainga Ora. One submitter suggested that revenue from private housing on this site could go towards redeveloping some of the Council's existing underutilised social housing stock.</p>	<p>increase the number of social housing units.⁶</p> <p>Options on how the site may contribute to social housing outcomes may be considered by the Council after the primary land-use option is decided.</p>
<p>Target market. Five submitters supported affordable housing. The different target markets suggested by submitters are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Families or young couples on low-medium incomes - Older people - Young disabled people <p>One submitter referenced the Abbeyfield model as a best practice cohousing model of development, mixing complimentary residential groups together.</p>	<p>Some of the target markets suggested by submitters align with future household population trends in the Housing Capacity Assessment Report, where there is a growing unmet need for one and two-bedroom dwellings.</p> <p>Options on how the site may provide for different target markets or models may be considered by the Council after the primary land-use option is decided.</p>
<p>Development and management approach. Four submitters preferred that the Council develop the site for housing themselves, due to a lack of confidence that the private development community would provide more than low density dwellings. Two submitters suggested a preference towards long-term rental accommodation provided by the Council.</p> <p>One submitter advocated for the use of</p>	<p>Options on how the site may be developed and managed may be considered by Council after the primary land-use option is decided.</p> <p>Universal design and age-in-place principles would align with best practice aims in the Connected Communities and City Growth Plans.</p>

⁶ Connected Communities Plan.

<p>universal design and age in place principles for new housing.</p> <p>One submitter suggested that the revenue from development should offset the costs of recreation programmes in the Long-Term Plan.</p> <p>Kainga Ora is interested in the sale and redevelopment of the site for housing.</p>	
<p>Development format. One submitter preferred single-storey owner-occupied dwellings. 13 submitters supported medium-density housing as a way of reducing urban sprawl and catering to both first homebuyers and residents downsizing from larger lots. A submitter to the 10-Year Plan 2021-31 also supported medium-density housing.</p> <p>Three submitters suggested that a hybrid format of dwellings and a small park would be preferable if recreation use is not chosen as the preferred option by the Council. Each submitter had different views on the 'ratio' between housing and recreation: some splitting the difference down the middle to match with the existing District Plan zones for the site, whereas some only request a minimum of 10% of the land left for a park. One submitter requested that the housing be retained as rental accommodation in case the Council wished to revert the landuse back to recreation in the future. Some submitters suggested that collocating housing with a park would give the site the oversight from adjacent neighbours similar to what a street frontage would provide. Some submitters suggested that this option would offset for smaller or no private yard space in higher density development, whereas some urged the need to maintain lower densities to avoid overlooking and disrupting existing residents' views of the Tararua Ranges. Submitters stated that this option would address the issue of nearby parks being difficult to access by foot or bike.</p>	<p>Single-storey dwellings are the most common housing unit in the City. This option would not be consistent with the Council's aims in the City Growth Plan to <i>deliver a more diverse range of housing types, such as duplexes, terraced housing, apartments and other multi-unit options, particularly in brownfield developments.</i></p> <p>Submissions in support of medium-density housing aligns with the Council's Strategic Direction.</p> <p>The need and design of any public green space to support housing can be considered by the Council after the primary land-use option is decided.</p>

Public transport should be extended to support housing on this site.	The site is within 300m of two bus routes. The current Horizons Regional Council Bus Review options would at worst, make the closest bus routes 280m and 375m away from the site, and at best, bring a bus route to as close as 150m away. Best practice is to have public transport access within 400m.
---	--

Option 2 Land-bank the site: The following submission points related to the comments regarding retaining the site for a future development opportunity.

Submission Topic	Analysis of Submission
<p>Land-banking in general. One submitter supported land-banking the site. The submitter suggested that holding onto the site may avoid the effects of a constrained construction sector currently. This site could help take pressure off new park initiatives being developed in our citywide reserves.</p> <p>Six submitters opposed land-banking, stating that it does not help address the housing shortage.</p>	<p>Community feedback aligns well with the Council strategic direction. Discouraging land-banking is a key recommendation adopted in the Housing Capacity Assessment Report 2021.</p> <p>The submitter's concerns regarding a constrained construction industry are noted.</p> <p>Reserve management and development plans and provisions in the District Plan Recreation Zone are an effective way to manage the submitter's concern of citywide reserves becoming over-saturated with initiatives.</p>

Option 3 Recreation use: The following submission points related to the comments regarding developing the site as a park.

Submission Topic	Analysis of Submission
<p>Recreation use in general. Ten submitters supported the use of the site as a park. Submitters supported a park to mitigate against the ongoing reduction of green space and biodiversity in the City. Submitters believe this is a suitable site for a park because of its size, views to the Tararua Ranges, drainage and sense of</p>	<p>At the citywide scale, Palmerston North has 10.3ha/1000 people, however we do not yet know if there is an equitable distribution of parks and reserves across the City⁷. Redeveloping the site into a park may assist with achieving the Council's goal in the Active Communities Plan to achieve more <i>equitable access to play, recreation, and sport facilities</i></p>

⁷ Active Communities Plan

peace. Small local reserves reduce the need to travel for recreation. Suggestions for the use of the park include:

- A dog park, due to a lack of walkable access to dog-friendly parks. The closest is Milverton Park, and is on-leash only
- A productive park with raised community gardens, urban orchard, and small playground
- A nature space that improves mental wellbeing
- A social media comment suggested a park that older people could enjoy

One submitter challenged the method used for determining the distance to nearby parks in the Statement of Proposal, comparing the direct distance to the walking distance on Google Maps.

Some submitters that were heard suggested that negotiating with neighbours to increase permeability with their rear fencing would provide the passive surveillance that would compensate for a lack of street frontage.

Ten submitters did not support the use of the site as a park. Submitters considered that there is not a shortage of green space in the City, agreed with the parks criteria considered in the Statement of Proposal and were concerned about the extra cost for developing and maintaining a park.

throughout the City. The contribution to this goal would be minor in relation to the investment required, due to limitations to the site's suitability as a park.

Each nearby park requires residents on Summerhays Street to cross busy roads. However, each busy intersection has either traffic light or pedestrian refuge facilities to provide safe crossing.

Dog parks often generate noise levels that are not complimentary to residential areas. For instance, fenced off dog areas at Ahimate Park and Ashhurst Domain are sited specifically away from housing due to noise sensitivity.

The submitter is correct that the distances quoted in the Statement of Proposal were 'as the crow flies.' A measurement of distances from the edge of the site to the edge of a nearby park along street edges shows the following walking distances:

- Memorial Park – 470m
- Hokowhitu Park – 840m
- Milverton Park – 870m
- Papaioea Park – 880m

Increasing the permeability of adjacent fencing is not considered a sustainable and effective option for creating passive surveillance over the site because:

- It would require both neighbours to agree on a fence design. Doing this with each individual neighbour may not guarantee a high enough level of permeability to substitute for what may be achieved with a street frontage.
- A number of the newer properties surrounding the site are closer to the boundary. These owners may not be agreeable to increased permeability

	<p>that may affect their privacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permeable fencing does not preclude neighbours from closing-up their sightlines with landscaping, additional fencing or structures within their boundary. An example of this is comparing the intentional open design of boundaries between Savage Reserve and its neighbours, and the building of close boarded fences on individual properties over time.
<p>Collaboration with Rangitāne o Manawatū. One submitter recommended involving Rangitāne o Manawatū at the earliest opportunity to develop a park. The submitter noted that the proposal has not addressed climate change impacts in the Statement of Proposal. A nature space would assist in regenerating the site from former pesticide use.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council would expect to deliver on their partnership with Rangitāne o Manawatū through early engagement at each milestone of the process.</p>

Option 4 Community use: The following submission points related to the comments retaining the site for a future community use.

Submission Topic	Analysis of Submission
<p>Community use in general. Six submitters supported the site for a community use. A number of these submitters see a synergy between recreation and community uses for the site. The site is seen as a viable location for an allotment-style community garden and orchard due to its size, existing buildings, and on-site carpark. Submitters disagreed that the Community Leisure Centre meets the community's needs, as there is no associated green space available. Those on social media that supported a community use suggested another sporting club, retention for historic value, or a stadium for concerts.</p> <p>Five submitters did not support the site for a community use. The submitters stated that the Community Leisure Centre is around the corner, and that the site is a strategic</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that the poor profile of the site and its comparably recent vacancy will not have assisted in attracting many community proposals since the Terrace End Bowling Club vacated the site. The existing building has been used as temporary storage by the Red Cross Book Sale, with a number of limitations to manage safety.</p> <p>The Council has not investigated any community need for allotment-style community gardens or an urban orchard in this location. The submitter has not provided any detail on a community need here. The Council is currently developing community orchards with community groups at other sites through the Council's edible tree programme, where needs and partnerships have been identified.</p>

<p>location for housing.</p>	<p>A community facilities review is being planned which may consider how important adjacency to green spaces is for community facilities. There are many successful community facilities in urban locations or without immediate access to green space.</p> <p>There have been no sporting codes that have expressed interest in the site. The size of the site precludes most sporting codes from being suitable for this site.</p> <p>The surrounding residential neighbourhood, size of the site, inconsistency with the city centre regime in the Strategic Direction and lack of evidence of a need make a stadium unsuitable.</p>
<p>Recreation complex for ethnic communities. The Manawatū Afghan Society suggested a recreation complex run by ethnic communities in Palmerston North. Communication, cultural, and religious constraints make it difficult to confidently participate in wider recreation activities, and this complex could create a fit for purpose facility.</p>	<p>The location and size of a citywide recreation complex for ethnic communities would need to be carefully scoped and considered. A community centre is being considered as part of the Civic and Cultural Precinct Masterplan and engagement will be undertaken with the Manawatū Multicultural Council. A community facilities review is being planned which may consider community facility needs for different communities. Both opportunities provide a more fit for purpose process for considering the gaps in community facilities for ethnic communities.</p>
<p>Themed community museum. One submitter suggested a unique museum where there is one room for each letter of the alphabet and each room is curated with objects related to that letter. The submitter stated this would help address the lack of things to do in the City, particularly during wet weather.</p>	<p>A tourism facility at this site would not be consistent with the strategic direction set in the City Shaping Plan or District Plan. The site is in a residential neighbourhood not directly adjacent to a commercial centre. Tourism facilities like this are better provided for as opportunities for existing exhibition facilities with the resourcing and infrastructure to accommodate it.</p> <p>It is not clear from the submission whether the submitter is proposing to invest in this idea.</p>

5. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 5.1 **Option 1:** That the Council confirms the intention to repurpose 17 Summerhays Street for housing, and then initiates amendments to the District Plan to enable the repurposing, including sale, development or lease of the land, noting that no decision has been made by the Council on the preferred delivery mechanism at this time.

Analysis: This was the recommended proposal. The key reason why it was identified as the preferred option is that it addresses housing supply issues.

Considering the submissions received, the recommended option remains the same as the proposal. Many of the submissions received were on specific preferences towards development formats, target markets, management approaches, and features of a housing development. These issues can be considered during the preparation of a District Plan change proposal or resource consent application if this option was adopted.

- 5.2 **Option 2:** Land-bank the site: No changes to the overall management regime for the reserve. The land is retained by the Council for a use to be determined at some time in the future.

Analysis: This option gained little support in submissions and does not address the housing supply issue or advance the use of the site for any recreational or community use.

- 5.3 **Option 3:** Develop for recreational purposes: The reserve is developed by the Council for a recreational purpose such as a park, playground or sports field.

Analysis: While several potential recreational uses were proposed in submissions, most lacked detail and the funding to deliver them. As detailed in the summary table, this option will not address the housing supply issue, will likely require an additional budget and will not provide an alternative revenue source. If the Council was to invest in a local reserve on the site, the benefit would reach a small number of households, in a catchment that already has good access to recreation opportunities.

- 5.4 **Option 4:** Retain for the community to use the site for a recreational, cultural or community purpose.

Analysis: While a couple of potential community uses were proposed in submissions, most lacked detail and the funding or budget to deliver them. As detailed in the summary table, this option will not address the housing supply issue, will likely require an additional budget and will not be likely to provide an alternative revenue source. Some of the ideas proposed are better placed for consideration in upcoming programmes for example the community facilities review and Civic Cultural Precinct Plan.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The recommended proposal addresses the housing supply issue, is consistent with direction provided in the City Growth Plan, requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and responds in part to the concerns and opportunities expressed in submissions.

7. NEXT ACTIONS

- 7.1 Implement the recommendations by:

- Report back to Council with options to seek direction on the preferred form of housing and development model for the site.
- Prepare a Proposed District Plan change that repurposes the site for housing.
- The Proposed District Plan Change is approved for consultation.
- The Proposed District Plan Change is consulted on and a decision made.
- A resource consent is prepared and submitted by the Council to develop housing at 17 Summerhays Street.

- 7.2 A resource consent application in advance of a District Plan change is an option that may release housing to the market quicker, but it does come with the following risks:

- Written approval of neighbours may be required because part of the site is zoned Recreation.
- If written approval is not obtained the resource consent may be notified and require a hearing.
- Council would be seen to be advancing residential development of a site zoned Recreation.

- 7.3 The relative merits of a resource consent application in advance of, or at the same time, as the rezoning proposal could be assessed further once Council has determined the final form of housing and preferred development model. In the meantime the rezoning proposal will be initiated in accordance with recommendation 3 of this report.

8. OUTLINE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

- 8.1 Submissions and hearings on a statement of proposal, following the Special Consultative Procedure under the Local Government Act 2002. This consultation included:

- Letters on the Statement of Proposal to 1666 property owners and occupiers in the vicinity of 17 Summerhays Street.
- Letters or emails to interested parties.
- A public notice published in the newspaper.
- Signage at the Summerhays Street and Ruahine Street entrances to the site.
- Social media promotion of the consultation on Council's social media pages, reaching up to 13,396 people.
- One drop-in session for the public to see the site in person.
- 360 images uploaded to Google Streetview for the public to see the site virtually.

COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide? If Yes quote relevant clause(s) from Delegations Manual	No
Are the decisions significant?	No
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	No
Can this decision only be made through a 10 Year Plan?	No
Does this decision require consultation through the Special Consultative procedure?	No
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	Yes
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	No
The recommendations contribute to Goal 1: An Innovative and Growing City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in City Growth	
The actions are:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity • Collaborate with the development community and Kāinga Ora on delivery of new housing developments and diverse forms of housing, such as duplexes, terrace housing, apartments and other multi-unit options. • Identify Council and Government land to be used for market and affordable housing. 	

Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	The Council also has a significant property portfolio that can be used to contribute to city growth and development, while also providing revenue. This could include repurposing underutilised land or identifying land where uses can be relocated to enable sustainable housing development and intensification.
--	---

ATTACHMENTS

1. Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street: Summary of Submissions [↓](#) 

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Number who wish to speak: **9** (10, 20, 28, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 56)

Submissions on 17 Summerhays Street Proposal – General issues

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Good design is vital and worth the effort	6	
Summerhays dairy has suffered since the bowling club has moved	3	
Consider the existing building for removal rather than demolition	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council may be able to get money from the building rather than costing them for demolition
Does not see why the existing building needs to be demolished	29, 39, 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see more evidence to justify demolishing the existing building Would like to see an investigation into the heritage status of the 1908 Clubroom The existing building has a good feel about it, has good sunlight access and an expansive view to surrounding green space Some of the existing storage sheds are beyond repair There is a lack of space for club rooms
A designated entrance on Summerhays Street and an exit on Ruahine Street	25, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is the potential for hold ups in peak traffic
Council could use neighbourhood 'play streets' to support public consultation and engagement	41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assists in gauging views from local residents on the need and format of houses and green space This approach supports Council's objectives under the Play Policy This approach supports Council's ability to guide its urban design response to public space infrastructure development
Using the number of households within the proximity of a park is a flawed argument	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This metric misses the point of what a unique opportunity a park development could be
Consider the Horizons One Plan	57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particular considerations include: Integrated infrastructure provision Flooding Stormwater management Land disturbance Liquefaction Energy efficiency Sustainable transport uptake

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Submissions on 17 Summerhays Street Proposal – Option 1: Housing

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Supports the repurposing of the site for housing	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to gather revenue • Good access to nearby amenities • More residents in that area will support nearby businesses • The City faces a housing shortage • The site is close to existing public transport routes • 270 Airforce staff will be moving to the Manawatu in 2023 will create additional pressure on housing supply • The site has not historically operated as a public open space • The site is within walking distance to two parks • The site is located within existing reticulated services • The site is surrounded by residential land use • Incorporate sustainable design into the development
Does not support the repurposing of the site for housing	5, 15, 27, 29, 39, 45, 46, 47, 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land will only benefit a handful of residents • The size of houses in new developments does not address the housing shortage effectively • We are losing too much green space to large homes • There are no budgets or costs presented to support the proposal • The existing accesses are too narrow to service high density housing • Building many properties here would increase transport risk between vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles • Is concerned about the potential leaching of residual pesticides into homes, food growing, or play areas as part of a housing development • The submitter's objection would be met by the retention of at least 10% of the site for recreation use, such as a playground • Access to green space will become more important as infill and increased housing density occurs in the City • Encouraging private land-bankers to develop would be more effective for creating additional housing
Supports the use of the site for social housing	6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 22, 25, 26, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 44, 48, 51, 54, 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should consult experienced social housing groups • Provides the opportunity to show a creative approach to wellbeing • A community lounge, shared social spaces and shared facilities (e.g. garden tool shed) should be incorporated to increase social cohesion • The site's central location lends itself better to social housing when compared to other Council-owned sites, e.g. Tamakuku Terrace • The land could be used for social housing developed by either Council, Kainga Ora or registered Community Housing Providers • Would support a mix of subsidised and non-subsidised rental accommodation owned by Council • The site could be used for emergency housing for those vulnerable to drug and alcohol addiction, domestic abuse, or parole. This type of accommodation may reduce the impact of criminal behaviour in the long term
Does not support the use of the site for Council-owned social housing	10, 37, 43, 47, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratepayers should not be subsidising rents when rate increases are so high • Council should stick to core business • Supports non-Council owned social housing

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the revenue from the sale of private housing on this site to provide social housing on other land within the City There is the equivalent of area within existing social housing areas that could be redeveloped instead Social housing is the primary responsibility of Central Government
The site should be used for affordable housing	3, 4, 44, 52, 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner with a developer to create low-cost housing Target towards young couples without children, solo parents, young couples with children all on lower or medium incomes
Council should develop the site themselves	3, 7, 36, 51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no evidence to suggest that a private developer would build enough reasonably priced homes to address the growing demand for housing Private developers are likely to develop single-storey standalone dwellings
The site should be used for medium density/apartment-style housing	2, 7, 10, 16, 19, 25, 26, 28, 31, 38, 48, 49, 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a great opportunity to maximise occupancy and create a common park grounds onsite for the residents Medium density would provide options for first home buyers as well as residents who may want to downsize from larger homes Medium-high density increases the site's potential to respond to the housing crisis without increasing urban sprawl The site is suitable for intensification to provide for a variety of housing types Access issues to the site can be solved creatively Low carbon urban design should be incorporated into this development
Supports the use of the site for housing that is suitable and affordable for people with special needs	20, 35, 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not enough housing for the young disabled A combination of housing for disabled and the older community is preferred, using co-housing models A good example of this form of co-housing is the Abbeyfield housing model, supported by Abbeyfield NZ and Disability Connect Refer to the Disability Connect Report '<i>The Unmet Housing Needs of Disabled People, Their Families and Whānau Research</i>'
Prefers the management of housing to be a long-term lease arrangement	23, 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is an unmet need for rental accommodation and rent security for long-term renters
Develop a portion of the site for sale to assist with the development costs of social housing for the remainder	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A mixed housing complex with shared social spaces is preferred
Housing should be developed for the older community	28, 33, 35, 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increased growth and price of retirement villages in the City is a sign that there is pressure to cater for our older community wanting to downsize their living environment The trend of tenancy applications to the Manawātū Community Housing Trust suggests that there are increases in the needs of the older community who are facing financial and social disadvantage The support services available to support this group need to be more than is offered by the Papaioea Place complex
Supports owner-occupied single-storey dwellings	37	

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
New housing should be designed using universal design and age in place principles	38	
Public transport access should be extended to support housing on this site	38	
May support housing developed on the existing Residential Zone portion of the site and a park developed on the Recreation Zone portion	39, 41, 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would avoid plan change costs • Subdivision design would need to avoid obstructing residents' views of the Tararua Ranges and avoid overshadowing • Would provide sections that overlook a new green space, helping the site meet parks criteria • Council could retain ownership of the residential properties for rental accommodation so that the option to revert to a park would still be available in the future • This option would provide a green space that could offset the reduced private yard space in higher density housing • Access to play at this site is not limited by crossing busy roads when compared with Memorial, Hokowhitu, and Milverton Parks • Few play spaces other than key destinations support an older or diverse residential demographic • This site could allow Council to initiate broader ways to support physical activity, e.g. walking, jogging, gardening and individual workout • Retaining a parcel of the recreation zone may allow Council to address difficulty for residents accessing existing park assets, reduce carbon emissions, and offer sanctuary for physical and community wellbeing
Revenue raised from developing recreation land should be used to offset the costs of recreation sector programmes in the Long-Term Plan	41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once land has been relinquished, it is unlikely that Council could get the land back
Consider the projected loss of green space to future generations	47, 55	
Engage with Kāinga Ora if there is an opportunity for further consultation or an opportunity to partner in the delivery of housing at this site	49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kāinga Ora is interested in any plan changes that relate to enabling housing in the urban environment • Kāinga Ora is interested in the sale and redevelopment of 17 Summerhays Street for housing

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Submissions on 17 Summerhays Street Proposal – Option 2: Land-banking

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Does not support land-banking the site	37, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is enough land-banking occurring in the City already More affordable housing is needed in central Palmerston North Is a missed opportunity to address housing supply in a strategic location
Supports land-banking the site	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could be a possible option if the site was maintained May help to avoid the effects of constrained supply for labour and materials in the construction sector Provides an option that could take the pressure off citywide reserves from having to accommodate new park initiatives, such as in the Esplanade

Submissions on 17 Summerhays Street Proposal – Option 3: Recreation Use

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Supports the use of the site for a green space/park	5, 15, 17, 27, 29, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The community green space could host community gardens, an urban orchard, and a playground Historical pesticide use would be unlikely to be serious enough to prevent tree growth and harvest This would help to address the ongoing destruction of green space in the City This would help prevent against the serious decline in biodiversity This would improve residents' physical and mental health, and support community cohesion Introduce no-parking or residents only parking only on the frontage, coupled with active transport promotion to prevent increased traffic to the site Small, easy to access reserves reduce the need to travel to access public green spaces If historical chemical use onsite does not preclude housing then it should not preclude a green space The site is peaceful and has views of the Tararua Ranges Local residents' recreation needs will not currently be met by having to cross busy roads to access Memorial, Hokowhitu, and Milverton Parks The land is slightly elevated along a river terrace and would possible have been free draining The site would have been zoned Recreation for good reason Disagrees that the site is surplus to outdoor recreational requirements There is a need for a dog park in a walkable area for the neighbourhood because Memorial and Milverton Parks prohibit dogs, and the neighbourhood is too far from the Manawatū River The size of the space is not suitable for sports and sports are already well catered for in Palmerston North
Does not believe the site is appropriate as a park	1, 3, 4, 9, 24, 37, 44, 48, 49, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are other parks close by The City does not have a shortage of parks The site is unsafe for general recreation The soil may not be safe for a community garden There is a lack of street frontage An extra park will incur more cost to Council to develop and maintain Is a missed opportunity to address housing supply in a strategic location

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Involve Rangitāne o Manawātū at the earliest opportunity to develop a park	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A natural green space designed by Rangitāne o Manawātū could be developed There is the opportunity to provide a recreation experience not otherwise provided by the nearby sports grounds or playgrounds Every opportunity to plant long-term green space would contribute towards mitigating the effects of Climate Change. Submitter notes that the proposal has not addressed climate change impacts in the Statement of Proposal Plantings would assist in regenerating the site from its former use of pesticides

Submissions on 17 Summerhays Street Proposal – Option 4: Community Use

Issue	Submission numbers	Submitter opinions/comments
Supports the retention of the site for a community use	13, 17, 18, 15, 39, 47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A community orchard would help to replace the Crewe Crescent Community Garden that was lost to housing No on-site building is required for a community orchard The site looks ideal to host an allotment-style community garden The existing building could be retained whole or partially for storage and facilities to support a community garden Disagrees that the Palmerston North Community Leisure Centre adequately serves the nearby community, as it has no green space associated with it Notes that the 'community use' option usually leads to contested views between community groups, ending in a stalemate A large carpark already services the site
Does not support the site for community use	9, 37, 48, 49, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Palmerston North Community Leisure Centre is nearby Is a missed opportunity to address housing supply in a strategic location
Supports a recreation complex for ethnic communities	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication barriers, cultural differences, and religious constraints make it difficult for ethnic communities to confidently participate in wider recreation activities The complex would be similar to Hancock Community House, but with wider scope Should be run by ethnic communities
Supports a themed community museum	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City lacks a variety of things to do, particularly during wet weather Build 26 rooms on site – One for each letter of the alphabet and curate each room to have objects starting with each letter The site could generate tourism. For example, \$20 for access to all rooms or \$5 to access five rooms

Summary of Submissions: The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street

Social Media Comments

Opinions/comments
<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rental properties may cost Council more to maintain than the revenue we would raise• Sell the site so that it can be developed for first home buyers• Council owned housing would be best• Build and sell housing to first home buyers with on-selling restrictions• Outsource the building of houses to Homes for People• There are access issues into the site, and housing may exacerbate speeding issues on Summerhays Street• Developing into housing will support more jobs for builders• The profits of the land sale could mean that Council may not need to increase parking fees in the City Centre• Housing is needed more than a bowling club• The site would be good for pensioner housing• There needs to be more detail about the type of housing Council has in mind• Build apartments on the site• Build private housing for first home buyers <p>Community Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Repurpose into another sporting club• Retain the site for community use as it has a lot of history associated with it• Build a stadium on the site for big concerts <p>Recreation Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'Keep it green'• Supports a park that the older community can enjoy, as they do not have many activities that involve exercise

COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 20 October 2021

TITLE: Committee Work Schedule

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated October 2021.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Committee Work Schedule October 2021 [↓](#) 

PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE – OCTOBER 2021

Item No.	Estimated Report Date	Subject	Person Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction/ Point of Origin
1.	October 2021	The Future Use of 17 Summerhays Street: Deliberations on Submissions	Chief Planning Officer		11 August 2021 Clause 22-21
2.	October 2021	The Future Use of Huia Street Reserve – Update Report	Chief Planning Officer	Circulated on Friday Compendium	14 October 2020 Clause 40-20
3.	TBA	Transport Portfolio	Councillor Brent Barrett		
4.	December 2021	Draft Stormwater Bylaw – Hearing and Summary of Submissions	Chief Planning Officer		8 September 2021 Clause 32-21
5.	December 2021	Draft Support and Funding Policy - Hearing and Summary of Submissions	Chief Planning Officer		Council 6 October 2021 Clause 120-21
6.	February 2022	Draft Procurement Policy targeting social and environmental impact	Chief Financial Officer	Policy with senior management	19 August 2019 Clause 54.3
7.	December 2021 March 2022	Draft Trade Waste Bylaw – Hearing and Summary of Submissions	Chief Planning Officer		11 August 2021 Clause 25-21
8.	June 2022	Palmerston North Civic and Cultural Precinct Masterplan – Update Report	Chief Planning Officer	Project setup	1 April 2019 Clause 16.1 11 August 2021 Clause 27-21
9.	December 2022	Palmerston North Civic and Cultural Precinct Masterplan – Final Report	Chief Planning Officer		1 April 2019 Clause 16.1
10.	TBC 2022	Licensing, Regulatory and Service Provision Tools for Waste Minimisation, and Impact Council Service Provision has on Commercial Sector	Chief Infrastructure Office / Chief Planning Officer		11 August 2021 Clause 24-21
11.	TBC 2022	Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Bylaw – Approval for Consultation	Chief Planning Officer		11 August 2021 Clause 24-21

Oasis # 13971441