



PAPAIOEA
PALMERSTON
NORTH
CITY

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY JOINT STEERING GROUP

9.00AM - DELIBERATIONS, MONDAY 20 MAY
2024

COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR
CIVIC ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
32 THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON NORTH

MEMBERS

Grant Smith (Chair)
Leonie Hapeta
Lorna Johnson
Rachel Keedwell
Fiona Gordon
Te Kenehi Teira

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

Waid Crockett

Chief Executive | PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Te Marae o Hine | 32 The Square
Private Bag 11034 | Palmerston North 4442 | New Zealand
pncc.govt.nz

PALMY™
PAPAIOEA
PALMERSTON
NORTH
CITY

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY JOINT STEERING GROUP MEETING

20 May 2024

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. **Karakia Timatanga**
2. **Apologies**
3. **Late Submissions - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024** Page 5
4. **Confirmation of Minutes** Page 63

"That the minutes of the Future Development Strategy Joint Steering Group meeting of 13 May 2024 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record."
5. **Deliberations Report - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024** Page 71

Memorandum, presented by Keegan Aplin-Thane, Senior Planner Palmerston North City Council and Leana Shirley, Senior Planner Horizons Regional Council.
6. **Karakia Whakamutunga**

SUBMISSION FROM CONSULTATION

TO: Future Development Strategy Joint Steering Group

MEETING DATE: 20 May 2024

TITLE: Late Submissions - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY JOINT STEERING GROUP

1. That the Joint Steering Group note the late submissions.
-

Late Submissions that were not previously circulated to the Joint Steering Group.

Submission Number	Name
139	Lorraine Langer
140	Gavin Cornford
141	Andrea Hurley
142	Dennis Yorke
143	Jenny Davies
144	Alex Davies
145	Zaneta Park and Mike Tate

ATTACHMENTS

1. Submission 139 - 145 [!\[\]\(e548a391c65118ac2476924cdb5db38c_img.jpg\)](#) [!\[\]\(6fc1fda334fce799e3b50f6cf68d70a8_img.jpg\)](#)

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Future Development Strategy Joint Steering Group Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 13 May 2024, commencing at 9.02am

Members Present: The Mayor (Grant Smith) (in the Chair), Councillors Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Rachel Keedwell, Fiona Gordon and Te Kenehi Teira.

Karakia Timatanga

Te Kenehi Teira opened the meeting with karakia.

1-24 **Agree Palmerston North City Council Standing Orders Part 2: Meeting Procedures**

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Te Kenehi Teira.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Steering Group agree to conduct business for all meetings using the Part 2 of the Palmerston North City Council Standing Orders.

Clause 1-24 above was carried 6 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Grant Smith, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Rachel Keedwell, Fiona Gordon and Te Kenehi Teira.

2-24 **Summary of Submissions - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024**

Memorandum, presented by Keegan Aplin-Thane, Senior Planner, Palmerston North City Council and Leana Shirley, Senior Planner, Horizons Regional Council.

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Leonie Hapeta.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Steering Group receive the summary of submissions on the Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024.

Clause 2-24 above was carried 6 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Grant Smith, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Rachel Keedwell, Fiona Gordon and Te Kenehi Teira.

3-24 Hearing of Submissions - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024

Moved Grant Smith, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Steering Group hear submissions from presenters who indicated their wish to be heard in support of their submission.
2. That the Steering Group note the Procedure for Hearing of Submissions, as described in the procedure sheet.

Clause 3-24 above was carried 6 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Grant Smith, Leonie Hapeta, Lorna Johnson, Rachel Keedwell, Fiona Gordon and Te Kenehi Teira.

The following persons appeared before the Committee to make oral statements in support of their submissions and replied to questions from Steering Group members.

Chris Teo-Sherrell (105)

Chris Teo-Sherrell spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

Mandy Shaw (128)

Mandy Shaw spoke to her submission and made no additional comments.

LT Projects Limited (Mike Taylor, Director, LT Projects Limited, Chris Lowe, Director, LT Projects Limited, Cam Twigley, Principal Planner, BTW Company, and Darrell Martin, Senior Planner, BTW Company) (83)

Mike, Chris, Cam and Darrell spoke to the submission and made no additional comments.

2nd Chapter Partners (Liam Dickson, Director 2nd Chapter Partners and Richard Coles, Director, Momentum Planning and Design, Advisor to 2nd Chapter Partners) (88)

Liam and Richard spoke to the submission and made no additional comments. Further information (presentation and tabled material) was presented at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

Foodstuffs North Island Limited (David Boersen, Development Manager – Property Investment, Foodstuff North Island Limited, Daniel Sadlier, Lawyer, Simone Williams, Associate, Barker & Associates, and Mike Nixon, Principal Transport Consultant) (90)

David and Daniel spoke to the submission and made no additional comments. Further information (tabled material in two parts) was presented at the meeting and appended to these minutes.

Grant Stevenson (99)

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

- He is interested in the points made by a previous submitter around hydrology and Bunnythorpe which he had not been aware of.
- He supports a focus on community and for Council to ensure due diligence is undertaken.

Robert McLachlan (101)

Robert spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

Meeting adjourned at 10.35am
Meeting resumed at 11.02am

Palmerston North Airport Limited (Mark Lash, Chief Commercial Officer) (106)

Mark spoke to the submission and made no additional comments.

Peter Davies (108)

Peter spoke to his submission and made the following additional

comments:

- He is supportive of the area where the Bunnythorpe business park is proposed as it consolidates industrial developments which seems to be an excellent idea.

KiwiRail (Anna Allen, Executive General Manager Property and Pam Butler, Senior RMA Advisor) (109)

Anna and Pam spoke to the submission and made the following additional comments:

- KiwiRail supports the removal of all level crossings.

LJ Futures Trust (Lynley Annand) (110)

Lynley spoke to the submission and made additional comments outlined in the tabled material appended to these minutes.

Stephen Kelly (131)

Stephen spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments:

- Consultation has been reasonable but a decision on the final plans needs to be made as quickly as possible, so people are not left in a position where they cannot move on with their lives.

Christine Staples (116)

Christine spoke to her submission and made the following additional comments noted below. Further information was tabled at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

- Simplify the information for easy understanding and absorption of all that is happening.

Ian Staples (117)

Ian spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

The meeting adjourned 12.14pm

The meeting resumed at 1.07pm

Jon Roygard, Group Manager Catchment Operations, Horizons Regional Council (18)

Jon spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments:

- This is a Horizons staff submission.
- Although Horizons staff were involved in developing the draft strategy, Jon was not involved in producing the draft strategy.

David and Fiona Odering, (23)

David spoke to his submission and made the following additional comments below. Further information (presentation slides) was tabled at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

- The submission is representative of his family and their property, not of his company, SOCO Limited.

Niuvaka Trust (Dana Kunaiti, General Manager, Analena Siu, Community Connector, Latai (youth) and William Tamutamu, Project Coordinator) (35)

Dana, Analena, Latai and William spoke to the submission and made additional comments outlined in the slides that were presented at the meeting and are appended to these minutes.

Dale O'Reilly (36)

Dale spoke to her submission and made the following additional comments below. Further information was tabled at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

- Bunnythorpe is one of only two rural villages in New Zealand not recognised as a settlement by Stats NZ.
- Shared some of the history between Manawatū District Council and Palmerston North City Council.
- If this plan goes ahead this will cause social cohesion issues for the community of Bunnythorpe.

Whakarongo Holding Company Ltd (Paul Thomas, Thomas Planning Ltd, Kevin Judd, Resonant Consulting Ltd, John Maassen, Barrister, Matthew Currie, Homewood Property) (80)

Paul, Kevin, John and Matthew spoke to the submission and made no additional comments. Further information (two slideshows) was tabled at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

Homewood Property (Matthew Currie) (104)

Matthew spoke to his submission and did not make any additional comments.

Beryl Brown (45)

Beryl spoke to her submission and made no additional comments. Further information was tabled at the meeting and is appended to these minutes.

Clair Reeves (57)

Clair and Ian spoke to their submission and made the following additional comments:

- Their main question is why would you leave two houses out of the plan in the middle of an industrial area.

Warren and Vicki Bradley (63)

Warren and Vicki spoke to their submission and made no additional comments.

Fonterra Limited (Laura Jeffries, Environmental Policy Manager, Susanne O'Rourke, National Environmental Manager, Philippa Fourie, Regional Engagement Manager) (75)

Laura, Susanne and Philippa spoke to the submission and made no additional comments.

Robert Gibb (118)

Robert spoke to his submission and made additional comments outlined in the further information (slideshow) that was presented at the meeting

and is appended to these minutes.

He also notes his statements are on behalf of Green Taskforce All Saints with the backing of Environmental Manawatū Network.

Aaron Fox (122)

Aaron spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

Dr Ruth Gorinski on behalf of Mr & Mrs Adams (71)

Dr Gorinski spoke on behalf of the submitters and made no additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at 3.31pm
The meeting resumed at 3.52pm

Moira Devine (136)

Moira spoke to her submission and made no additional comments.

Heritage Estates (2000) Ltd (John Farquhar, Owner, Amanda Coats, Proarch Consultants Limited) (107)

John spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

Jeff Twigge (102)

Jeff spoke to his submission and made no additional comments.

AgResearch (Graeme Mathieson, Senior Consultant) (94)

Graeme spoke to the submission and made no additional comments.

Transpower New Zealand Limited (Rebecca Eng, Technical Lead) (65)

Rebecca spoke to the submission and made no additional comments.

Karakia Whakamutunga

Councillor Te Kenehi Teira closed the meeting with karakia.

The meeting finished at 4.37pm

Confirmed 20 May 2024

Chair

MEMORANDUM

TO: Future Development Strategy Joint Steering Group

MEETING DATE: 20 May 2024

TITLE: Deliberations Report - Draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024

PRESENTED BY: Keegan Aplin-Thane, Senior Planner Palmerston North City Council and Leana Shirley, Senior Planner Horizons Regional Council

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATIONS TO FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY JOINT STEERING GROUP

1. That the Joint Steering Group agree the following updates to the draft Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024:
 - (a) as recommended in Table 1
 - (b) to (n) as recommended in Table 2
 - (o) as recommended in Table 3
 - (p) as recommended in Table 4
 - (q) to (ee) as recommended in Table 5
 - (ff) to (ii) as recommended in Table 6
 - (jj) to (tt) as recommended in Table 7

 2. That the Joint Steering Group recommend the final draft of the Palmerston North Future Development Strategy 2024 (incorporating changes agreed above) for adoption by Palmerston North City Council and Horizons Regional Council.
-

1. ISSUE

- 1.1 Palmerston North City Council and Horizons Regional Council have jointly prepared a draft Future Development Strategy ('the Strategy') for Palmerston North according to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.
- 1.2 The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 requires that consultation on the draft Future Development Strategy uses the special consultative procedure.

- 1.3 As part of the special consultative procedure, public consultation was held for six weeks followed by a hearing for those submitters who wished to speak to their submission in person.
- 1.4 This report provides an analysis of the submissions received and recommendations from management for the treatment of the matters raised in the submissions.
- 1.5 A [report to the 13 May 2024](#) meeting included a [summary of submissions](#).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 requires Horizons Regional Council and Palmerston North City Council to jointly prepare a Future Development Strategy for Palmerston North (a tier 2 urban environment) in time to inform, or at the same time as preparation of, the Long Term Plan.
- 2.2 The purpose of the Strategy is to set out how the two councils intend to:
 - Achieve well-functioning urban environments in our existing and future urban areas.
 - Provide at least sufficient development capacity over the next 30 years to meet expected demand.
 - Assist the integration of planning decisions under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) with infrastructure planning and funding decisions under other legislation.
- 2.3 The Strategy also includes a statement of hapū and iwi values and aspirations for urban development.
- 2.4 The purpose of the Strategy is to take a high-level view of what type of urban development will occur, and where, in Palmerston North in the coming decades. It is not intended to provide the detail that will enable site-specific planning. A range of other, more detailed planning processes are required before a development project can proceed. These include:
 - Engaging with affected stakeholders and property owners.
 - Investigations such as transport and stormwater modelling, and geotechnical assessments.
 - Preparing master plans/structure plans.
 - District Plan zoning and related plan changes (note plan changes are required to have regard to the Future Development Strategy [Clause 3.17, NPS-UD]).
 - Regulatory permissions including subdivision, land use and building consents and engineering approvals.

- 2.5 The Strategy informs a range of other Council planning processes, including Long-Term Plans, Infrastructure Strategies, and priorities and decisions in Regional Land Transport and Public Transport Plans.
- 2.6 The Strategy consulted on from 26 of March to 5 May 2024.
- 2.7 The Strategy sets out where housing, business and industrial growth will occur in Palmerston North over the next 30 years along with the development and additional infrastructure required to support that growth.
- 2.8 The Strategy is largely consistent with Palmerston North City Council's existing growth plan for Palmerston North, setting out at a high level where and when growth will occur.
- 2.9 The Strategy explores the advantages and disadvantages of four approaches to providing for growth for Palmerston North:
- **Growing Up:** Providing for growth in our existing urban environments through infill and intensification of housing, business, and industry.
 - **Growing In:** Repurposing/rezoning pockets of industrial land¹, and two previously identified reserves that are not required to meet community or recreation needs² It also means continuing to enable housing above ground floor level within the city centre.
 - **Growing Out:** Providing for growth via greenfield areas at the edges of the city. This includes:
 - The development of our existing greenfield growth areas in the short³ to medium⁴ terms – the Mātangi, Whakarongo, Napier Road Extension Area, and Kikiwhenua Residential areas, and the North East Industrial Zone Extension.
 - Greenfield growth in the medium-term and long-term⁵ for homes at Aokautere and Kākātangiata and neighbourhood centres in these growth areas,
 - Greenfield growth to the northeast of the city in line with the Te Utanganui Masterplan to support industrial growth.
 - **Village Growth:** Greenfield and infill growth in our rural villages; Ashhurst, Bunnythorpe, Longburn and Linton.

¹ Roxburgh Crescent industrial area, the Albert Street Depot and pockets of industrial zoned land on Botanical Road and Joseph and West Streets.

² Huia Street Reserve and the Former Terrace End Bowling Club on Summerhays Street

³ Within the next three years.

⁴ Between 3 and 10 years.

⁵ Between 10 and 30 years.

- 2.10 The preferred growth option set out in the Strategy and the Statement of Proposal is a **balanced approach**.
- 2.11 A balanced approach to growth incorporates all four options in a way that will provide for expected market demand across a range of types and locations for housing, business, and industrial use. Council can enable intensification options while still enabling greenfield growth to meet market demand. The balanced approach also takes into account the varied constraints that occur within our existing urban environment.

3. CONSULTATION

- 3.1 The consultation process for the Strategy has been broadly described in the Summary of Submissions report presented to the Joint Steering Committee at the Hearing of Submissions meeting held on the 13 May 2024.
- 3.2 During the hearings, a variety of comments were made by submitters relating to the consultation process. Officers make the following comments to clarify issues raised at the hearings:
 - Aside from Te Utanganui, consultation was broad on the Future Development Strategy and utilised existing Long-Term Plan engagement events to socialise the Strategy.
 - The process for consultation on Te Utanganui is through the Strategy. Socialisation of the Masterplan was undertaken early with affected and surrounding landowners to prepare them for the consultation process. This included drop-in sessions in October for landowners with zoning implications indicated for their property, and in December for landowners with an adjacent or surrounding interest in the Masterplan area.
 - Concern was raised by Mr Twigge (submitter 102) about being left out of the October mail drop. After the hearings officers further checked Mr Twigge's property in relation to the Masterplan and are satisfied that while he did not receive an October letter, he was sent a letter as part of the December drop-in sessions as his property is not included in the area identified for a potential zone change in the Masterplan.
 - Letters were sent to landowners within Manawatū District in the area surrounding Te Utanganui as part of the December drop-in sessions.

4. SUBMISSIONS SUMMARY, THEMES AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES

- 4.1 A total of 145 submissions were received. Seven of these were received after the deadline. Some of the late submissions were received on 9 May 2024 which was the deadline for submissions to the Long-Term Plan. All late submissions were accepted.

- 4.2 Feedback received in the late submissions has been incorporated into the summary analysis, comments, and recommendations provided in this report and its attachments.
- 4.3 A further 21 submissions to the Palmerston North City Council Long-Term Plan have been received with submission points related to the Future Development Strategy. These were received after the completion of the summary of submissions and this report. We will speak to these during the presentation of this report.
- 4.4 32 submitters spoke to their submissions at the Hearing on 13 May 2024.
- 4.5 Sections 5 – 11 of this report address the submitters' answers to the consultation questions.
- 4.6 A brief summary is provided of the themes identified for each of the questions.
 - 4.6.1 A significant number of the points raised by submitters were outside the scope of the Future Development Strategy. Most of these points can be addressed through other processes or by other organisations, for example:

Palmerston North City Council

- Future Development Strategy Implementation Plan
- Future reviews of the Future Development Strategy
- Long-Term Plan
- District Plan Changes
- Review of the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative
- Vegetation framework review

Horizons Regional Council

- Future Development Strategy Implementation Plan
- Future reviews of the Future Development Strategy
- Long-Term Plan
- Resource consent processes
- Regional Land Transport Plan
- Other regional planning processes

Other

- Responsibility of other agencies
- Other national policy statements or environmental standards

- 4.6.2 These points, and the relevant process for addressing them, have been recorded in Attachments 1-9 to this report. Officers will ensure they are considered as part of the appropriate process.

4.6.3 Several issues and/or requests raised by submitters have prompted officers to consider updates to the Strategy. Officer comments and recommendations in response to these issues/requests are provided in this report.

5. WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENTS

(Refer to page 18 of the draft Strategy)

Consultation question 1: Is there anything else you think should be part of our urban areas to make them well-functioning?

- 5.1 26 comments supported the definition of well-functioning urban environments as drafted. The main theme (6 comments) was support for housing within a walkable distance to shops, schools, community services and parks.
- 5.2 24 comments requested a change to the definition of well-functioning urban environments. The only theme arising from these comments (7) was a request to reference support for all cultures.
- 5.3 Officers recommend **one** change to the definition of well-functioning urban environments in the Strategy as set out in Table 1 below. Refer to Attachment 1 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 1: Recommended change to the definition of well-functioning urban environments

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Requests a city that is easier for our Pasifika to live and thrive in	We acknowledge the thrust of the submission relates to larger house sizes that reflect the intergenerational living traditions of our Pasifika community. We recommend a change to one of the existing criterion to acknowledge the diversity of need that we aspire to provide for in the city.	a) Replace "Māori have the ability to express their cultural norms and traditions including papakāinga options" with " <u>Māori and other cultures have the ability to express their cultural norms and traditions</u> "
Requests reference to supporting all cultures	Rangitāne (132) recommend provision is made for other cultures to express their cultural traditions and norms under the korowai of Rangitāne. A criterion to this effect may suffice for capturing the existing provision for Māori traditions as well as other cultures. Papakāinga is already provided for under the criterion for "Māori development (including papakāinga, cultural hubs and new marae) is a readily available option, so a replacement of the Māori	

	traditions criterion would not compromise provision for papakāinga.	
--	---	--

6. GROWTH OPPORTUNITES

(Refer to page 35 of the draft Strategy)

Consultation question 2: Do you know of any opportunities we've missed?

- 6.1 21 suggestions were made for growth opportunities that have been missed. All of these were out of scope for the Future Development Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means.
- 6.2 There are no recommended changes to the Strategy related to growth opportunities. The majority of requests for additional sites or removal of sites from the Strategy are addressed under recommendations for growing in, up and out further below in this report. Refer to Attachment 2 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

7. GROWTH CONSTRAINTS

(Refer to Appendix 1 of the draft Strategy, page 71)

7.1 Consultation question 3: Do you think there are any constraints we've missed?

- 7.1.1 There were 85 comments related to constraints. Five themes can be identified (where there are more than five comments):
 - a) Affordability of growth infrastructure (16)
 - b) Requests that 5G cell phone towers in proximity to the airport be included as a constraint (13)
 - c) Include traffic flows as a constraint to manage (9)
 - d) Highly productive land is an important constraint (7)
 - e) Requests greater emphasis on flood prone areas as a constraint (6)

All these themes are already addressed in the draft Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means (see Attachment 3).

- 7.1.2 A range of comments prompted some suggested changes to the Constraints section of the Strategy. Officers recommend **13** changes as set out in Table 2 below. Refer to Attachment 4 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 2: Recommended changes to the Strategy Appendix 1: Growth Constraints

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
<p>Concern about community severance risks to Bunnythorpe from the Regional Freight Ring Road</p>	<p>Accept. A proposed business case to identify the alignment of the Regional Freight Ring Road is in years 2 and 3 of the PNCC Long Term Plan. The business case will involve a discussion with Bunnythorpe and wider community about how best to settle on an alignment that has least impact on communities. In particular, the Bunnythorpe community has raised concern about the Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road creating physical and community severance.</p>	<p>b) Amend Map 34 (State highway network) to highlight existing and future community severance risks.</p>
<p>Requests additional constraints to be considered regarding the coping capacity for the natural landscape and native ecosystems</p>	<p>Accept. We currently hold information that could assist in satisfying the submitter's request. These include landscape units assessed for the Palmerston North Landscape Inventory 2011.</p>	<p>c) Add a new constraint to Appendix 1 acknowledging landscapes. Include information relating to the Palmerston North Landscape Inventory 2011, bush remnants, known wetlands and significant bush areas, streams and the Tararua Range Landscape Protection Area.</p>
<p>Requests inclusion of natural river paths, streams, and springs as a constraint</p>	<p>Accept. We currently hold information that could assist in satisfying the submitter's request. These include streams, but we note that Palmerston North does not have natural springs to factor into this constraint.</p>	<p>c) Add a new constraint to Appendix 1 to reflect sites and activities across the district that are anticipated to have reverse sensitivity risks to manage.</p>
<p>Requests inclusion of reverse sensitivity risks to industrial and rural activities as a constraint</p>	<p>Accept. Reverse sensitivity risks related to rail, state highways, and rural-residential development are acknowledged in Appendix 1, however risks associated with industries or facilities like the submitters note have not. We would recommend including a specific section related to reverse sensitivity as a constraint in Appendix 1, which should be broadened to capture other sites worth acknowledging. We are confident that this would not impact our current preferred growth option, as any possible reverse sensitivity effects would be assessed within a District Plan change.</p>	<p>d) Add a new constraint to Appendix 1 to reflect sites and activities across the district that are anticipated to have reverse sensitivity risks to manage.</p>

<p>Requests changes to the constraints and infrastructure sections of the Strategy to more clearly recognize the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>e) Amend text to the effect of Transpower's submission relating to being more specific about national grid infrastructure.</p>
<p>Recognise the national gas network as a constraint</p>	<p>Accept. We note the national gas network had not featured in the draft FDS but do not consider this to be material to the consideration of growth areas. Avoidance measures can be considered in the rezoning process.</p>	<p>f) Add the national gas network to the National Grid section of Appendix 1 and Map 36.</p>
<p>Requests that the FDS is clearer about reverse sensitivity effects on the national grid</p>	<p>Accept.</p>	<p>g) Amend text to the effect of Transpower's submission relating to being more specific about reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid.</p>
<p>Market-led approaches are considered a constraint to achieving diverse housing design and tenure needed to develop local communities</p>	<p>Accept. We recommend including text under page 72 of Appendix 1 to reflect the limitations that Council's role in housing and business growth has in meeting broader outcomes.</p>	<p>h) Add a new constraint to Appendix 1 as follows: <u>“Council's influence over the market.”</u> <u>Key levers that Councils have in influencing community outcomes for housing and business growth are limited in their scope. Our communities of interest have told us in the Housing and Business Needs Assessment 2023 that there are limited options for inter-generational living, accessible housing, and larger homes. These options either don't represent projected household sizes that our market is driven to cater for, or represent possible increased costs to construction that reduce a developer's ability to remain market-competitive. Diverse housing tenure models and sustainable construction are areas of interest to our community, but there is limited scope for our District Plan, Development Contributions Policy, and our administration of the Building Act to be able to</u></p>

		encourage or require these outcomes."
Requests consideration of our solid waste capacity as a constraint	Accept. Solid waste is a constraint to all growth in the district but is not considered a location-specific factor for deciding on options for meeting demand for housing and business land.	<p>i) Add a constraint to Appendix 1 as follows:</p> <p><u>“Landfill capacity:</u></p> <p><u>Bonny Glen landfill in Turakina services the greater regions solid waste needs and is privately owned. Bonny Glen is a Class A municipal solid waste facility that is consented till 2055 and at current filling rates has airspace remaining for disposal for a projected 25-30 years'. Risks to this projected landfill capacity include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Growth in districts serviced by Bonny Glen (Whanganui, Taranaki, Ruapehu, Rangitikei, Manawatū, Kapiti, Horowhenua and Wairarapa).</u> - <u>Contractual arrangements with the landfill company (who has contractual access, for what and over what period).</u> - <u>Inert C&D (construction and demolition) waste or other bulky materials competing for premium disposal airspace. There are no outlets of significance in the lower NI for treated timber or other demolitions materials, with the exception of concrete to crushing outlets.</u> - <u>Future changes to waste acceptance criteria from central government or the landfill regulator Horizons RC. Eg. Organics or consent condition changes.</u> - <u>Future changes to waste recyclables.</u> - <u>Reducing capacity in surrounding Wellington, Tararua and Hawkes Bay regions.”</u>

<p>Requests that private developer agreements be acknowledged as a way of funding growth for Kākātangiata earlier than the medium term</p>	<p>Accept. Developer agreements have already been referred to on page 71, but we acknowledge their role in expediting infrastructure delivery has not been made clear enough in the Strategy.</p>	<p>j) Amend text on page 71 as follows: "In addition, these changes do not prevent developers lodging private plan change applications <u>or entering into developer agreements to enable</u> development sooner than we have scheduled the funding to support growth."</p>
<p>Requests consideration of the constrained funding environment for transport</p> <p>Requests acknowledgement of the business case process for expediting outcomes in the Strategy</p>	<p>Accept. We recommend including this consideration as new text under page 71.</p>	<p>k) Add text to page 71 as follows: <u>"Funding for transport changes in the State Highway network anticipated for growth is significantly constrained. Funding commitments can change to adjust to national priorities. We need a variety of land-use, structure plan, staging, and local funding options to manage this risk. This risk is more acute in our greenfield areas than our existing urban environment. The business case process can assist in demonstrating value for money compared to other competing interests in the National Land Transport Fund."</u></p>
<p>Requests that wording is changed for the flood prone areas constraint to provide for engineering solutions where appropriate</p>	<p>We recommend including changes to the text in the Flood Prone Areas section of Appendix 1 to reflect further investigation required on appropriate flood risk responses in Te Utanganui.</p>	<p>l) Amend text on page 78 as follows: "Kākātangiata and Te Utanganui will address the risk posed by the flood prone areas through <u>by seeking to avoid</u> development within them. <u>Some areas within the Te Utanganui area require further flood risk assessment to understand whether appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures can be put in place to enable these to be developed."</u></p>
<p>Acknowledge opportunities for site-based stormwater management and upstream benefits from the KiwiRail Hub</p>	<p>The relief sought is already addressed in the current text where it is signalled that stormwater needs to be</p>	<p>m) Change reference to Map 30 on page 73, to Map 28.</p>

and other developments in the stormwater ponding constraint	carefully managed in greenfield growth areas. However, it is noted that the notified version of the FDS incorrectly refers to Map 30 as the 200-year model showing stormwater depths. This submitter has correctly identified this as Map 28.	
Requests an acknowledgement of the role of aggregate and quarrying to Palmerston North's future development and protect aggregate resources from alternative land uses or access constraints	We don't anticipate the identified growth areas in the Future Development Strategy to conflict with the aggregate locations identified by the submitter. Officers are open to further conversation about informing the next Future Development Strategy review in 2027. We recommend including further text under Geographical and Physical Constraints on page 72 to recognise the need for local aggregate supplies to support growth.	n) Add the following text to Geographical and Other Physical Constraints section on page 72: <u>"Aggregate is an essential resource for the construction of housing and business areas. Projected housing demand in the district equates to demand for 103,000 tonnes of aggregates per year. Because of the high travel costs associated with aggregates, consideration of local aggregate resources when planning urban growth is important."</u>

8. GROWING IN

(Refer to Appendix 3 of the draft Strategy, page 116)

8.1 Consultation question 4: Do you agree or disagree with the extent we've shown for 'Growing In'?

Number of submitters		
Submissions in support: 44	Submissions in opposition: 40	Undecided submissions: 17

8.2 21 comments in support of the extent of 'Growing In' presented in the draft Strategy. The main theme arising from these comments was "More efficient use of land and infrastructure" (13)

8.3 117 comments expressed concerns about 'Growing In'. Eight themes can be identified (where there are more than five comments):

- a) Preservation of and greater need for greenspaces (23)
- b) Increased pressure on services (14)
- c) Concern about increased antisocial behaviour/crime (12)
- d) Neighbours end up living too close to each other (11)
- e) Noise effects (8)
- f) Not supportive of medium/high density for growing in (8)
- g) Pollution effects (6)

h) Concern about poor urban design outcomes (6)

All these themes are either out of scope, already addressed in the draft Strategy, or are more appropriately addressed through different means (see Attachment 4).

8.4 Consultation question 5: Do you have any other thoughts about ‘growing in’?

8.5 50 specific requests were raised regarding ‘Growing In’, all of which are already addressed in the draft Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means.

8.6 Of the 50 comments, 21 mentioned the opportunities related to underutilised land and buildings in the city centre.

8.7 Consultation question 6: Are there any other ‘growing in’ opportunities you think we’ve missed?

8.8 Officers recommend **one** change as set out in Table 3 below. Refer to Attachment 4 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 3: Recommended change to "Growing In"

Submission Theme	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Concern about reverse sensitivity effects if Massey land were to be repurposed for housing	Accept	o) Map Ag Research site as a reverse sensitivity site. (Cf. recommendation (d))

9. GROWING UP

(Refer to Appendix 3 of the draft Strategy, page 116)

9.1 Consultation question 7: Do you agree or disagree with the extent we’ve shown for ‘growing up’?

Number of submitters		
Submissions in support: 41	Submissions in opposition: 46	Undecided submissions: 9

9.2 19 comments in support of the extent of ‘Growing Up’ presented in the draft Strategy. While there were no dominant themes, seven comments observed that this approach provides better options for public, private, and Māori housing.

9.3 133 comments expressed concern about ‘Growing Up’. Ten themes can be observed (where there are more than five comments):

- a) Height-related effects such as sunlight and privacy for neighbours (25)
- b) Concern about network infrastructure capacity (16)

- c) Neighbours living too close to each other (13)
- d) Concern about quality of life, social and mental health effects (13)
- e) Reduced private outdoor space (13)
- f) Pressure on carparking (6)
- g) Impact on existing character and heritage (6)
- h) Higher density is not suitable for meeting everyone's needs (5)
- i) Noise effects (5)
- j) Concern about the quality of development (5)

All these themes are either out of scope, already addressed in the draft Strategy, or are more appropriately addressed through different means (see Attachment 6).

9.4 Consultation question 8: Do you have any other thoughts about 'Growing Up'?

9.5 There were 19 specific requests raised regarding 'Growing Up' most of which are already addressed in the draft Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means. Some comments did not require any treatment.

9.6 Consultation question 9: Are there any areas we've missed to 'Growing Up'? If so, where?

9.7 There are no recommended changes to the Strategy related to 'Growing Up'. Refer to Attachment 5 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

10. GROWING OUT

(Refer to Appendix 3 of the draft Strategy, page 123)

10.1 Consultation question 10: Do you agree or disagree with the extent we've shown for 'Growing Out'?

Number of submitters		
Submissions in support: 54	Submissions in opposition: 36	Undecided submissions: 8

10.2 There were 28 comments in support of the extent of 'Growing Out' presented in the draft Strategy. Only one theme was apparent with five comments mentioning that "Growing Out" makes it easier to provide a large enough land supply to keep the market competitive.

10.3 On the other hand, there were 68 comments expressing concern about 'Growing Out'. The five themes identified were:

- a) Retention of highly productive land (17)
- b) Concern around natural hazard risk such as flood prone areas, land stability and liquefaction (10)

- c) Concern about protecting green spaces and enhancing public transport, schools, and local shopping centres (7)
- d) Transport issues related to car-dependency, car parking needs, and unresolved pre-existing transport issues (7)
- e) Concern about the cost burden and viability of providing growth infrastructure (7)

10.4 **Consultation question 11: Do you have any other thoughts about 'Growing Out'?**

10.5 30 specific requests were raised regarding 'Growing Out', almost all of which are already addressed in the draft Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means. One request has been recommended as a change (see Table 4 below).

10.6 The themes arising from these requests (receiving more than 5 comments) were:

Prioritise development within existing urban environments before growing out (6)

Request for 160 Napier Road to be included in the extent of Growing Out (5)

10.7 Officers recommend **one** change as set out in Table 4 below. Refer to Attachment 6 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 4: Recommended change to 'Growing Out'

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Request for 160 Napier Road to be included in the extent of growing out	The proposed 160 Napier Road site has merit for residential use, however, faces highly productive land and stormwater constraints that are yet to have been fully assessed through a private plan change. We recommend that the site be included in the Future Development Strategy, but as a medium-term growth area to reflect the uncertainty about the highly productive land and stormwater constraints. The applicant would have to demonstrate that the tests in the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land can be met in order to justify rezoning productive land.	p) Add 160 Napier Road to the Future Development Strategy as a medium-term growing out residential area.

11. ANYTHING ELSE?

11.1 Consultation question 12: What other information could be useful for considering the next 30 years of growth for the district?

11.2 In answer to this question there were 50 comments related to infrastructure. No strong themes were identified, however support for the expansion and enhancement of the public and active transport network was affirmed in five comments and there were seven requests for greater passenger rail options and frequency.

11.3 A range of other comments prompted some suggested infrastructure-related changes to the Strategy. Officers recommend **15** changes as set out in Table 5 below. Refer to Attachment 7 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 5: Recommended infrastructure-related changes

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Requests a correction to the Schools map to acknowledge that the Manukura School site is now open and operating	Accept	q) Amend Map 24 to change the Manukura school site from 'future school' to 'high school'
Requests clarity on the reference to revoking SH3	Accept	r) Amend text on page 58 as follows: Once the new freight route is operational, <u>we will explore the advantages of revoking the existing state highway status of State Highway 3 will be revoked and eventually become more of managing Rangitikei Line as a local road in nature.</u>
Requests clarity on how Te Ahu a Turanga and Ōtaki to North of Levin will influence future growth	Accept	s) Add the following text to Page 13: <u>"Te Ahu a Turanga and Ōtaki to North of Levin will result in more efficient freight movements into and out of Palmerston North, encouraging the utilisation of the city's future industrial land use. Alongside this it could encourage more people to commute into Palmerston North from the East and South, as</u>

		<u>well as commuters from Palmerston North south towards Wellington."</u>
Identify Rangitāne aspirations for a kura-a-iwi in the school infrastructure section	Accept. We recommend including text in the Schools infrastructure section of the FDS to satisfy this request. Because no locations were specifically mentioned, we are assuming this aspiration is not currently tied to any particular sites.	t) Add text on page 64 as below: <u>"Rangitāne aspire to plan and develop kura-a-iwi (schools with localised curriculum based on iwi values) and grow the number of opportunities for tamariki o Rangitāne and tamariki Māori in Palmerston North."</u>
Requests that the labelling of State Highway Improvement maps are amended to be consistent with language in the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative	Accept	u) Amend the key on Map 22 to rename "Potential New Road - Alternative Southern Bridge Location" to "New Road Sub Option"
		v) Amend the key on Map 22 to rename "Potential Road Upgrade" to "Road Upgrade Sub Option"
Lack of assessment into whether we will reach our future water supply limit in the District.	The constraints associated with water supply and growth are identified in the FDS. At the present time, it is understood that water is available within the Manawatū Groundwater Management Zone. This will be assessed further as individual plan changes for growth areas progress.	w) Amend the text on page 40 as follows: "New bores will be required to support growth. Indicative locations for the bores are shown in Map 11. <u>At the present time, we understand that there is water available for abstraction within the Manawatū Groundwater Management Zone.</u> Demand for groundwater associated with the growth areas is not yet fully known, nor the impacts of the bores on groundwater users and groundwater fed waterbodies."
Request to update National Grid assets on the National Grid map	Accept.	x) Update the National Grid map in Section E, page 93, to reflect the map in submission 65.
Requests separate references between the national grid and local electricity network in the introduction of Section E	Accept. The change assists in distinguishing between local and national networks.	y) Add text to page 38 as follows: "Additional infrastructure is: • land transport not controlled by
Requests that flood	Accept. In the National	

<p>protection structures are moved to the Additional Infrastructure section of the Strategy, and clarity on infrastructure funding expectations for growth areas that rely on upgrades to this infrastructure.</p>	<p>Policy Statement on Urban Development definitions, flood protection infrastructure is not included in either 'development infrastructure' or 'additional infrastructure'. However, given the important role flood protection plays in the city, inclusion of this as part of our definition for Additional Infrastructure is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Horizons Regional Council or Palmerston North City Council such as the State Highway network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public open spaces, including city-wide and local reserves • community infrastructure • schools, • healthcare facilities • telecommuni- cations network, and • <u>the National Grid,</u> • <u>local</u> electricity and gas networks <u>and</u> • <u>flood protection infrastructure"</u>
		<p>z) Add a new paragraph at the end of page 38 as follows: <u>"Flood protection is an important element of supporting urban growth. Horizons Regional Council's 30-year Infrastructure Strategy and draft 2024 Long-term Plan identifies planned flood protection works for the City over the course of this Strategy. Flood protection levels and any future improvements will likely influence the timing of growth for the city."</u></p> <p>aa) Move Flood Protection Structures on pages 80-81 to the Additional Infrastructure section under Section E.</p>
<p>Requests more detail on how the Strategy intends to resolve gaps in flood protection infrastructure</p>	<p>Accept. Recommend text changes to page 80 and inclusion of a footnote to Maps 29 and 30 reference to data sources for the flood modelling information.</p>	<p>bb) Amend text on page 80 as follows: "These stopbanks provide protection from the Manawatū River, the Mangaone Stream and the Ashhurst Stream. The</p>

		<p>city stopbank network was upgraded to 1 in 500-year protection plus 600mm freeboard (room for uncertainty) following the 2004 floods, while the Ashhurst Stream stopbank provides 1 in 100-year protection plus 300mm freeboard. <u>Some areas we have identified for future growth (for example Ashhurst), are not included for investigation, scoping, increasing, or building of flood protection in Horizons' Infrastructure Strategy for the next 30 years. As such there are currently no plans for new stopbank development within the city boundary. Horizons' Infrastructure Strategy identifies minor works planned that relate to increasing the resilience of the network rather than increasing the current level of flood protection. Also, Given there are no plans for new or upgraded stopbank development this may be a constraint to our growth, particularly in Ashhurst where we know some of the growth areas require a stopbank upgrade. To address this constraint, both Councils, landowners, the community, and infrastructure providers will need to work together to establish ways of addressing these constraints (for</u></p>
--	--	---

		<p><u>example access to alternative funding). In some cases, these growth areas need to be reconsidered in future versions of this strategy.</u></p> <p>Rules in the Regional Plan prevent development (particularly intensification) in close proximity to the protection structures, which growth will need to take into account. Also, given there are no plans for new or upgraded stopbank development this may be a constraint to our growth, particularly in Ashhurst where we know some of the growth areas require a stopbank upgrade"</p> <p><u>Flood protection structures do not guarantee that communities are safe from floods that exceed the protection level indicated on Map 30, so flood risk is never eliminated. Increasing severity and frequency of rainfall events due to climate change is likely to diminish the expected protection levels of the stopbanks in future years.</u></p>
<p>Page 38 refers to "our Infrastructure Strategy". Recommend that this more clearly reflects that this a reference to PNCC's Infrastructure Strategy and Long-term Plan</p>	<p>Accept.</p>	<p>cc) Change reference on page 38 as follows: Our Palmerston North City Council's Infrastructure Strategy and draft 2024 Long Term Plan has scheduled funding of development infrastructure in particular years. The timing when growth areas will be infrastructure-ready is broadly shown in Figure 2, page 25.</p>

Lack of assessment into land suitability for wastewater discharges onto land	Accept. The Nature Calls project has assessed land suitability for wastewater discharge and the study area is available online (pncc.govt.nz/Council/What-were-doing/Ongoing-projects-and-programmes/Nature-Calls/Nature-Calls-update). We recommend that we amend map 12 to reflect this spatially.	dd) Amend Map 12, page 43, to include the area of interest for land discharge for Nature Calls.
		ee) Add the following text to page 42: <u>"The area of interest for land suitable to discharge treated wastewater for Nature Calls is shown on Map 12. The requirement for land for Nature Calls has the potential to conflict with latter stages of Kākātangiata, which we would expect to explore further along with any potential reverse sensitivity effects in a wastewater servicing assessment in a District Plan change."</u>

11.4 **Consultation 13: Do you have any other comments you'd like to make on the future development of Palmerston North City and district?**

11.5 70 comments were made in response to this question. Five themes were identified (receiving five or more comments):

- a) Concern about the risk of population and local economic forecasts changing (8)
- b) Requests for greater acknowledgement of how surrounding districts influence our Future Development Strategy (7)
- c) Concern relating to consultation such as lengthy documents, weekend closing dates, overlapping consultations, and lack of independent peer review. (7)
- d) Requests for more engagement with the community (5)
- e) Support for a stormwater management strategy and/or improved stormwater evidence (5)

All these themes are already addressed in the draft Strategy or are more appropriately addressed through different means (see Attachment 8).

11.6 A range of other comments prompted some suggested changes and/or clarifications to maps and text in the Strategy. Officers recommend **four** changes as set out in Table 6 below. Refer to Attachment for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 6: Recommended changes in relation to "Other Comments" on the Strategy

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Requests that the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative is acknowledged in Figure 1	Accept. We recommend including reference to the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative as it is not currently captured under national or local government direction in this document.	
Requests that the importance and degree of alignment of the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative is clarified in the Strategy	Accept. Including reference of PNITI to Figure 1 will demonstrate its importance to growth in the city. The growth areas are aligned with anticipated growth under PNITI. Smaller pockets of industrial areas indicated for future repurposing strengthen the consolidation of freight transport under PNITI.	ff) Include reference to the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative in Figure 1.
Update maps to better show the extent of Bunnythorpe	Accept. We acknowledge the extent used to represent Bunnythorpe in the FDS (extent of residential, industrial, and business zoned land) makes it difficult to discern the Bunnythorpe community at the scale that the FDS maps are shown. We recommend replacing the extent with the Stats NZ extent of Bunnythorpe.	gg) Update the base-map underlying all the maps in the Strategy to include the Stats NZ extent of Bunnythorpe.
Requests greater acknowledgement of how surrounding districts influence our Future Development Strategy	This is already partially addressed by pages 11 and 36. There is scope to draw reference to recently adopted or planned growth strategies for other districts.	<p>hh) Add text to page 36 as follows:</p> <p><u>Some of our neighbouring districts have recently completed their own projections and growth strategies. These include Rangitikei District Council's Community Spatial Plan, and Tararua District Council's Urban Growth Strategy. Manawatū District also has plans for an urban development framework to identify new growth areas. As these districts assess how much capacity they have to cater for housing and business demand, we will be able to better understand possible additional pressures on</u></p>

		<u>our district.</u>
Requests that the funding status of required infrastructure and its timing for delivery could be incorporated into the FDS and subsequent Implementation Plan	The final nature of growth programmes feeding into the Development Contributions Policy will not be known until the PNCC LTP is finalised. Given the FDS is required to be approved before final adoption of the LTP it is not possible to have the funding status of required infrastructure and its timing for delivery in the FDS. However, a note can be placed in the FDS pointing to the schedule of assets in the Development Contributions Policy that describes the infrastructure programmes in place to support growth.	ii) Add text to page 14 as follows: <u>Note: the schedule of assets for which development contributions will be used to fund growth is contained in the PNCC 2024 Development Contributions Policy (pages 73-78).</u>

12. TE UTANGANUI – CENTRAL NEW ZEALAND DISTRIBUTION HUB

Number of submitters	
Submissions in support: 37	Submissions in opposition: 11

- 12.1 There were 24 comments in support of Te Utanganui Masterplan presented in the draft Strategy, mostly in relation to more efficient freight movements, e.g. away from residential areas and closer to strategic transport assets (10), and the economic benefits such as job growth and agglomeration (7).
- 12.2 There were 144 comments expressing concern about Te Utanganui Masterplan. Eleven themes were identified (receiving more than 5 comments):
- a) Social and economic impact on local residents and neighbours (31)
 - b) Retention of highly productive land (17)
 - c) Transport effects (16)
 - d) Concern about consultation with the community, neighbours, farming representatives and local Iwi (11)
 - e) Noise effects (9)
 - f) Risk of environmental degradation such as vegetation clearance, soil erosion, and air and waterway/groundwater contamination (9)
 - g) Concern about land acquisition for any growth infrastructure (7)
 - h) Concern about flood and liquefaction risk (7)
 - i) Concern about whether it's feasible (7)
 - j) Challenging topography in Area C (6)
 - k) Fragmented urban form in the Masterplan (5)

These concerns are already addressed in the draft Strategy or can be addressed through different means.

12.3 A range of other comments and requests prompted some suggested changes to Te Utanganui Masterplan. Officers recommend **11** changes as set out in Table 7 below. Refer to Attachment 9 for the officer responses to all submission points, including those that are more appropriately addressed through different means.

Table 7: Recommended changes to Te Utanganui Masterplan

Submission	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation
Fragmented urban form indicated in the Masterplan	Accept. We recommend removing Areas D and E from the Masterplan in part because of fragmentation of urban form.	jj) Remove Areas D and E from the Future Development Strategy and Te Utanganui Masterplan.
813 Roberts Line to be included in the scope of Area B	We acknowledge the advantages that the submitter described for including their land for investigation for industrial use. There are on site flood constraints which would need further enquiry to confirm if the site is suitable for industrial development. There is merit in including the site for consideration when developing the District Plan change for Areas A and B.	kk) Add 813 Roberts Line into the Future Development Strategy but not as part of the Te Utanganui Masterplan as a medium-term growing out industrial area.
815 Roberts Line to be included in the scope of Area B	We acknowledge the advantages that the submitter described for including their land for investigation for industrial use. There are on-site flood and highly productive land constraints which would need further enquiry to confirm inclusion in the Te Utanganui Masterplan however, which we recommend be conducted in the District Plan change for Areas A and B. We recommend inclusion of this site in the Future Development Strategy to support further investigation, but not to include this area in the Te Utanganui Masterplan until flood and highly productive land constraints are explored.	ll) Add 815 Roberts Line into the Future Development Strategy but not as part of the Te Utanganui Masterplan as a medium-term growing out industrial area.
129 Richardsons Line to be included in the scope of	We acknowledge the advantages that the	mm) Add 129 Richardsons Line into the Future

Area A	submitter described for including their land for investigation for industrial use. There are on-site flood, highly productive land and liquefaction constraints which would need further enquiry to confirm the site is suitable for industrial development. There is merit to include the site in the District Plan change for Areas A and B. We recommend inclusion of this site in the Future Development Strategy to support further investigation, but not to include this area in the Te Utanganui Masterplan until flood and highly productive land constraints are explored.	Development Strategy but not as part of the Te Utanganui Masterplan as a medium-term growing out industrial area.
109 and 125 Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road be included in the Masterplan as a long-term growth area	We acknowledge the advantages that the submitter described for including their land for investigation for industrial use. There are on site flood, highly productive land and liquefaction constraints which would need further enquiry to confirm the site is suitable for industrial development. There is merit to include the site in the District Plan change for Areas A and B. We recommend inclusion of this site in the Future Development Strategy to support further investigation, but not to include this area in the Te Utanganui Masterplan until flood and highly productive land constraints are explored. We recommend including reference to the Bunnythorpe Business Park under Opportunities for Housing and Business Growth, but do not recommend further references requested by the submitter until further information on the viability of the growth area is confirmed.	<p>nn) Add 109 and 125 Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road into the Future Development Strategy but not as part of the Te Utanganui Masterplan as a medium-term growing out industrial area.</p> <p>oo) Add the following text to page 36: <u>"The Bunnythorpe Business Park proposed for 109 and 125 Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road is a location with transport and proximity advantages to the Te Utanganui area. We expect that a private plan change is explored to better understand the viability of the Bunnythorpe Business Park given significant flood risk and potential geotechnical and ecological constraints that make this site uncertain."</u></p>
Remove the proposed grade separation at Railway Road and Roberts Line	Precluding grade separation in advance of transport modelling and more detailed transport assessments would risk safe and efficient	pp) Replace the reference on the Te Utanganui Masterplan legend to 'over bridge' with a descriptor of 'future

	<p>transport access between Area C, the KiwiRail Hub, Palmerston North Airport and the Regional Freight Ring Road. District Plan change or designation processes to implement Area C would be the appropriate time to assess impacts and effects of transport at the level that the submitter is seeking, which they would be an affected party to. Given a specific investigation into the most appropriate solution is some time away, a possible solution is to remove the reference in the Masterplan legend to 'over bridge' and replace with 'future connection.'</p>	<p>connection.'</p>
<p>Remove Area D from Te Utanganui Masterplan</p>	<p>Area D is spatially disconnected from the existing North East Industrial Zone, proposed KiwiRail freight hub and the core area shown in the proposed Te Utanganui Masterplan. Area D's spatial disconnection will not promote a compact, connected, and efficient logistics hub. Given the site is not needed for expansion to Te Utanganui until 2052, further work can be undertaken in the meantime to investigate other land expansion options.</p>	<p>qq) Remove Area D from the Future Development Strategy. Remove Area D from the Te Utanganui Masterplan.</p>
<p>Remove Areas E from Te Utanganui Masterplan</p>	<p>Area E is spatially disconnected from the existing North East Industrial Zone, proposed KiwiRail freight hub and the core area shown in the proposed Te Utanganui Masterplan. Area D's spatial disconnection will not promote a compact, connected, and efficient logistics hub. Given the site is not needed for expansion to Te Utanganui until 2052, further work can be undertaken in the meantime to investigate other land expansion options.</p>	<p>rr) Remove Area E from the Future Development Strategy. Remove Area E from the Te Utanganui Masterplan.</p>
<p>Remove the proposed road link between Richardsons Line and Aldersons Drive</p>	<p>Removing the proposed road link between Richardsons Line and Aldersons Line would provide less direct access to the Manawatū Regional</p>	<p>ss) Remove the 'Main Freight Road' and 'Road Intersection Design' indicated on the Te Utanganui Masterplan</p>

	<p>Freight Ring Road for the submitter. It would also place more transport pressure on Railway Road and El Prado Drive, which is planned for an access to Richardsons Line in the short term. The El Prado Drive to Richardsons Line road link creates less of a need for the Aldersons Drive to Richardsons Line road link but provides less direct access from industry in the North East Industrial Zone to the Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road. We recommend the removal of the road link but note that it is a sub-optimal outcome for the wider logistics hub.</p>	<p>between Aldersons Drive and Richardsons Line. Update map 14 (Land Transport - roading network) accordingly.</p>
<p>Remove the stormwater area indicated on 703 Roberts Line</p>	<p>Since the Te Utanganui Masterplan was produced, the submitter has lodged a resource consent which resolves the stormwater risks that the indicative stormwater area had sought to manage. We accept the stormwater area is no longer needed.</p>	<p>tt) Remove the 'Stormwater Wetland Zone' associated with 703 Roberts Line from the Te Utanganui Masterplan. Update maps 13 (Stormwater network) and 23 (Open space network) accordingly.</p>

13. NEXT STEPS

- 13.1 As a result of its deliberations, the Joint Steering Group will make recommendations for the finalisation of the Future Development Strategy to the Palmerston North City Council and Horizons Regional Council.
- 13.2 Officers will prepare a final draft of the Strategy based on the recommendations of the Joint Steering Group.
- 13.3 The final draft of the Palmerston North Future Development Strategy will be circulated to the Joint Steering Group prior to it being forwarded to the two councils for adoption.
- 13.4 Adoption of the final draft will be sought alongside the Councils' respective Long-term Plans (25 June 2024 for Horizons, 26 June for the City Council).
- 13.5 After adoption, an implementation plan will be prepared for the Future Development Strategy in accordance with section 3.18 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Like the Strategy, the implementation plan will be the joint responsibility of Palmerston North City Council and Horizons Regional Council. It must be updated annually. No consultation is required in the preparation of the implementation plan.

14. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Working Group 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?	Yes
Is there funding in the current Annual Plan for these actions?	No
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	Yes
The recommendations contribute to Goal 1: An Innovative and Growing City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in City Growth	
The action is: Develop a Future Development Strategy	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	The Future Development Strategy will contribute to the four well-beings by providing an integrated, 30-year approach to the provision of appropriate solutions for housing and business growth needs. The focus is on ensuring well-functioning urban environments, the definition of which explicitly addresses social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Recommendations Well Functioning Urban Environments Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
2. Recommendations Opportunities Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
3. Recommendations Constraints Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
4. Recommendations Growing In Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
5. Recommendations Growing Up Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
6. Recommendations Growing Out Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
7. Recommendation Infrastructure Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
8. Recommendations Other Comments Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 
9. Recommendations Te Utanganui Draft Future Development Strategy 2024 [↓](#) 

