



PAPAIOEA
PALMERSTON
NORTH
CITY

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

9AM, WEDNESDAY 9 MARCH 2022
AUDIO-VISUAL MEETING

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

9 March 2022

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. **Confirmation of Minutes** Page 7
"That the minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting of 9 February 2022 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record."

6. **Options to address 'street racer' issues** Page 13
Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager.

7. **Deliberations Report - Draft Support and Funding Policy 2022** Page 31
Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager.

8. **Update on the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan** Page 93
Memorandum, presented by David Warburton, Project Director, Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan.

9. **Infrastructure to support Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth** Page 111
Memorandum, presented by Michael Duindam, Principal Planner.

10. **Committee Work Schedule** Page 121

11. **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].

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 09 February 2022, commencing at 9.00am

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, Billy Meehan, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

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

Apologies: Councillor Vaughan Dennison.

1-22 **Apologies**

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 1-22 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

2-22 **Hearing of Submissions - Draft Stormwater Bylaw**

The Committee considered submissions on the Draft Stormwater Bylaw together with supporting oral statements including additional tabled material.

The following persons appeared before the Committee and made oral statements in support of their submissions and replied to questions from Elected Members.

Grant Binns (4)

Mr Grant Binns spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments:

- Not against stormwater attenuation, think it's a great idea but it

needs to be done properly, be well engineered and properly thought through.

- Explained the attenuation system.
- Council has been allowing infill housing throughout the city and in a lot of areas where stormwater infrastructure has been unable to cope with the existing volumes let alone that created by the new infill projects.
- In his view Council has already passed the buck onto the landowner by forcing them to install attenuation tanks. Council now wants to pass on the performance of the entire network to these landowners as well. The landowner gets no benefit from these tanks at all, whereas the Council network receives 100% of the benefit.
- With this bylaw people will have to maintain these tanks which is an added cost to them.

Chris Teo-Sherrell (3)

Mr Chris Teo-Sherrell spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments:

- Concerns regarding the extent of hard surface that is increasing around the city.
- It is time that the costs do shift to private landowners.
- Council needs to continue to educate people about not putting contaminants into the stormwater drain and they need to up their enforcement and encourage people to report instances of contaminants being poured into that system.

Rangitane o Manawatu (10)

Mr Thomas Kay spoke to the submission and made the following additional comments:

- Believed that Council has stuck to the format and minimum requirements of the legislation and has only just updated what was already there. There are some significant shortfalls that have been missed that can be addressed, which other Councils have done.
- The timeframe for building over stormwater pipes and only allowing 50 years' worth of life in the pipe is ludicrous. That is way too short and we actually need access to these pipes.
- Concern that stormwater is not treated before it goes into the environment which needs to be addressed in New Zealand.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee note submissions from presenters who spoke in support of their submission.
2. That the Committee note the Procedure for Hearing of Submissions, as described in the procedure sheet.

Clause 2-22 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

3-22 Draft Stormwater Bylaw - Summary of Submissions

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald - Strategy & Policy Manager.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Committee receive the memorandum titled 'Draft Stormwater Bylaw – Summary of 9 February 2022.
2. That the Committee note a late submission received from Rangitāne o Manawatū will be included in the deliberations report.

Clause 3-22 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

4-22 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the minutes of the Planning & Strategy Committee meeting of 8 December 2021 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record, subject to amending the time that Councillor Rachel Bowen entered the meeting in clause 43-21 from '9.06am' to '9.05am'.

Clause 4-22 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

5-22 Draft Trade Waste Bylaw 2022 - Summary of Submissions

Memorandum, presented by Julie Macdonald - Strategy and Policy Manager.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The COMMITTEE RESOLVED

1. That the Committee receive the summary of submissions to the draft

Trade Waste Bylaw 2022.

Clause 5-22 above was carried 14 votes to 0, with 1 abstention, 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, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

Abstained:

Councillor Leonie Hapeta.

6-22

Submission to the Palmerston North Reserves Empowering Amendment Bill (Huia Street Reserve)

Memorandum, presented by Jono Ferguson-Pye, City Planning Manager.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the Submission to the Palmerston North Reserves Empowering Amendment Bill, as attached to the report presented to the 9 February 2022 Planning & Strategy Committee.

Clause 6.1-22 above was carried 13 votes to 2, the voting being as follows:

For:

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

Against:

Councillors Brent Barrett and Lorna Johnson.

Moved Aleisha Rutherford, seconded Patrick Handcock ONZM.

2. That the Committee note that the Submission to the Palmerston North Reserves Empowering Amendment Bill will be approved by the Mayor under delegation (clause 192.6 of the Delegations Manual) as there is insufficient time for the submission to be referred to the Council for approval.
3. That the Committee note that in accordance with clause 192.6 of the Delegations Manual, the final submission will be reported for approval by the Council at the next available opportunity.

Clauses 6.2 and 6.3 above were 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Lorna Johnson.

Note:

On a motion that “The Palmerston North City Council submission be revised to advocate that the Palmerston North Reserves Empowering Amendment Bill be amended to ensure ongoing public ownership of the Huia Street Reserve land”, the motion was lost 5 votes to 10, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Zulfiqar Butt, Renee Dingwall, Lorna Johnson and Billy Meehan.

Against:

The Mayor (Grant Smith) and Councillors Aleisha Rutherford, Susan Baty, Rachel Bowen, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

7-22 Committee Work Schedule

Moved Karen Naylor, seconded Grant Smith.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated February 2022.
2. That an update on the Palmerston North Civic and Cultural Precinct Masterplan be presented to the March Planning & Strategy Committee Meeting.

Clause 7-22 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, Renee Dingwall, Lew Findlay QSM, Patrick Handcock ONZM, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Billy Meehan, Karen Naylor, Bruno Petrenas and Orphée Mickalad.

The meeting finished at 10.35am

Confirmed 9 March 2022

Chairperson

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 9 March 2022

TITLE: Options to address 'street racer' issues

PRESENTED BY: Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee receive the memorandum entitled 'Options to address 'street racer' issues'.
2. That the Committee endorse *Option 3: Make Works Road a No Parking area* as described in the Memorandum dated 9 March and entitled 'Options to address 'street racer' issues'.
3. That the Chief Executive initiate a process to extend parking restrictions (as described in Option 3 of this report) to other areas where street racing activity occurs, and report back to the Planning and Strategy Committee on progress towards achieving this by December 2022.
4. That *Option 6a: Physical deterrent (installation of speed humps)* is endorsed, for use where appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

5. That Council endorse *Option 1: Limit access to Works Road through a bylaw* as described in the Memorandum dated 9 March and entitled 'Options to address 'street racer' issues'.
 6. That unbudgeted expenditure of \$30,000 be approved to enable a Traffic and Parking Bylaw review to be brought forward to 2021/2022 – 2022/2023.
 7. That unbudgeted expenditure of \$50,000 be approved to enable the implementation of *Option 6a: Physical deterrent (installation of speed humps)* at additional locations (where appropriate).
-

1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide recommendations to the Committee about actions Council could take to respond to issues concerning street racing and its effects. The report arose because of specific issues concerning street racer activities in Longburn at Works Road, however the scope of the report is broader than this specific location.

The advice is provided according to this structure:

- Background to the report
- Problem definition
- Identification of options to address the problem
- Assessment of options against selected criteria
- Discussion and recommendations

Table 1: Summary of options and conclusions

Option	Summary of conclusion
Option 1: Limit access to Works Road through a bylaw	Option supported (Recommendation 5) Additional \$30,000 funding (Recommendation 6)
Option 2: Develop a ‘Cruising Bylaw’	Option not supported No action
Option 3: Make Works Road a ‘No Parking’ area	Option supported (Recommendations 2 and 3)
Option 4: Temporarily close Works Road	Option not supported No action
Option 5: Permanently close Works Road	Option not supported No action
Option 6a: Physical deterrent (installation of speed humps)	Option supported (Recommendation 4) Additional \$50,000 funding (Recommendation 7)
Option 6b: Physical deterrent (surface treatment)	Option not supported No action

2. BACKGROUND

Council (through the Strategy and Planning Committee on 20 October 2021) adopted the following Notice of Motion:

That the Chief Executive investigate the anti-social and ‘street racer’ activity occurring at various locations on the outskirts of Palmerston North and provide advice on the various options Council could pursue to address this problem.

This resolution followed a presentation by Georgina Murrow, Stu Ryder (owner of Longchill Ltd), Ann-Marie Bailey, Brendan Van Oostveen (Principal of Longburn Adventist College) and Mr Warwick Dunn (Storage NZ) who described issues the Longburn community has experienced with street racing events on Works Road over a long period of time. The presentation is appended to the minutes of the October 2021 meeting of the Strategy and Planning Committee. Members of the deputation described the ongoing noise and disruption experienced by Longburn residents, as

well as their attempts to solve the problem through requests to the Police and Council. They noted:

- street racing activities restricted access to businesses on Works Road
- a lack of response to requests for Police assistance
- ongoing distress to residents due to noise and disruption caused by street racer activity
- litter and damage in the area

Council staff have continued to liaise with the presenters to discuss infrastructure options (to act as a deterrent) for Works Road, while also developing advice about the wider issues. Staff have discussed the issues and options with Inspector Ross Grantham, representing the Police, and with some other councils who have experienced similar issues.

Staff have not yet engaged with anyone involved in the street racer activities. This is because the report is primarily about the mechanisms available to Council to address the problems identified, and so its focus is on high-level options. Should Council resolve to pursue any regulatory path, engagement with a broad range of stakeholders will be essential.

Since the October presentation and subsequent resolution staff have implemented speed bumps at Works Road, although these were removed illegally shortly after installation. At the time of writing, more permanent speed bumps were being installed (AC humps – see Option 6b, below), but the efficacy of these is not yet known.

3. PROBLEM DEFINITION

Problem definition: Street racer gathering and activity at Works Road

The problem is defined as the dangerous driving, noise and disruption caused by street racer gatherings at Works Road, including consequential damage to property, obstructed access to business premises, and general impact on the lives of nearby residents.

Police report that street racer activity is a constant issue at various times and places in the city. Anyone driving around Palmerston North can see evidence of burnouts left on the road. There is active organisation of some street racer activity, for example through Facebook, but the prevalence of both organised and 'opportunistic' activity is unknown.

Police data shows that in the past six-months (August 2021 to January 2022) there were almost 685 calls to Police in the Manawatū region which were classified specifically as street racer activity. This number does not include calls where the primary activity was logged as something else (such as disorder or mass-gathering). Works Road was the most prevalent primary location amongst the 685 calls, with 44 individual occasions of concern. Multiple calls were also made about Bennett Street (33), Tremaine Avenue (27), Napier Road (21), Valor Drive (17) and El Prado Drive (12). Many other locations throughout the city were the subject of fewer than ten calls each during the six-month period. This data shows that street activity occurs throughout the city and wider region.

As the scope of this report is broader than proposing solutions to the immediate issues at Works Road, the criteria used in the options analysis includes consideration of how well each option could be extended to respond to the consequences of street racer gathering anywhere in the city.

4. OPTIONS

Any consideration of the effects of street racer activity on city communities quickly reveals how varied these are and, therefore, how difficult for enforcement agencies to respond to. While some activities may already breach the law, it is often difficult to enforce the existing law when the street racer activity is unpredictable and potentially dangerous for responding officers. Some cities, such as Christchurch and Hamilton, have adopted bylaws which go some way to providing a means to discourage street racing. Practical measures, such as road closures, surface treatments, and restricting access through barriers and bollards, are also solutions which have been variously applied. However, none of the measures currently available provide a complete solution to the complexity of the issues raised.

Seven options are identified as potentially appropriate responses to the problem. More enforcement of existing laws by Police is not analysed as an option because it is not within the Council's control, and because feedback from the Police suggests that greater enforcement of existing controls is not easily achieved.

Each of Council's main options are described here, alongside an analysis of their efficacy in responding to the problem. The options are not mutually exclusive, as they each provide a different kind of response to the identified problem. Implementation of options may be co-ordinated to provide a more effective solution to the problem.

The options have been identified with consideration of the problem itself, as well as Council's strategic direction. The Land Transport Act and the National Policy Statement on Transport both underpin the Council's strategic transport objectives and include safety as a priority in providing an effective land transport network. The actions that the Council takes to achieve this effective system are informed by this national policy and legislative framework.

Option 1: Limit access to Works Road through a bylaw

Option 2: Develop a 'Cruising Bylaw'

Option 3: Make Works Road a 'No Parking' area

Option 4: Temporarily close Works Road

Option 5: Permanently close Works Road

Option 6a: Physical deterrent (installation of speed humps)

Option 6b: Physical deterrent (surface treatment)

5. OPTIONS ANALYSIS AGAINST CRITERIA

The analysis of each of the options is made with reference to the following criteria:

- a. Legal -whether the option can be implemented under law

- b. Viable – whether the option can be practicably implemented
- c. Effective – whether the option will work
- d. Enduring – how long the option will last
- e. Applicable to other locations
- f. Timely – how quickly the option can be implemented
- g. Avoids other adverse effects

These criteria were selected to provide a clear picture of the workability and value of each option. Estimates of cost to implement are also provided at the end of each option, along with a description of the next steps.

Option 1: Limit access to Works Road through a bylaw

Amend the existing Traffic and Parking Bylaw to restrict access to a specified location (in this instance, Works Road) by imposing restrictions to vehicles of a certain weight within specific hours, preventing gatherings on identified public roads, and/or some other methods as allowed under section 22AB of the Land Transport Act. Exceptions, such as conveying workers to business premises, could be included in the bylaw provisions to ensure that lawful activities are not captured. Any restrictions of this nature would require signage to indicate the hours and other description of the restriction in place.

Consideration of criteria

a. Legal

A bylaw response could provide a legal means to restrict the activities at Works Road (or elsewhere) if there is justification that this measure will enhance road safety. The power for the various methods described above is in section 22AB of the Land Transport Act 1998, which includes:

- prohibiting or restricting, absolutely or conditionally, any specified class of traffic (whether heavy traffic or not), or any specified motor vehicles or class of motor vehicle that, by reason of its size or nature or the nature of the goods carried, is unsuitable for use on any road or roads;
- regulating any road-related matters, including (but not limited to) enhancing or promoting road safety or providing protection for the environment.

As with any bylaw, before commencing with the process for making the bylaw, the Council would need to determine that the bylaw is the most appropriate means of addressing the perceived problem under section 155 of the Local Government Act 2002.

b. Viable

Amending the current Traffic and Parking Bylaw is a viable option in that Council could incorporate street racing controls into the existing bylaw framework. These controls could apply to the city in general, and Works Road in particular. Investigations into the appropriate controls could occur with the review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw.

In the event the Traffic and Parking Bylaw is updated and makes provision for street racing controls, signage describing those controls would need to be installed (to

alert users of the restrictions). The penalty or infringement fees cannot be imposed without first notifying road users of the event giving rise to the penalty of infringement fee. Signs are an essential component of this notification.

Securing signage from vandalism could be problematic. It seems likely, given the removal of the speed humps recently, that street signs could be a target of vandalism or removal. Without secure signage, Police could be unable to enforce any new conditions established by a bylaw.

c. Effective

The efficacy of amending the Traffic and Parking Bylaw to provide for various restrictions targeted at preventing gatherings would depend almost entirely on the subsequent enforcement of those restrictions. The deterrence factor of infringement fees is only effective if repeatedly enforced.

The amendments to the existing bylaw described in Option 1 would provide the Police with new means of issuing infringement notices or prosecuting offences. For example, depending on the specific control in the bylaw, simply being on Works Road at a prohibited time without lawful excuse could warrant issue of an infringement notice. Under the Land Transport (Offences and Penalties) Regulations 1999, contravention of a bylaw without reasonable excuse can be penalised by \$1,000 on conviction or \$150 on issue of an infringement notice.

In addition to providing the Police with powers to issue infringement notices, contravention of a bylaw in certain cases can authorise the Police to seize and impound vehicles. Section 96(1AA) of the Land Transport Act 1998 enables enforcement officers (Police) to seize and impound a vehicle if:

1. The driver operated the vehicle in a manner that breached a qualifying bylaw; and
2. The vehicle is subject to a warning notice.

A warning notice can be fixed to a vehicle if a 'qualifying bylaw' is breached, so the subject vehicle would need to have been operated in contravention of a qualifying bylaw twice before it is seized and impounded.

A 'qualifying bylaw' means a bylaw that prohibits cruising or is made for one of the three purposes in section 145 of the Local Government Act 2002: protecting the public from nuisance; protecting, promoting and maintaining public health and safety; and minimising the potential for offensive behaviour in public places.

The above purposes will need to be considered in greater detail during the bylaw creation process, however controls imposed to prevent street racer activities would likely meet one or several of the section 145 purposes.

The Police consider that amending the Traffic and Parking Bylaw would provide useful additional enforcement options to enable early intervention on evenings when gatherings are anticipated. The efficacy of this option also depends on finding a practical means to ensure signage remained in place to enable enforcement.

d. Enduring

This response would remain in place until Council saw fit to amend the bylaw.

e. Applicable to other locations

Any measures introduced in a new bylaw provision could be expanded (beyond Works Road) to apply to other locations of concern. Such locations could be identified during the community engagement phase of bylaw development, from Police complaints reporting or during the initial development of the section 155 determination required under the Local Government Act.

Further locations could also be added by amending the Traffic and Parking Bylaw Administration Manual (requiring further consultation in each instance) if these controls are needed at locations identified after the Bylaw is enacted. This would provide the Council with some flexibility to deal with situations elsewhere in the city as they arise.

While adding street racing controls into the Traffic and Parking Bylaw would enable enforcement officers to target activities at specific locations, such as Works Road, it may not be effective at regulating street racer activities on long stretches of road or non-contained areas (for example, long rural roads or several city blocks). This is because it would be difficult to install signage describing the restriction on those sorts of roads. This option would, therefore, be most practically extended to specific locations (similar in nature to the Works Road cul-de-sac).

f. Timely

The timeframe needed to add street racing controls into the Traffic and Parking Bylaw would be at least a year. The Council already has a full policy and bylaw review and development programme, and the election period also provides some limitations to the pace at which work could proceed.

g. Avoids other adverse effects

Option 1 could have some effect in preventing the problem at Works Road, and this could potentially result in the activity moving to other locations.

Summary

Amending the existing bylaw would provide Police with a new tool in its enforcement toolkit. The efficacy of this option will ultimately rest with Police enforcement.

Estimated cost of Option 1

A review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw is not currently on the three-year work plan. If brought forward, this work would be additional to the three-year work programme and so require additional resources to complete. The cost of implementing any new bylaw provision would largely fall on the Police. Council would be required to provide signage to notify the community of any new restrictions (estimated at \$6,500 and managed within current budgets).

Next step for Option 1:

If Council decides to proceed with Option 1 (recommendations 5 and 6 of this report) then the next step will be for Council to proceed with a review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw. The review will include all matters pertaining to Traffic and Parking (appropriate for consideration in a bylaw), including efforts to identify areas in addition to Works Road where the problem behaviour is occurring.

Option 2: Develop a ‘Cruising Bylaw’

Amend the Traffic and Parking bylaw or develop a new bylaw to enable the restriction of cruising in a specified location (in this instance, Works Road).

Cruising is defined in the Land Transport Act as:

driving repeatedly in the same direction over the same section of a road in a motor vehicle in a manner that—

(a) draws attention to the power or sound of the engine of the motor vehicle being driven; or

(b) creates a convoy that—

(i) is formed otherwise than in trade; and

(ii) impedes traffic flow

Consideration of criteria

a. Legal

When a ‘cruising bylaw’ response has been developed by other councils, it has usually been included in a bylaw alongside the kinds of restrictions discussed in Option 1 (for example, Wellington and Christchurch City Councils). There is possibly an element of ‘just in case’ rationale in some of the bylaws adopted by other councils, rather than a clear demonstration that prohibiting cruising itself is the best answer to the problem.

The Local Government Act requires a determination under section 155 that a bylaw is the most appropriate response to the identified problem. While this current report is a high-level consideration of options rather than a section 155 analysis, the current information about the street racing activities at Works Road does not would justify the creation of a ‘cruising bylaw’ at the outset. This is because the definition of ‘cruising’ under the Land Transport Act (provided above) is not an accurate description of the activity at Works Road. However, that is not to say that cruising may not emerge as a significant issue in future, or upon further investigation.

b. Viable

Development of a new, standalone ‘cruising bylaw’ is not a viable option without further investigation. However, as with Option 1, if Council wants to pursue this option, consideration of its efficacy could be included in the next review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw.

As with Option 1, the security of the necessary signage could be problematic. Without secure signage, Police would be unable to enforce any new conditions established by a bylaw. For example, when Christchurch City Council adopted its ‘cruising bylaw’ in 2010 there was a cost of around \$350,000 for 1,000 new signs.

c. Effective

None of the staff from several other councils spoken to consider that a cruising bylaw (on its own) is the best response to the issues they have experienced in their communities. They cite the need for signage, and other issues with implementation (including identification and designation of restricted roads or areas), as significant barriers to effective implementation.

The Police are not in favour of Option 2 and agree that cruising is not an accurate description of the current problems.

d. Enduring

This response would remain in place until Council saw fit to amend the bylaw.

e. Application to other areas

Any measures introduced in a new cruising bylaw could be applied to any area where cruising is identified as a concern. Such locations could be identified during the community engagement phase of bylaw development. Other additional locations could also be added later upon amendment of the bylaw Administration Manual (requiring further consultation in each instance).

f. Timely

The timeframe needed to restrict activities through any bylaw provision would be at least a year, assuming the review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw is brought forward. The Council already has a full policy and bylaw review and development programme, and the election period also provides some limitations to the pace at which work could proceed.

a. Avoids other adverse effects

Because the options analysis has concluded that a cruising bylaw does not directly address the problem identified, this option is unlikely to result in any effects (positive or negative).

Summary

Developing a cruising bylaw would not provide a feasible or effective solution to the problem identified at Works Road.

Estimated cost of Option 2:

This work would be additional to the three-year work programme. It would either need to take priority over other work or require additional staffing resources.

Council would be required to provide signage to notify the community of any new restrictions. The cost of signage to comply with a new bylaw is estimated to be \$6,000-\$7,000 (per location). The cost of enforcing any new bylaw provision would largely fall on the Police.

Next step for Option 2:

If Council decides to proceed with Option 2 then the next step will be to proceed with the initial engagement to inform a section 155 determination that a bylaw is the most appropriate response to the identified problem.

Option 3: Make Works Road a 'No Parking' area

Restrict parking within a specified location (in this instance, Works Road) as allowed by the Parking provisions of the existing Traffic and Parking Bylaw. For example, No Parking, or limitations on hours for parking on all or part of Works Road. For a discrete area such as Works Road, it may be possible to provide 'area parking signs' rather than roadside signs which may be more vulnerable to vandalism.

a. Legal

This option provides a legally available response to the identified problem.

b. Viable

This option uses current provisions of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw to restrict parking in specified locations (in this instance, Works Road). Parking restrictions are set under delegated authority of Council to the Chief Infrastructure Officer.

Parking restrictions are identified on site by prescribed traffic signs and/or markings. Contravention of the applicable traffic sign or marking has a corresponding penalty or infringement fee in the Land Transport (Offences and Penalties) Regulations 1999. Depending on the exact signs or markings, the infringement penalty fee is likely to be in the vicinity of \$40 to \$60.

As with Options 1 and 2, the security of the necessary signage could be problematic. Without secure signage, Police would be unable to enforce any new conditions. For this option to be a viable solution for Works Road, either an 'area sign' with variable conditions and/or permanent 'No Parking' road markings would provide the most robust signage options.

c. Effective

The efficacy of this option would depend almost entirely on its enforcement. It seems probable that signage indicating any restrictions in place under the Bylaw would be ignored without constant policing.

The Police consider that this option would provide a useful tool to allow early intervention on evenings when gatherings are anticipated. The efficacy of this option also depends on finding a practical means to ensure signage remained in place to enable enforcement. This option is most likely to be effective if there is permanent road marking for a No Parking area, or an 'area sign' for variable conditions, rather than roadside signage.

d. Enduring

This response would be enduring, and so could provide a long-term solution.

e. Application to other areas

This option could be extended to other areas, although the provision of secure signage would be required (as above) to enable enforcement.

While this option could target activity at specific locations, it would not be effective at regulating activity in large or general areas (for example, long rural roads or several city blocks). This is because this option would require signage or road marking to describe the restriction in place, along with enforcement. This option would, therefore, be most practically extended to specific locations (similar in nature to the Works Road cul-de-sac).

f. Timely

A restricted parking provision could be implemented relatively quickly, following the usual requirements of local engagement with stakeholders to ascertain the most effective form of parking restriction.

g. Avoids other adverse effects

Option 3 could have some effect in preventing the problem at Works Road, and this could potentially result in the activity moving to other locations.

Summary

Introducing additional parking restrictions at Works Road would provide another enforcement tool for Police. Its efficacy would depend on the provision of effective signage and adequate enforcement efforts.

Estimated cost of Option 3:

Stationary parking offences can be enforced by parking wardens. However, given the potential health and safety risks of enforcement, it would be preferable for the Police to enforce the parking restrictions because they are better resourced and equipped to manage the health and safety risks. The cost of implementing any new bylaw provision would therefore largely fall on the Police.

Council would be required to provide signage to notify the community of any new restrictions. The estimated cost for signage at Works Road is \$6,500 (managed within current budgets). Option 3 could be extended to other locations in the city where appropriate (at perhaps a rate of two per year), but any greater response would require an additional budget.

Next step for Option 3:

If Council decides to proceed with Option 3 (recommendations 2 and 3 of this report) then the next step will be for Council to proceed with the initial engagement to determine the most effective form of parking restriction to maximise the opportunities for effective enforcement. There would be no further decision-making required by elected members (aside from the usual high-level oversight and response to community issues).

Option 4: Temporarily close Works Road

Temporarily prohibit "any specified type of traffic" to a specified location (in this instance, Works Road) as enabled by the Local Government Act.

a. Legal

The Council has powers under the Local Government Act to temporarily close any road or part of a road to all traffic or "any specified type of traffic" where public disorder exists or is anticipated. This action must only follow consultation with local stakeholders, Police and Waka Kotahi.

The activities occurring at Works Road may meet the definition of 'public disorder'. However, legal advice sought on this option suggests that the term 'temporary' could not be reasonably interpreted to include regular, anticipated road closures (for example, weekend nights) over a long period of time. The legality only applies when the justification for the road closure is met for each individual occasion. Therefore, this option does not provide a legally viable solution to the identified problem, beyond being available as a short-term measure prior to other measures being implemented.

b. Viable

A temporary closure of this, or any other, road would require justification on each occasion. Therefore, this option does not provide a viable long-term solution to the identified problem, beyond being available as a short-term measure prior to other actions. A temporarily closed road would also need to be physically closed to the public. The Council would need to administer access to Works Road so that legitimate users have access. Ensuring that the closure still enabled access to Works Road for legitimate business purposes would present significant practical challenges.

c. Effective

This option could potentially be effective in the short-term on a specific occasion, where accommodation could be made for legitimate road access. It does not provide an effective solution to the ongoing problem.

d. Durable

This option does not provide a durable solution to the problem because it is not available in the long-term due to the cost and impracticality of renewing the temporary closure.

e. Applicable to other areas

Temporary road closure is a mechanism available to the Council in a variety of circumstances if the appropriate legal criteria are met. However, any road closure is a stand-alone exercise and consideration is specific to that location.

f. Timely

This option could be implemented relatively quickly on a specific occasion, following consultation with Waka Kotahi and Police.

g. Avoids other adverse effects

Option 4 could have some effect in preventing the problem at Works Road in the short-term, and this could potentially result in the activity moving to other locations.

Summary

Temporary road closure is a mechanism available to Council involving considerable cost and practical difficulty to apply on each occasion it is considered warranted.

Estimated cost of Option 4:

The costs of implementing Option 4 would include consultation with stakeholders and any practical arrangements required to temporarily close the road and still accommodate legitimate access.

Next step for Option 4:

The next step for Option 4 would be to develop a process, in agreement with Waka Kotahi and the Police, to establish whether a road closure is justified when a particular set of circumstances arise (for example, foreknowledge of a planned gathering).

Option 5: Permanently close Works Road

Permanently stop a road or part of a road (in this instance, Works Road) and transfer it into private ownership.

a. Legal

The Local Government Act enables the Council to permanently stop a road or part of a road. Where a road is stopped, it must be transferred into private ownership. This option would require consultation with adjoining landowners.

b. Viable

Growth is projected at both Longburn and the North East Industrial Zone. One of the drivers for the Central New Zealand Distribution Hub is to achieve an integrated multi-modal freight hub with strong transport connections between different parcels of land, including Palmerston North Airport, North East Industrial Zone and the proposed KiwiRail Regional Freight Hub. Private ownership of all or some of these roads could further complicate the delivery of this integrated system as industrial areas grow and new owners emerge. Private ownership of roads can also complicate matters where Council and other utility providers are required to access underground services. For these reasons the District Plan and Engineering Standards for Land Development encourage roads to be vested with Council as public roads at the time of development.

Further to the structural challenges of private ownership for the overall transport system, this option is not viable because the problem is not a consequence of Council's ownership. While a private owner could attempt to manage Works Road in some way, they would have to address the same issues Council is dealing with, with potentially fewer resources (in terms of legal powers or resources). Staff also note there are multiple landowners on Works Road, adding to the complication and viability of this option.

c. Effective

The ownership of Works Road is not related to the problem. A change of ownership will not have any positive impact without other changes to the road's management.

d. Durable

Road closure is a durable option, however durability is largely irrelevant because this option does not provide an effective solution to the problem.

e. Applicable to other areas

While theoretically Council could choose to close multiple roads, in practice certain circumstances need to be in place for this to be feasible. For example, Works Road is a cul-de-sac. Other areas where there may be similar problems to those being experienced at Works Road might not be as easily separated from the smooth function of the roading network in the area.

f. Timely

There would be significant additional work required to transfer ownership of the road, even assuming this would be a desirable outcome for any potential owner.

g. Avoids other adverse effects

This option could potentially have a negative impact on the effective operation of the road transport system.

Summary

Road closure would not provide a viable or effective solution to the problem.

Estimated cost of Option 5:

The cost of permanent road closure would include legal costs as well as an estimated \$70,000 for gates (or similar).

Next step for Option 5:

The next step for Option 5 would be to prepare a plan for the road closure in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act.

Option 6a: Physical deterrent (installation of speed humps)

Use powers as the Road Controlling Authority to install speed humps to a specified location (in this instance, Works Road).

a. Legal

As a Road Controlling Authority, the Council is responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of road infrastructure in the district.

b. Viable

Asphaltic concrete (AC) humps are not typically installed in industrial areas. This is because of their potential impact on load-stability for heavy vehicles. This impact can lead to increased pavement damage (and therefore higher maintenance costs), damage of the goods carried, damage to vehicles, and potentially adverse effects on property access.

c. Effective

AC humps have now been installed at Works Road. The layout was specifically designed not to affect property access for heavy vehicles. This treatment may prove effective in reducing the identified problem by making the road surface less conducive to street racer activities.

d. Durable

AC humps last about five to ten years before requiring renewal.

e. Applicable to other areas

Applicability of this option to other areas can only be determined following site assessment. Decisions about the suitability of roading treatments are made with site-specific consideration of the situation. For example, AC humps are not practical in residential areas, on bus routes or cycle routes.

f. Timely

AC humps can be quickly installed following consultation with relevant stakeholders.

g. Avoids other adverse consequences

Infrastructure treatments that effectively prevent gathering and street racer activity in one location (in this instance, Works Road) may result in that activity moving elsewhere in the city.

Summary

The installation of AC humps may deter street racer activity at Works Road, or any other location. There may be adverse effects on access to the Road for other users.

Estimated cost of Option 6a:

The cost of installing the AC humps at Works Road has been managed within current budgets. An additional budget would be needed for this option to be extended to other locations. The estimated cost of new AC humps is approximately \$25,000 for each location. This cost includes the site-specific assessment, traffic management, materials, and installation.

Next step for Option 6a:

AC humps have already been installed at Works Road. If elected members want to make this option available for other sites, then a further budget will be required (recommendation 7).

Option 6b: Physical deterrent (surface treatment)

Use powers as the Road Controlling Authority to introduce a high-friction surface to a specified location (in this instance, Works Road).

a. Legal

As a Road Controlling Authority, the Council is responsible for the operation, maintenance and improvement of road infrastructure in the district.

b. Viable

A high-friction surface could be applied to industrial or other areas where street racing is an identified issue.

c. Effective

The rationale behind the high-friction surface is that tyres will wear out more quickly, although this is likely to require repeated use over many visits. There is evidence of tyre debris left at Works Road, and other street racer locations, indicating that drivers may be deliberately ruining their tyres. Furthermore, drivers may not realise they are travelling over a high-friction surface, meaning that the deterrence value may be minimal. A high-friction surface may not make a noticeable difference to users and is unlikely to be a significant deterrent to the activity.

d. Durable

High-friction surfacing is expected to last six to eight years. Durability may be lower if there is street racer activity at the location, as drifting, doughnuts and burnouts will all wear the surface material more quickly.

e. Applicable to other areas

Applicability of this option to other areas can only be determined following site assessment. Decisions about the suitability of roading treatments are made with site-specific consideration of the situation. The treatment can be applied to all roads but is typically used on high risk roads/intersections to improve road safety.

f. Timely

Road surface changes can be made relatively quickly following consultation with relevant stakeholders. The application of the product would be similar to road reseals and resurfacing. It is expected that once the product is acquired then implementation would take a couple of days.

g. Avoids other adverse consequences

Infrastructure treatments that effectively prevent gathering and street racer activity in one location (in this instance, Works Road) may result in that activity moving to other locations.

Summary

A high-friction surface may not make a noticeable difference to users and is unlikely to be a deterrent. Staff are continuing to investigate surface treatment options.

Estimated cost of Option 6b:

The cost to use high-friction surfacing is considerably higher than standard surface treatments. Examples of estimated costs are:

- Works Road \$90,000
- El Prado Drive Industrial Estate \$230,000
- Makomako Road \$70,000
- Cul de sac head only \$7,000 (each)

Next step for Option 6b:

If elected members want to make this option available at Works Road or other sites, then additional budget will be required.

6. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the initial presentation at the October 2021 meeting by members of the Longburn community, the Council has attempted to discourage street racer activity by installing speed humps. The first effort was unsuccessful (due to illegal removal), and, at the time of writing, the second has yet to be tested. Regardless of the efficacy of those localised interventions, the Council also has an opportunity to address the challenging issue of street racer activity more generally. This report describes a variety of potential actions and an analysis of their value.

Short-term

The Council's Group Manager Transport and Development (Acting) advises that efforts to achieve effective roading treatments to deter street racing activity at Works Road will continue, and do not require additional budget or direction by the Council. Staff will continue to investigate other road surface treatment options and to consider their applicability to locations of concern. Progress with this work will be reported back through the Infrastructure Committee as part of regular updates.

Staff recommend that, in addition to the ongoing infrastructure treatments, Option 3 of this report (restriction of parking) is also implemented. The restriction of parking at Works Road is a relatively modest action, requiring only local stakeholder engagement and then installation of appropriate signage for the agreed

restrictions. Despite the equally modest penalty for infringement (\$40-60) the Police consider that this could provide an additional enforcement tool. This option can be enacted through existing delegations to the Chief Infrastructure Officer.

No particular action is required by the Committee to progress these short-term options. However, endorsement for them is reflected in recommendations 2, 3 and 4. These recommendations have been made to recognise the high level of public interest in these matters, and to ensure that staff actions are supported by elected members.

Longer-term

The most effective longer-term option to address the identified problem is the limitation of access to Works Road through restrictions adopted as part of a bylaw (Option 1). Recommendations to Council are to review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw and to approve additional budget to enable this action (recommendations 5 and 6).

The options canvassed in this report focus on the tools available to respond to the identified problem. Other options involving efforts to prevent the street racer activity (for example, working with street racers to encourage alternative locations or activities) are outside the scope of this report and beyond the resources of the Council at present. Staff note that there may be merit in working with the street racer community to reduce the harm being caused. This issue will be raised for Council consideration in the preliminary strategic work brought to the Council as part of the next 10-Year Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Short-term

Staff are continuing to work with the Works Road community to install effective road treatments to deter gatherings and street racer activity.

If Council endorses the recommendations to proceed with Option 3, then the next step will be for Council to proceed with the initial engagement to determine the most effective form of parking restriction to maximise the opportunities for effective enforcement. There would be no further decision-making required by elected members (aside from the usual high-level oversight and response to community issues).

Longer-term

If Council decides to proceed with Option 1 and approve the additional expenditure to enable this option (recommendations 5 and 6), then the next step will be for Council to proceed with the review of the Traffic and Parking Bylaw. The review will include all matters pertaining to Traffic and Parking (appropriate for consideration in a bylaw), including efforts to identify areas in addition to Works Road where the problem behaviour is occurring.

7. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	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?	No
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 Transport	
The action is: Develop, maintain, operate and renew the transport network to deliver on the Council goals, the purpose of this plan, and the Government Policy Statement on Transport	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	The options recommended to address the identified issue at Works Road contribute to the effective and safe operation of the city's transport network.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 9 March 2022

TITLE: Deliberations Report - Draft Support and Funding Policy 2022

PRESENTED BY: Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the Council adopt the Support and Funding Policy 2022, Attachment 2 of the Memorandum entitled 'Deliberations Report – Draft Support and Funding Policy 2022' dated 9 March 2022.
 2. That the Support and Funding Policy 2022, Attachment 2 of the Memorandum entitled 'Deliberations Report – Draft Support and Funding Policy 2022' dated 9 March 2022, replaces the Community Funding Policy 2018.
 3. That a Sector Lead Partnership Fund is referred to the 2024-2034 10-Year Plan process for consideration as a separate budget item.
 4. That the Chief Executive provide a report to the Community Development Committee before development of the next 10-year plan describing the operational implications of the Sector Lead Partnership Agreements (section 5.6) of the proposed Support and Funding Policy 2022.
 5. That the Chief Executive Officer prepare an implementation and monitoring plan for the proposed Support and Funding Policy 2022.
-

1. ISSUE

The Community Funding Policy 2018 was reviewed in 2021/2022. This policy provided a framework to guide funding support to the City's community and voluntary sector, while also ensuring Council's resources are targeted at meeting its strategic outcomes.

On 6 October 2021 the Council approved for consultation the Draft Support and Funding Policy 2021, which was the outcome of both the policy review and a response to additional issues including directly contracting sector lead organisations.

Public consultation on the draft policy ran from 28 October to 27 November 2021, and 21 written submissions were received. A hearing of submissions was held on 8 December 2021 at the Planning and Strategy Committee meeting, and seven submitters were heard.

2. CONSULTATION

Public consultation on the draft policy opened on 28 October 2021. A consultation document outlining the key changes was developed, including consultation questions to guide the feedback. The document was produced in printed form and was also available online on Council's website alongside an online submission form.

Targeted emails and letters were sent to previous and current recipients of Council support, as well as parties who had applied for support but were unsuccessful. Over 300 targeted email, and around 100 printed letters were sent.

Various media were also used to raise awareness of the consultation including newspaper notices in the Manawatū Standard and Guardian, the Community Services Council's Flax Pānui, and Facebook posts and advertisements.

Staff attended a meeting with Rangitāne o Manawatū to provide an update on the policy and seek feedback.

Staff also ran an online drop-in session to answer any questions from the community, which was attended by representatives of five organisations.

3. SUBMISSIONS

In general, the submissions received were supportive of the draft Support and Funding Policy. Attachment 1 is a summary of written submissions, including a response from staff and whether any change is recommended to the proposed policy. The attachment also includes a breakdown of responses to the questions on the submission form. The main subjects of the submissions are considered here:

a) Policy principles – Section 3

Thirteen submitters said they support the proposed policy principles and two were unsure. One submitter expressed the view that the principle of 'need' was lacking from the policy. The submitter did not provide a definition of the principle of 'need', other than to say it was distinct from equity.

The proposed policy principles reflect a shift to a broader scope of support and funding programmes, to support the voluntary and community sector, events sector and heritage preservation. Community need is reflected in the voluntary and community sector activities, but may not be as relevant to the events sector, for example. The proposed principles drive the implementation of the overall framework (the draft policy) to ensure that the culture of delivery is consistent at an operational level. Staff consider that community need is reflected appropriately within the relevant support and funding programmes.

No changes to the draft policy are recommended to the principles.

b) Eligibility – Section 5.2

Four submitters indicated support for the general eligibility requirements. One submitter was not supportive of the general eligibility requirements to provide a

statement of financial position (section 5.2.1 (b)). The submitter noted that this requirement is not necessary to achieve the fund outcomes, and potentially could both be a barrier to applying and present privacy issues. The submitter recommended that an applicant's declaration that they can afford the project will suffice. This submitter was particularly referring to the requirements for natural and cultural heritage funding.

Providing a statement of financial position has several uses, depending on the support programme that is being applied for. In some cases, it may be used to determine an applicant's suitability to deliver on a proposal, and/or in some cases it may be evidence of need. Given that funds are limited, and applicants are competing for funds, understanding an applicant's financial position is an important component to providing fair and equitable support to the community.

In terms of the heritage preservation funding, specifically, its purpose is to encourage private owners by providing a financial incentive to help property owners of heritage buildings to comply with the heritage requirements in the District Plan. The focus is on the building itself rather than the applicant. The fund works on a reimbursement basis, which is different to other support programmes. Successful applicants are required to fund the works from their own finances and on completion the evidence and costs are provided to Council for assessment and reimbursement for the work.

A change is recommended to the policy to make an exception for heritage funding applicants to the requirement to provide a financial statement.

c) Reporting requirements for Occupancy – Section 5.4.3

Under section 5.4.3 a) of the proposed policy all recipients of support and funding are required to provide a report to Council of the outcomes and benefits of the support. Some submitters were unsure about this expectation and described it as a new requirement for those with occupancy arrangements; they recommended that reporting requirements do not become more onerous. Staff overseeing Council tenancies have confirmed that reporting from community occupancy tenants is currently not requested, although there is a general clause in tenancy agreements stating that reporting may be required.

Under 5.4.3 a) of the proposed policy, reporting requirements will be proportionate to the level of support provided. Staff suggest that if existing reports are available and cover the outcomes and benefits of Council support, then these will be sufficient. The intention of this clause is to not make reporting onerous, but rather to reflect the policies' objectives of having a transparent and consistent system for support and funding programmes.

No changes are recommended to the reporting requirements.

d) Discretionary decision-making – Section 5.4.4

Two submitters indicated support for the new discretionary decision-making provisions in the proposed policy, and two were unsure. One other submitter noted that there may be good reasons for giving funding or non-financial support for a

specific purpose. Another submitter was concerned that there is potential for this provision to be influenced by Councillors' personal projects. One submitter was unsure about the criteria and scope that would give rise to discretionary decision-making and noted that the provision has potential for budget blow-outs.

This section of the proposed policy does not confer a new decision-making power on elected members; irrespective of this provision elected members can decide how to respond to any requests that are put to them. However, through section 5.4.4 of the proposed policy elected members will commit to a process and criteria to deal with proposals that are outside the requirements of support and funding programmes.

No changes are recommended to the discretionary decision-making provisions.

e) Sector leads – Section 5.6

The draft policy introduced a new mechanism to engage sector leads through a partnership agreement (section 5.6) and proposed that funding for these agreements be from the Strategic Priority Grants (SPG). There were several submissions in support of the sector lead partnerships, however some submitters were unsupportive of the funding being taken from the SPG pool. The main reason for opposition was the view that this action would reduce the amount of funding that would be available to other recipients of the SPG. Suggestions were made to separate sector lead funding in its own budget line, separate from SPG funding. Some submitters also asked for more clarity in how this will be implemented, as the provisions of the policy did not provide finer implementation details.

Staff have identified five organisations who were SPG recipients between 2019 and 2022 that fit the sector lead criteria in the draft policy. Combined, these organisations received 27% of the total SPG pool. It is likely that the total amount of funding requested by these organisations will increase in future, as is usually the case for SPG applications from one funding round to the next, due to rising costs and changes to service delivery. It is also likely that other organisations will put themselves forward as sector leads because of the likelihood of ongoing secure funding, so there could be more demand on SPG funding for sector leads.

Administration of partnership agreements could have operational impacts for Council. For some sector leads, too, the change may mean new ways of working with Council with changed accountability requirements. The proposed policy provides a new mechanism to allow Council to develop stronger, more secure funding arrangements with sector lead organisations. However, the proposed change could also mean that sector leads 'crowd-out' other SPG applicants from the limited funding, unless Council makes deliberate decisions about the allocation of funds to sector lead organisations.

The proposed policy puts in place a mechanism to fund sector lead organisations, however the financial support for these organisations requires further deliberation by Council. Staff therefore recommended that prior to the next SPG funding round, and through the 10-year plan, a Sector Lead Fund is included as a separate budget item. Changes to the proposed policy are also recommended (see Attachment 2) to

leave open the possibility that funding for sector lead partnership agreements may come from SPG or from another fund created for the sector lead partnership agreements

Staff also recommend that sector lead partnerships (section 5.6 of proposed policy) are not applied to the 2021/2022 SPG funding round as this is already underway. Instead this report recommends that the Community Development team provide a report to the Community Development Committee outlining the implementation of sector lead partnership agreements and any operational impacts (see Recommendation 4). This report will provide Council with an opportunity to consider the implications of the change and enable a response through the 10-year plan process. It will also give staff time to operationalise the draft policy in a sustainable way and provide potential sector leads the ability to compare the benefits of a SPG contract to that of a more significant sector lead partnership agreement.

f) Support and Funding Programmes – Part B

Community Development Small Grants Fund – Part B6

Several submitters were unsupportive of the move to increase the total allocation of this fund to \$10,000. The main reason given for this view is that the fund is currently oversubscribed, and applicants are not receiving the maximum allocation of \$5,000. Submitters suggested that an increase to the total allocation could be misleading to potential applicants. Some submitters recommended keeping the maximum allocation at \$5,000.

Some submitters were also unsupportive of the support priority that applicants

do not receive other forms of operational funding and support from Council including rates remissions or community occupancy.

Some submitters said that this could restrict a large number of worthy applicants from receiving funding, as many of these groups also receive other forms of Council support. Some submitters recommended removing this a support priority.

The increase in the maximum to \$10,000 was suggested to align with the Covid-19 funding at the time. The change in maximum allocation was suggested alongside other changes that were an attempt to focus the fund more. Those proposals were not included in the proposed draft when it was adopted by the Council for consultation, but the increased maximum of \$10,000 remained. Therefore, it makes sense to revert back to the previous maximum of \$5,000, for the reasons outlined by submitters.

The support priority:

do not receive other forms of operational funding and support from Council including rates remissions or community occupancy

was also interpreted by submitters as an *exclusion* rather than a *priority* for decision-making. The guidance for this fund explicitly states that applicants who do not receive other forms of funding will be prioritised. The guidelines do place a stronger

emphasis on providing evidence of council support/funding when applying to council for support (5.2.1 (b)) and in the assessment process (5.3.3 (b)). Responsibility is also placed on decision-makers under 5.3.4 (d) of the policy - that the decisions will be made in the knowledge of previous and/or current Council support. As occupancy is now included in the proposed policy as a form of Council support, the decision-making process will continue to emphasise this aspect in the future.

Staff recommend that the maximum allocation for the Community Development Small Grants Fund be reduced to \$5,000 and the support priorities remain unchanged.

Community-led Initiatives Fund – Part B7

Some submitters requested that 'Rainbow Communities' be included in the support priorities under this fund with Māori, Pasifika, minority ethnic groups, former refugees, people with disabilities, children and young people, and older people. Submitters also suggested that "other marginalised groups" be included in this list of priorities.

Some submitters were opposed to including "open to the public" as a support priority because it may shift the focus to allowing every member in the public access, rather than supporting specific events and initiatives for "specific disadvantaged groups". Some submitters recommended changing this priority to say, "open to all members of the relevant community".

The support priorities in this fund were carried over from the Celebrating Communities Fund which the Community-led Initiatives fund replaced. These priorities were developed over time, and the previous fund had an emphasis on "communities of identity, place or interest", which has been carried over to the new guidelines. The use of "marginalised groups" as a descriptor for a group of people is not mana-enhancing and there is a risk that it may not be welcomed by those it is intended for. There may be other groups 'missing' from these priorities, and section 5.3.1a) gives Council the ability to develop these priorities further.

The inclusion of "open to the public" as a proposed support priority is intended to ensure that public funds are not used to finance private initiatives. However, submitters make a good point about ensuring that the focus does not become about giving access to all people, but instead supports communities of identity, place or interest to grow.

Staff recommend that "rainbow communities" is included in the list of proposed support priorities. Staff propose that the support priority "open to the public" be changed to state "open to the members of the relevant community", in response to feedback from submitters.

Hancock Community House Support – Part B8b

Some submitters were unsure of the support priority that states:

are provided by a foundation tenant who was involved with the establishment of Hancock Community House.

Submitters felt the intention was not clear and also that it may be difficult to determine whether prospective applicants were foundation tenants.

This support priority was included to recognise the investment and/or assistance with fund-raising efforts by the original Hancock Community House tenants. The facility was opened in 2011 and was a community-driven project in partnership with the Council. The shared aim was the establishment of a purpose-built Community House facility, to provide suitable, secure, and affordable accommodation for a wide variety of community-based service providers.

Staff note that this proposed support priority reflects the current situation rather than providing policy direction for future tenancies of Hancock Community House (HCH). Therefore, staff recommend the deletion of this support priority.

One submitter noted that the draft policy treats rents for HCH as a subsidy, however the policy does not stipulate to what degree or how a commercial rental is identified, nor to what extent additional costs of tenancy impact on the said subsidy.

In 2011 Council established the rent rate for tenants at approximately 50% of the commercial rate, with an objective to cover on-going costs. Reports from that time suggest Council's intention was for HCH to be cost-neutral to ratepayers, while also offering substantial savings to the service providers. This discounting method has, over time, been referred to as offering 'subsidised rents' to HCH tenants. HCH tenants also receive other forms of support from Council, such as income from meeting room hire to support the overhead costs of individual tenants.

New lease agreements, including rents, were made with the tenants in 2021 on a five-year term with a five-year right of renewal. These new agreements reflect the approach taken to setting the establishment rents in 2011. To clarify the intention of the policy, staff propose removing the term 'subsidised rents' from the proposed policy and adding an explanation of the background and subsequent lease arrangements.

Staff recommend clarifying in the proposed policy that the rental calculation is the tenant occupancy area (per square metre) rate of approximately 50% commercial rental in 2011, with an additional CPI-adjustment. While this proposal departs from what was in the draft policy, it seems unwise to propose any new basis for rent-setting without further consultation on this matter. The proposed clarification provides direction for lease agreements in future and reassures HCH tenants of Council's intention to support their activities.

Staff recommend that the support priority "are provided by a foundation tenant who was involved with the establishment of Hancock Community" is deleted from the draft policy.

Staff also propose that the draft policy be amended to read:

Annual rental rates are based on the area of occupancy (per square metre) for each tenant. When Hancock Community House was founded in 2011 rental rates were set at approximately 50% of the current commercial rate and have been subject to CPI

adjustments since. The rental calculation in future lease agreements will be made on this same basis.

g) Operational matters

Many submissions were about operational matters outside the scope of the draft policy. This included updates on specific support and funding requests, requests for different funding streams, or ideas for amending the purpose of particular support and funding programmes. These matters have been referred to relevant staff.

h) Other changes to the proposed policy

Minor editorial changes were made to the draft policy to clarify the intention, including the change of date to 2022.

All changes are highlighted in yellow in the proposed final policy in Attachment 2.

4. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The proposed Support and Funding Policy brings together a wider range of mechanisms used by Council to support the Palmerston North community. The issues raised by submitters have enabled some useful reflection on aspects of the policy, resulting in the proposed changes described in this report.



If Council adopts the proposed Support and Funding Policy 2022 staff will develop an implementation and monitoring plan to ensure that Council's intent is carried out in the administration of support and funding

Consideration of a specific fund for sector leads, as allowed for in the proposed policy, will be referred to the 10-year plan process for consideration by elected members.

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	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 3: A Connected and Safe Community	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Connected Communities	
The action is: Review the Community Funding Policy	
Contribution to	The recommendations will help Council achieve its objective in

<p>strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being</p>	<p>making support and funding processes transparent, responsive and empowering for communities.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1 - Summary of Submissions - Proposed Support and Funding Policy 2022 [↓](#) 
2. Attachment 2 - Support and Funding Policy 2022 [↓](#) 

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 9 March 2022

TITLE: Update on the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan

PRESENTED BY: David Warburton, Project Director, Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the Committee receive the update report titled 'Palmerston North City Council Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan Update for Elected Members', as attached to the memorandum titled 'Update on the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan' presented to the 9 March 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee.

1. ISSUE

Resolution 54.2 of the 9 February 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee requested an update on the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan (CCPMP) be presented to the 9 March 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee.

2. BACKGROUND

As requested by resolution 54.2 of the 9 February Planning and Strategy Committee, attached to this memorandum is an update report from the CCPMP Project Director for the Committee's consideration.

Attached to the Project Director's report is:

Appendix I: Scope Paper Presented to an Elected Members workshop, 19 August 2020

Appendix II: Updated Plan for Project Delivery

3. NEXT STEPS




The Committee receives the Project Director's update report on the CCPMP.

4. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	Yes
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 2: A Creative and Exciting City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in City Shaping	
The action is: Finalise the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan.	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Completion of the Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan will help achieve our goal for Palmerston North to be an exciting place to live, where we offer a great lifestyle in a city that reflects the diversity of the city community.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Civic and Cultural Precinct Update Report March 2022 [↓](#) 
2. Appendix I: Scope Paper Presented to Elected Members Workshop 19 August 2020 [↓](#) 
3. Appendix II: Updated Plan for Project Delivery [↓](#) 

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 9 March 2022

TITLE: Infrastructure to support Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth

PRESENTED BY: Michael Duindam, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That the Committee receives the memorandum entitled “Infrastructure to support Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth” presented to the 9 March 2022 Planning & Strategy Committee.
 2. That the Council endorses the need to fund and provide adequate infrastructure to support development of land in Aokautere in order to give effect to key strategy and policy documents including the Innovative and Growing City Strategy, the City Growth Plan and National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
 3. That if Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth is approved for consultation under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Chief Executive be directed to prepare infrastructure work programmes required for land transport and stormwater to be included in the 2024 Long Term Plan prior to the hearing for Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth.
 4. That the Chief Executive be directed to provide information relating to the description, timing and quantum of the infrastructure work programmes to enable growth in Aokautere at the 14 September 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee.
 5. That in advance of the hearing for Proposed District Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth the Chief Executive be directed to explore opportunities for Waka Kotahi to fund and/or co-fund transport infrastructure upgrades to enable development in Aokautere.
-

1. ISSUE

Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth is in the process of being finalised. Technical assessments informing the plan change have identified unanticipated transport network infrastructure issues that will need to be addressed in advance of development progressing. The management of stormwater will also require a change in approach to ensure that the sensitive gully environment in Aokautere is not adversely impacted by future development. This memo is intended to provide advanced notice of these issues and to set up processes to address these, which will

increase the likelihood of Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth being approved through the Resource Management Act 1991 process.

This memo seeks that Council request the Chief Executive to direct the preparation of work programmes for land transport and stormwater infrastructure required to service Aokautere growth. The intention is for these infrastructure programmes to be reported back to the 14 September 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee, where endorsement for them to be included in the next Long Term Plan will be sought, subject to the plan change being approved. This will assist officers in demonstrating that rezoning of land in Aokautere for urban growth will be viable through the provision of adequate supporting infrastructure.

Infrastructure works to support growth (and the direction to the Chief Executive) would only be required if the Council approve for notification the proposed plan change to re-zone 454 ha of land for residential purposes in Aokautere (Plan Change G). Plan Change G is due to for reporting to Council in April 2022.

2. BACKGROUND

Plan Change G proposes to rezone a new greenfield growth area at Aokautere where land is currently zoned a mixture of residential, rural and rural-residential. The plan change includes a suite of changes to enable additional housing capacity through rezoning land for residential purposes, a structure plan, and a suite of rule and objective and policy changes.

Plan Change G is being proposed primarily to give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). Under Section 55(2B) of the RMA, a local authority must make amendments to a proposed plan to give effect to provisions within a national policy statement. These amendments must be undertaken using the process in Schedule 1 of the RMA.

The NPS-UD requires the Council to provide sufficient capacity to meet residential demand over the short, medium and long term. Analysis and monitoring undertaken by Council to date has identified that Palmerston North has a shortfall in housing capacity over these timeframes. Plan Change G seeks to address the requirement to provide sufficient development capacity for the medium term (up to 10 years). Other plan changes are proposed to further address development capacity in the city over the medium term. Development capacity for the longer term (10-30 years) is not required to be included within the District Plan and will be addressed through other means.

Aokautere is identified within the Council's Innovative and Growing City Strategy and City Growth Plan as a growth location, with Council stated projections ranging from 400 to 1200 additional dwellings. Planning to date indicates in the region of 995 additional dwellings within the Aokautere growth area.

The NPS-UD requires Council to not only provide for well-functioning urban environments, but also sufficient development capacity to meet the needs of people and communities.

To be "sufficient" development capacity must be:

- a) plan-enabled (land zoned for short and medium-term demand and future urban zoned for long term demand); and
- b) infrastructure-ready; and
- c) feasible and reasonably expected to be realised.

Land is "Infrastructure-ready" if, relevantly for areas marked for medium-term growth (between 3 and 10 years) like Aokautere, that there is adequate existing development infrastructure to support the development of the land or funding for adequate infrastructure to support development of the land is identified in a long-term plan.

Council must also be satisfied that any additional infrastructure, including land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities, to service the development capacity is likely to be available. This is relevant when considering Waka Kotahi's One Network required to access Aokautere

With its focus on ensuring sufficient capacity to meet demand, the NPS-UD emphasises the need for planning decisions to be integrated with infrastructure and funding decisions. This is consistent with the broad functions of the Council to establish, implement and review objectives, policies and methods (which includes zones) to achieve the integrated management of the effects of the use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the District and Council's own strategic objectives, reflective of the RPS, to ensure integrated development with infrastructure and services.

The provision and timing of enabling infrastructure is therefore a highly relevant consideration for NPS-UD driven plan changes; with Council needing to ensure that there is sufficient feasible urban zoned land, but that when land is zoned, that it is then serviced.

Servicing Aokautere

Technical reports prepared in support of Plan Change G have considered the infrastructure requirements for the growth area with a view to confirming the land is suitable for residential zoning, with sufficient development capacity (including strategic infrastructure services) to service the rezoned land. This includes water supply, reticulated sewerage, an integrated approach to managing stormwater and a fit for purpose transport network that supports a range of transport methods.

The supporting reports will be provided alongside the draft plan change for approval by Council for notification; however, two matters arise at this stage for Council consideration. Specifically, the need for immediate local transport network improvements (that is, before any further development) and the provision of stormwater infrastructure (detention and water quality treatment facilities) to support the stormwater management strategy for the Structure Plan area.

Transport

Aokautere is located to the south of State Highway 57 Aokautere Drive and to the east of Turitea Road. The area currently connects with the external road network at the intersections of each of Pacific Drive and Johnstone Drive with SH57 Aokautere Drive. The northern and southern sections of Johnstone Drive have recently been connected and the link vested in Council.

There are currently around 592 existing suburban lots (496 houses) within the area served by Pacific and Johnstone Drives. These roads also provide access to the International Pacific College, the IPU Tertiary Institute NZ and the One School Global Palmerston North. It is anticipated that the area could accommodate up to a further 995 dwellings, and a local business centre.

Council's independent traffic expert has confirmed that the growth area can be developed for residential and local business purposes, subject to specific mitigation measures being put in place. Four of the six overarching mitigation measures are recommended to occur "from the outset" (meaning before any further development of the Aokautere area). These include substantial upgrades to several intersections, including those identified below, along with the addition of cycle paths at the northern end of the Ruapehu Drive and the city.

The intersections requiring upgrade before further development include:

- a) Mountain View Road and Ruapehu Drive intersections with Summerhill Drive;
- b) SH57 Old West Road intersection into SH57 Aokautere; and
- c) Pacific Drive intersection with SH57.

The locations are detailed below in *Figure 1: Intersection safety improvement locations*.



Figure 1: Intersection safety improvement locations

The recommended land transport works are required to ensure additional transport and traffic activity from the residential development facilitated by the proposed Structure Plan can be safely accommodated. The report acknowledges that these issues involve existing level of service and safety concerns with the network in these areas; however, traffic associated with the further development of Aokautere will increase demand on the network and exacerbate those issues.

Council's traffic assessment concludes that the recommendations for work prior to further development is consistent with a range of statutory provisions and strategic documents relevant to traffic and transportation, including the more recent shift in priority towards the delivery of safe and multi-modal transport infrastructure with improved road safety, increased active mode and public transport use and reduced emissions from land transport.

While there are other recommendations for works as development proceeds (e.g., the installation of four new intersection controls internal to the structure plan area), these matters are able to be addressed in line with and commensurate with development/growth.

At this time, however, a commitment from Council to undertake (to the extent within its control) the required upgrades/improvements proposed at the SH57 Aokautere, SH57 Pacific Drive, and Mountain View/Ruapehu Drive intersections, with the related cycle path improvements, is sought to support rezoning of the growth area over the medium term (as defined in the NPS-UD).

The commitment must be sufficiently certain to support the rezoning of the land over the medium term. Whether the infrastructure or upgrades to existing infrastructure is planned by the Council in its Long Term Plan, which is reviewed every three years through a public process, is relevant when considering Council's commitment to the proposed works.

Presently the works are unbudgeted in the Long Term Plan approved by Council in 2021. The issues identified through the plan change process are of a detailed nature that had not been able to have been identified as part of the recent Long Term Plan process. While unfortunate, it reflects the practicality of preparing infrastructure programmes when the detailed nature of development needs is not able to be fully understood until detailed investigations are undertaken. This is particularly true for transport and stormwater infrastructure, which are complex and influenced by site specific issues, such as roading layout, number of accesses, hard surface area, topography and geology.

The Long Term Plan is due for review in 2024, with planning for that Local Government Act statutory process due to formally start in late 2022 / early 2023. This leaves three options:

- a) Amend the Long Term Plan.
- b) Resolve to direct the Chief Executive to prepare work programmes for land transport and stormwater infrastructure required to service Aokautere growth
- c) Do nothing.

Given the requirements of the statutory plan making process, including the NPS-UD, the option of doing nothing is not supported by Council officers. Equally, an amendment to the Long Term Plan is an onerous step at this stage of the Long Term Plan's cycle. Given planning for implementation of the NPS-UD is often linked to three yearly reviews of the Long Term Plan, option b) is considered the best option.

As a minimum, the Council should undertake to complete the necessary work to ensure the transport upgrades are provided for in the next Long Term Plan (with likely timing of works). The more certainty Council can provide around funding and completion of the necessary land transport works in Aokautere, the less likely that the absence of funding in the current Long Term Plan could be seen as an impediment to Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth providing integrated development with infrastructure and services.

Any direction to the Chief Executive must be timebound with regular reporting requirements around progress with development of the work programmes, so as to ensure that decision making can inform the plan change Schedule 1 process. Aside

from demonstrating the commitment of Council to the work, the mitigation recommendations are likely to necessitate provisions which require the infrastructure upgrades to have occurred before any part of any development can occur in Aokautere. The timing of the proposed works will seek to prevent further development until certain works are completed.

The more certainty that Council can provide to the commitment for the investment and infrastructure work programmes into the short to medium terms the greater the likelihood that the plan change will be able to be approved.

A related feature of the traffic recommendations is the need for Waka Kotahi to undertake intersection works involving SH57. Council cannot commit to these works given they involve network outside of its control. However, Council officers are working with Waka Kotahi to ensure that there is a likelihood of the works being completed within the timeframes necessary to support development of the growth area. This is consistent with intent of the NPS-UD. Discussions are positive and on-going at this time.

Stormwater

An overarching stormwater management strategy for the Structure Plan area proposes design criteria and conceptual design alternatives for stormwater controls to mitigate the assessed impacts of development. The existing developments that are already in place in the Structure Plan have been assessed by Council's technical advisors, GHD, in conjunction with areas of proposed development in order to recommend stormwater management controls that collectively achieve the established design criteria for the entire Structure Plan area.

Accounting for the limited areas of development constructed over the preceding 20 to 30 years reflects the intention of the stormwater strategy to effectively address all stormwater runoff in the structure plan area and avoid the "grandfathering" of existing areas which would then incur a disproportionately high impact to the receiving environment.

As this approach involves managing stormwater which is generated from existing development (and therefore is not directly related to new residential development) Council will need to deliver on certain components of the stormwater management design, including some stormwater detention facilities to mitigate flood and erosion risk.

Environmental regulation has changed significantly since development in Aokautere commenced 20 – 30 years ago. Under the RMA 1991, natural hazards have been elevated to a matter of national importance and water quality issues have resulted in the release of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 and National Environmental Standard for Freshwater 2020. Environmental regulation and the evolution of best practice approaches to stormwater management has informed the decision to take a holistic approach to stormwater management in Aokautere. The stormwater approach for Aokautere will provide Council with much greater control over how adverse effects of development on the sensitive gully environments can be avoided. It also provides the opportunity to enhance the gully

environment and provide developers with greater certainty about how stormwater will be managed in their resource consenting processes.

As with any development, there is a cost to growth. Stormwater detention systems to accommodate new growth can be funded through development contributions. However, the infrastructure required to address stormwater from existing development will need to be funded from rates.

Like transport, stormwater infrastructure programmes necessary to facilitate development in Aokautere will need to be prepared and included in the next Long Term Plan.

3. NEXT STEPS

The next steps are:

- Consider Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth for public notification in April 2022.
- Prepare infrastructure work programmes required for land transport and stormwater to be included in the next Long Term Plan.
- Publicly notify Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth for submissions.
- Report back on proposed infrastructure work programmes for land transport and stormwater at the 14 September 2022 Planning and Strategy Committee and seek endorsement for those programmes to be included in the 2024 Long Term Plan.
- Hold hearing for Proposed Plan Change G: Aokautere Growth
- Include infrastructure programmes in 2024 Long Term Plan to support growth in Aokautere if Plan Change G is approved.

4. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Committee have delegated authority to decide?	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?	No
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	No
This is consistent with the City Growth Plan, which specifically seeks to:	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. create and enable opportunities for employment and growth 2. Provide infrastructure to enable growth and a transport system that links people and opportunities 3. Support the development of more housing that meets community needs 	
The recommendations contribute to Goal 1: An Innovative and Growing City	
<p>The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in City Growth</p> <p>The actions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the National Policy Statement on Urban Development; and • Update the District Plan to rezone identified growth areas for housing and business needs. 	
<p>Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being</p>	<p>Ensuring land-use and infrastructure planning aligns will ensure that Council will deliver on implementing the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and that rezoning of Aokautere is successfully achieved to provide development capacity for the City.</p>

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

TO: Planning & Strategy Committee

MEETING DATE: 9 March 2022

TITLE: Committee Work Schedule

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO PLANNING & STRATEGY COMMITTEE

1. That the Planning & Strategy Committee receive its Work Schedule dated March 2022.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Committee Work Schedule - March 2022 [↓](#) 

