



PAPAIOEA
PALMERSTON
NORTH
CITY

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

9:00 AM, WEDNESDAY 22 MAY 2024

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

MEMBERS

Brent Barrett (Chair)
Kaydee Zabelin (Deputy Chair)
Grant Smith (The Mayor)

Roly Fitzgerald	Lorna Johnson
Patrick Handcock (ONZM)	Debi Marshall-Lobb
Leonie Hapeta	Karen Naylor

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

SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING

22 May 2024

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Karakia Timatanga

2. Apologies

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.)

6. Presentation - Ruahine Kiwi Project Page 7

7. Confirmation of Minutes Page 9

“That the minutes of the Sustainability Committee meeting of 13 March 2024 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.”

8. Draft Food Security and Resilience Policy and resourcing considerations Page 15

Memorandum, presented by Kate Harridge, Policy Analyst and Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager.

9. Update on opportunities for native species re-introductions in the Turitea Reserve Page 51

Memorandum, presented by Adam Jarvis, Principal Climate Change Advisor.

10. Sustainability Review 2024 Page 59

Memorandum, presented by Olivia Wix, Communications Manager.

11. Wastewater Treatment Plant - Nature Calls: Quarterly Update Page 61

Memorandum, presented by Mike Monaghan, Group Manager - Three Waters.

12. Palmerston North to Feilding Shared Pathway Project Page 165

Memorandum, presented by Glen O'Connor, Group Manager - Transport and Development and Michael Bridge, Service Manager - Active Transport.

13. Committee Work Schedule

14. Karakia Whakamutunga

15. Exclusion of Public

To be moved:

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

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

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

This resolution is made in reliance on Section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by Section 6 or Section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public as stated in the above table.

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

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

PRESENTATION

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Presentation - Ruahine Kiwi Project

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

- 1. That the Sustainability Committee receive the presentation for information.**
-

SUMMARY

Stewart Harrex and Vicky Forgie will present an update on the Ruahine Kiwi Project, a project of Source to Sea.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the Sustainability Committee Meeting Part I Public, held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, 32 The Square, Palmerston North on 13 March 2024, commencing at 9.06am

Members Present: Councillors Brent Barrett (in the Chair), Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb and Karen Naylor.

Non Members: Councillors Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

Apologies: The Mayor (Grant Smith) (Council business), Councillor Roly Fitzgerald, Councillor Leonie Hapeta, Councillor Karen Naylor (early departure), Councillor Kaydee Zabelin (late arrival).

Councillor Kaydee Zabelin entered the meeting at 9.26am during consideration of clause 3. She was not present for clauses 1 and 2.

Councillor Rachel Bowen left the meeting at 10.27am during consideration of clause 5. She entered the meeting again at 11.43am during consideration of clause 7. She was not present for clauses 5 and 6.

Councillor Karen Naylor was not present when the meeting resumed at 11.10am. She was not present for clauses 6 to 8 inclusive.

Karakia Timatanga

Councillor Brent Barrett opened the meeting with karakia.

1-24 Apologies

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Patrick Handcock.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the apologies.

Clause 1-24 above was carried 8 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Karen Naylor, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

2-24 Confirmation of Minutes

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Patrick Handcock.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the minutes of the Sustainability Committee meeting of 29 November 2023 Part I Public be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Clause 2-24 above was carried 8 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Karen Naylor, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

3-24

Annual Sector Lead Report: Environment Network Manawatū

Memorandum, presented by Amy Viles, Community Development Advisor, Rebecca Bell, ENM Co-Chairperson and Madz BatachEl, ENM Coordinator, as attached to these Minutes.

Rebecca acknowledged the outstanding work being undertaken by the team to achieve the goals of the organisation. Work has been done on updating their strategic framework over the last year, with the strategic action plan to be completed by the end of this financial year.

Challenges:

- Resourcing/capacity
- Difficult funding environment; eg. Ruahine Kiwi Project – coming to the end of a three year contract with Department of Conservation, needing to source alternative funding so project can continue and kiwis can be returned to the ranges by 2026
- Work in food resilience space – indications are government funding will be drying up pretty fast, still a huge amount of need/interest

Opportunities:

- Developing nationwide food waste prevention programme in collaboration with Zero Waste Network NZ and three other environment centres around the country
- After a successful pilot scheme through resource recovery fund (providing TerraCycle boxes for recycling hard to recycle products) questions were raised on how can the learnings be shared? How can they advocate for change on a wider scale?

Looking forward to Long-Term Plan process and hearing from Officers regarding the development of Food Policy.

Councillor Kaydee Zabelin entered the meeting at 9.26am.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Patrick Handcock.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the Annual Sector Lead Report:

Environment Network Manawatū (January-December 2023)
(Attachments 1, 2 and 3).

Clause 3-24 above was carried 9 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Karen Naylor, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

4-24

Wastewater Treatment Plant - Nature Calls: Quarterly Update

Memorandum, presented by Mike Monaghan, Group Manager Three Waters and Anna Lewis, Project Manager – Wastewater Discharge Consent Programme.

Officers noted the following update to the report:

Section 6.2 – End of February financials = \$1,088,986 spent to date of \$913,000 budget.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Kaydee Zabelin.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the report titled 'Wastewater Treatment Plant – Nature Calls: Quarterly Update' presented to the Sustainability Committee on 13 March 2024.

Clause 4-24 above was carried 9 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Karen Naylor, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

5-24

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - approval for consultation

Memorandum, presented by Peter Ridge, Senior Policy Analyst and Natasha Hickmott, Activities Manager – Resource Recovery and Sustainability Infrastructure.

Elected Members requested that the inclusion of a kerbside green waste collection service be investigated alongside the development of a city-wide food scraps collection service.

Councillor Rachel Bowen left the meeting at 10.27am.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee approve the Statement of Proposal - Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2024 (Attachment 1), as amended, for public consultation concurrent with and linked to the draft 2024-34 Long-Term Plan consultation.
2. That action 3.6 in the draft WMMP be amended to read 'Develop a city-wide food scraps collection service and investigate the inclusion of a kerbside green waste collection service' and that the

corresponding action in the draft Resource Recovery Plan be amended accordingly prior to the consultation on the draft Long Term Plan.

Clause 5-24 above was carried 8 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Karen Naylor, Mark Arnott and Lew Findlay.

The meeting adjourned at 10.50am.

The meeting resumed at 11.10am.

Councillor Karen Naylor was not present when the meeting resumed.

6-24 Update on the Low Carbon Fund 2023/24

Memorandum, presented by David Watson, Senior Climate Change Advisor and Adam Jarvis, Principal Climate Change Advisor.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Patrick Handcock.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee receive the memorandum titled 'Update on the Low Carbon Fund 2023/24' presented to the Sustainability Committee on 13 March 2024.

Clause 6-24 above was carried 7 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Mark Arnott and Lew Findlay.

7-24 Palmerston North City Council Carbon Neutral Feasibility Study Update

Memorandum, presented by Adam Jarvis, Principal Climate Change Advisor and David Watson, Senior Climate Change Advisor.

Councillor Rachel Bowen entered the meeting again at 11.43am.

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Lorna Johnson.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That as part of the process of finalising the 2024-34 Long-Term Plan, Council either reaffirm the existing corporate emissions reduction target or replace the existing corporate emissions reduction target with a different one.
2. That Council note that further Officer advice on the corporate emissions reduction target will be provided alongside deliberations on the 2024-34 Long-Term Plan.

Clause 7-24 above was carried 8 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

8-24 Committee Work Schedule

Moved Brent Barrett, seconded Patrick Handcock.

The **COMMITTEE RESOLVED**

1. That the Sustainability Committee receive its Work Schedule dated March 2024.

Clause 8-24 above was carried 8 votes to 0, the voting being as follows:

For:

Councillors Brent Barrett, Kaydee Zabelin, Patrick Handcock, Lorna Johnson, Debi Marshall-Lobb, Mark Arnott, Rachel Bowen and Lew Findlay.

Karakia Whakamutunga

Councillor Brent Barrett closed the meeting with karakia.

The meeting finished at 11.57am.

Confirmed 22 May 2024

Chair

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Draft Food Security and Resilience Policy and resourcing considerations

PRESENTED BY: Kate Harridge, Policy Analyst and Julie Macdonald, Strategy and Policy Manager

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee refer the allocation of dedicated resources for delivery of the draft Food Security and Resilience Policy to the 2024-34 Long-Term Plan deliberations.
-

1. ISSUE

- 1.1 In September 2022 Council agreed to allocate \$20,000 to support the development of a food resilience policy in accordance with Council's Policy Framework. This funding enabled staff to undertake a research exercise and carry out analysis of the practicable options. The research and options analysis has been completed and Officers have identified that a policy is the appropriate response. A working draft of the Policy is included as Attachment 1 for the Committee to consider, to help understand the policy option and the implications for resourcing.
- 1.2 The issue of resourcing for the delivery of the policy remains unresolved. Through the drafting of the policy it has become apparent that without dedicated resourcing the policy may be ineffective in achieving the desired outcomes.
- 1.3 We recommend that Council consider allocating dedicated resources for the delivery of the draft Food Security and Resilience Policy, as part of the Long-Term Plan deliberations.
- 1.4 Subject to the Long-Term Plan deliberations, a draft policy can be presented to the Committee in August 2024 for approval for public consultation. Officers welcome feedback on the working draft of the policy in the interim.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 18 May 2022, the Environmental Sustainability Committee resolved 'That the Chief Executive provides a short report to Environmental Sustainability

Committee advising a suitable process and resourcing required to establish a Food Resilience Policy for Council'.

- 2.2 This resolution followed a presentation from Dave Mollard and Madz BatacheI from Environment Network Manawatū on the recently developed 4412 Kai Resilience Strategy and the situational analysis that informed it. They advocated for Council to develop a Food Resilience Policy and take a leadership role in supporting economic, social and environmental wellbeing in the city.
- 2.3 On 21 September 2022, the Environmental Sustainability Committee received the memorandum titled '*Process and resourcing required to establish a Food Resilience Policy*' for information. Council resolved to provide \$20,000 in the 2023/24 Annual Budget for the development of a Food Resilience Policy.

3. PROCESS

- 3.1 We undertook early engagement with identified stakeholders to determine scope and clarify outcomes. This engagement assisted Officers in preparing the research report (Attachment 2) and is the basis for the draft Policy which we have prepared for the Committee to consider.
- 3.2 The research report:
 - Defines food security and food resilience.
 - Analyses national and local data to understand the current state of food security and resilience in New Zealand and Palmerston North.
 - Explores the current involvement of central government and Council.
 - Provides a detailed analysis of early engagement responses and the subsequent options available to Council.
- 3.3 For the purposes of the draft Policy, we have defined the key terms as follows:
 - **Food security** means having reliable access to sufficient, safe, nutritious, and culturally appropriate food. It includes not only the availability of food but also affordability, accessibility, and the ability to prepare and store food.
 - **Food resilience** refers to a system's capacity to provide sufficient food security even during shocks and disruptions. Achieving food resilience is crucial for ensuring long-term food security, especially during times of instability.
 - A **food system** is defined as a network of activities and organisations involved in growing, processing, manufacturing, transporting, storing, distributing and consuming food.
- 3.4 These terms do not have an official definition. Therefore, we have developed these definitions based on examples taken from the World Health Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organisation, Ministry of Health, and

Health Coalition Aotearoa. We think that these definitions will be more easily understood in the context of this draft Policy.

- 3.5 As part of the engagement process for the research report, we interviewed key stakeholders including Environment Network Manawatū, Te Tihi o Ruahine Whānau Ora Alliance and Tanenuiarangi Manawatū Incorporated – Rangitāne o Manawatū. We also participated in site tours arranged by Just Zilch and Salvation Army and had discussions with attendees of the Manawatū Food Action Network’s end-of-year hui.
- 3.6 We also developed a survey that was sent to key stakeholder community groups as well as Elected Members. The purpose of this survey was to determine what Council’s role should or could be to respond to city-wide food security and resilience issues.
- 3.7 A detailed analysis of the findings of this engagement process is in the research report (Attachment 2). A brief summary is provided in section 4.

4. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

- 4.1 There are numerous challenges that contribute to food insecurity in our community. These include economic hardship, inadequate knowledge about food production, dependence on supermarkets, and housing instability.
- 4.2 While short-term measures like food handouts are beneficial, respondents generally felt long-term strategies focusing on education and systemic change are essential. Under-resourcing was identified as a significant barrier with respondents highlighting the need for funding and support.
- 4.3 Most respondents from the community survey believed Council should play a role in addressing city-wide food security and resilience. However, respondents identified resource constraints, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and limited funding and personnel as the main barriers and challenges hindering Council’s effectiveness in addressing food security and building resilience in our city.
- 4.4 Survey respondents identified the need for strong collaboration and partnership between Council and community groups and businesses as the key to leveraging resources and bridging gaps in responding to food security and resilience issues.
- 4.5 Respondents also suggested that Council should be an ‘enabler’ rather than an ‘implementer’ of initiatives, by providing resources, expertise and ongoing support.
- 4.6 A more detailed analysis of the issues and points raised during the engagement process is in the research report (Attachment 2).

5. DISCUSSION

- 5.1 The report to the Environmental Sustainability Committee in September 2022 noted that staff had not yet undertaken any analysis to determine whether the development of a Food Security Policy is the most appropriate response to the issues raised.
- 5.2 Nevertheless, Council resolved during the 2023/24 Annual Budget round to allocate resources to a policy response. This memorandum, therefore, provides an analysis of possible responses, as well as a draft policy for consideration by the Committee.
- 5.3 Given that Council resolved to allocate resources to this work, community expectations are a major consideration in the analysis. Despite these raised expectations, Council still needs to consider the most appropriate way to respond to the issues of food insecurity discussed in the research report.
- 5.4 The attached research report notes that Council is only one player in a community-wide system that both creates and responds to food insecurity. Housing insecurity, cost of living pressures, employment challenges, education and skill levels, mental and physical health, dysfunctional family structures, intergenerational impacts, and other entrenched difficulties all contribute to food insecurity.
- 5.5 On balance, the creation of a policy provides Council with an opportunity to determine the roles it wants to play, and the level of resourcing for these roles. However, the question of resourcing remains a key issue to be resolved. The most appropriate way to address the question of resourcing is through the deliberations on the Long-Term Plan.
- 5.6 The exact nature of the resourcing that may be required is undetermined. The level of change and leadership that Council is seeking to achieve through the draft policy relates to the level of resourcing. It could include a full or part-time role within Council, internal funding to support actions, grant funding to support an external role, or another mode of resourcing. For example, implementation of the Play Policy is included within our contract with Sport Manawatū and Sport NZ contributes to the cost of a dedicated role within Council. Another example is the Auahi Kore Smokefree and Vapefree Policy, for which Council has set aside a \$5,000 budget for implementation by the Smokefree and Vapefree Policy Working Group.

6. DESCRIPTION OF OPTIONS

- 6.1 There are two options for the Committee to consider. Option 1 is to refer consideration of allocating dedicated resourcing for the delivery of the Policy to the Long-Term Plan deliberations on 29-30 May. Option 2 is to not resource the delivery of the Policy.
- 6.2 Option 1 does not commit Council to any specific level of resourcing for the draft Policy. The consideration of the level of resourcing will remain with

Council as part of the broader strategic considerations for funding within the Long-Term Plan.

- 6.3 Option 2 would confirm that the draft Policy does not have a dedicated resource component. Officers would take this into consideration during the finalisation of the draft Policy before it is presented to the Committee in August, for approval for consultation.

7. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

Option 1 – refer consideration of allocating dedicated resourcing for the delivery of the draft Food Security and Resilience Policy to the Long-Term Plan deliberations

- 7.1 This option would ensure that the question of resourcing for the delivery of the Policy is considered alongside the other strategic considerations for the Long-Term Plan.
- 7.2 A decision around resourcing will give Officers greater clarity around determining Council's role in promoting and achieving food security and resilience, to be included in the draft Policy.
- 7.3 Dedicated resourcing (and the nature of that resourcing) would enable Council to take a leadership role in supporting wellbeing in the city, as well as acting as a collaborator, connector, coordinator and promoter of food security and resilience, similar to the role of Council in other areas of the community such as youth, age-friendly, and play.

Option 2 – do not resource the draft Policy

- 7.4 Without dedicated resourcing to deliver the draft Policy once adopted, the Policy is unlikely to be as effective in achieving the desired outcomes.
- 7.5 A decision to not resource the delivery of the draft Policy will require staff to re-evaluate the scope of the draft Policy before it is presented to the Committee in August.
- 7.6 We recommend option 1 – that the Committee refer consideration of allocating dedicated resourcing for the delivery of the draft Food Security and Resilience Policy to the Long-Term Plan deliberations. This will allow Council to consider the resourcing of the draft Policy as part of its strategic plans for the next ten years.

8. NEXT STEPS

- 8.1 If the Committee recommends to Council that it consider resourcing the delivery of the draft Policy as part of its deliberations on the Long-Term Plan, then this would happen on 29-30 May. The nature of any resourcing would be a matter for Council to determine.
- 8.2 Staff will continue to revise the draft Policy. We will present a draft Policy to the Committee in August 2024 for approval for public consultation.

9. 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 3: A Connected and Safe Community	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of actions in the Connected Communities Plan, specifically the Community Development Chapter. The actions are:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify opportunities for organisational improvements which align with the aspirations of for-purpose organisations. • Build and maintain relationships with local communities of identity, interest and place to understand and support their strengths and aspirations. • Provide advice, including governance support, funding expertise, and event and project support, to communities and for-purpose organisations. • Provide support to community groups to increase freely-available crops in the city. • Support and strengthen Māori community networks and agencies as they work to address issues of opportunity and concern. 	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	The recommendations also contribute to our (proposed) objectives for our community to have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The support they want to live healthy lives (Goal 3). • A healthy, thriving, ecosystem, including native biodiversity and food security (Goal 4). • Access to relevant information and education to support more sustainable choices (Goal 4).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Working Draft Food Security and Resilience Policy May 2024 [↓](#) 
2. Research report: PN City Council's role in responding to city-wide food security and resilience issues [↓](#) 

Food security and resilience policy

Introduction

Food security means having reliable access to sufficient, safe, nutritious, and culturally appropriate food. It includes not only the availability of food but also affordability, accessibility, and the ability to prepare and store food.

Food resilience refers to a system's capacity to provide sufficient food security even during shocks and disruptions. Achieving food resilience is crucial for ensuring long-term food security, especially during times of instability.

A food system is defined as a network of activities and organisations involved in growing, processing, manufacturing, transporting, storing, distributing and consuming food.

Food security is a fundamental aspect of community wellbeing; ensuring access to healthy, nutritious and culturally appropriate food. Despite New Zealand's agricultural abundance, issues of food insecurity persist, particularly for lower-income individuals and families. It's estimated that more than 10,000 people in our city are food insecure.

Community leaders working to improve food security and resilience outcomes for whānau have advocated for Council to develop a Food Security and Resilience Policy and take a leadership role in supporting economic, social and environmental wellbeing in the city.

Strategic Context

Our (proposed) vision for our city is He iti rā, he iti pounamu - Small city benefits, big city ambition.

Four (proposed) goals sit beneath this vision, to describe the outcomes we want to achieve for our communities:

Whāinga 1: He tāone auaha, he tāone tiputipu
Goal 1: An innovative and growing city

Whāinga 2: He tāone whakaihiihi, tapatapahi ana
Goal 2: A creative and exciting city

Whāinga 3: He hāpori tūhonohono, he hāpori haumarū
Goal 3: A connected and safe community

Whāinga 4: He tāone toitū, he tāone manawaroa
Goal 4: A sustainable and resilient city

This policy contributes to our (proposed) objectives for our community to have:

- the support they want to live healthy lives (Goal 3)
- a healthy, thriving, ecosystem, including native biodiversity and food security (Goal 4)
- access to relevant information and education to support more sustainable choices (Goal 4)

Purpose and objectives

We want to be a city where every resident has access to nutritious and affordable food, and where the community is resilient in the face of food-related challenges. We also want to be part of building a sustainable and inclusive food system that enhances the wellbeing of all residents. The purpose of this policy is to inform and guide Council's actions in support of food security and resilience in our community.

Our objectives are to have:

1. Healthy outcomes for communities.
2. An engaged, connected and collaborative community.
3. Community-led educational opportunities that enable individuals to enhance their knowledge and upskill.
4. A resilient community with reliable access to food during times of adversity.
5. Healthy, nutritious, and culturally appropriate food that is produced, distributed and consumed locally.
6. Local food systems that are environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.
7. Public spaces that are utilised as community food hubs.
8. Community organisations that are supported and resourced to deliver food security and resilience initiatives.
9. Edible food waste diverted from landfill.

Principles

Partnership with Rangitāne o Manawatū – we will work in partnership with Rangitāne o Manawatū on projects and initiatives of agreed priority and embed a Whānau Ora approach in our work.¹

Equity – We acknowledge the inequitable opportunities and outcomes experienced by communities and will work to ensure access and opportunity for everyone.

Partnership – We will be relationship-centred in our actions, in recognition that many others also work to improve community wellbeing.

Collaboration – We will work alongside others towards our shared goals.

Guidelines

The Council will:

1. Embed the objectives of this policy in decision-making and implementation of community support and funding, resource recovery, housing, emergency management, vegetation, and the use of public space.
2. Advocate for food security and resilience to national and local decision-makers.
3. Support initiatives that promote increased food security and resilience.

¹ Oranga Papaioea City Strategy Partnership with Rangitāne o Manawatū.

Implementation, monitoring, and review

This policy provides a mandate for Council's involvement in actions that support food security and resilience. The extent to which the policy is implemented will depend on resourcing, and so we will develop an implementation plan following the adoption of the Long-Term Plan.

The outcomes of this policy will only be evident in high-level and slow-moving community wellbeing indicators. Our community wellbeing monitoring (see the City Dashboards) will track this high-level progress. However, the activities associated with the policy, and the progress towards implementing the guidelines, will be publicly reported through the Council Committee process annually. These could include, for example, how food security and resilience objectives have shaped advice to elected members, and the level of support provided to community initiatives.

A review of the policy will be considered after five years, or earlier if requested by Council.

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Update on opportunities for native species re-introductions in the Turitea Reserve

PRESENTED BY: Adam Jarvis, Principal Climate Change Advisor

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, Chief Planning Officer

RECOMMENDATION TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee receive the memorandum titled 'Update on opportunities for native species re-introductions in the Turitea Reserve' presented to the Sustainability Committee on 22 May 2024.

1. ISSUE

This memorandum follows a previous memo titled '[Opportunities for native species reintroductions in the Turitea Reserve](#)' which was presented to the 7 June 2023 Sustainability Committee. The memo advised that further translocations would not be possible until after the recently reintroduced Toutouwai (North Island Robins) had successfully established themselves in the reserve. The Committee received this information and requested further information about costs and next steps, which are detailed below.

Six species have been identified as potential future translocation candidates: Kiwi, Pāteke, Kōkako, Kākā, Yellow-crowned Kākāriki, and Weka. While the advice regarding the need to focus on fully establishing Toutouwai in the reserve first remains unchanged, this memo provides high-level advice about the requirements and costs involved with the reintroduction of each of these species.

2. BACKGROUND

Council began predator control operations in the Turitea in 2003. The project has grown over time and now involves thousands of traps and bait stations across 40sqkm of Turitea Reserve and Hardings Park. The project has been highly successful, with a 10-15x growth in the population of key bird species like Tūi and Kererū.

2.1 Toutouwai – North Island Robin

Building on the success of the project, Council worked with Rangitāne, Massey University and numerous expert volunteers to reintroduce the locally extinct Toutouwai in 2021. These birds were generously provided by Bushy Park and Ngāa Rauru.

Unfortunately, the 2021/2022 breeding season coincided with a nationwide increase in rat numbers, brought on by a rare podocarp mast. Dispersion of released birds was also greater than expected, meaning many birds flew great distances from the release site, and were unable to contribute to growing the nascent population.

Council responded by significantly increasing rat control within the core breeding area where the Toutouwai population had established themselves. These efforts included a tenfold increase in rat monitoring frequency, the progressive installation of modern 'AT220' self-resetting traps, and a currently annual intensive manually-deployed rat poison operation. These efforts have enabled Council to maintain rat numbers at near-zero within the core Toutouwai area, and led to a significant increase in the bird's survival rates and breeding success. However, the disastrous first year means that these relative numbers are still small in absolute terms, and the Toutouwai population remains marginal and hence vulnerable to sudden environmental changes, disease, etc. Our permit allows for a follow-up release of 40 birds to supplement the Turitea population and improve its genetic diversity. This is currently scheduled for Autumn 2025.

2.2 General commentary on future translocations

Any future translocation process would begin with a species-specific assessment of the Turitea. This would be conducted by a species expert and determine the suitability of the habitat for the species under consideration, including what predator control changes (if any) would need to be made to give the species in question the best opportunity to thrive. As such, this assessment would form the basis of a future Department of Conservation permitting application and discussions with source-site mana whenua. This would cost up to \$10,000, depending on the species and expert availability, and could be covered within existing budgets. All other costs associated with these proposed translocations are currently unbudgeted.

Preliminary expert advice suggests there are six species that could potentially be reintroduced to the Turitea within the near future. Each has different biodiversity advantages and challenges, and hence differing translocation and ongoing costs. In all cases however, the costs are likely to be significantly higher than for the Toutouwai translocation, which was achieved entirely within existing budgets thanks to considerable trained-volunteer assistance, the relative abundance and ease of capturing Toutouwai, and the fortuitous availability of funding from MBIE for post-release monitoring in partnership with Massey.

Though costs can vary considerably depending on the location and logistical difficulties posed by the source site, Council should expect a baseline of \$40,000 for the physical translocation of these species, with additional species-specific costs

and requirements as discussed below. A table summary of estimated costs by species is provided in Attachment 1.

2.3 Kiwi

Given the recent success of Kiwi in the nearby and ecologically similar Ruahine Ranges, and the current lack of ground-browsing native species, Kiwi are perhaps the strongest preliminary contender for Council's next focus. Given their status as New Zealand's native bird, any translocation would likely generate considerable enthusiasm from the community.

Kiwi are most vulnerable to stoats, dogs, cats, and ferrets. Stoat and ferret numbers within the reserve are low, and dogs are essentially absent aside from those with contracted hunters. Kiwi aversion training would need to be conducted with any farm or household dogs on properties adjacent to the reserve. Thankfully, these are relatively few, though achieving full uptake would be easiest were Council to cover training fees, for a total cost of approximately \$1,000. Unfortunately, cat numbers have not been systematically monitored within the Turitea historically and are a potential concern for the viability of a Kiwi reintroduction that Council is currently working to assess formally.

Follow-up post-release monitoring standards are higher for Kiwi than Toutouwai, with radio tracking conducted monthly for the first three months, and quarterly thereafter for three years, for a potential cost of \$120,000 over three years.

2.4 Pāteke – Brown Teal Duck

The Turitea's dam sites are judged to be potentially highly suitable for a population of Pāteke. Palmerston North also has considerable historic association with Pāteke, given the contribution of the Victoria Esplanade to the breeding programme.

Pāteke have a similar set of predator vulnerabilities as Kiwi above, though with the additional complication of needing a much broader 'halo' than Kiwi given the tendency of the birds to fly considerable distances from their home nesting sites to ponds in surrounding farmland where they are vulnerable to ferrets, cats, farm dogs, and cars. Creating such a halo would be easier in the scenario where some of this work has already been done in service of protecting Kiwi or another species.

Post-release monitoring requirements are similar to Kiwi, though perhaps 50% more costly given the bird's tendency to spread over a wider range. Availability of birds for translocation is low, potentially meaning a long wait after approval until the Turitea reaches the front of the 'queue' for any translocation.

2.5 Kōkako

Informal advice from a member of the Kōkako recovery group suggests the Turitea, with its dense undergrowth (thanks to PN City Council's possum and deer control), could be an excellent habitat for Kōkako if the Turitea could continue to maintain the extremely low rat numbers that Council has been achieving since 2022. This has been done via annual high-intensity manually-deployed poison baiting in order to

provide the Toutouwai population the best-possible chances of survival. We hope to reduce our reliance on these operations over the next two years as we continue to roll out the latest generation of 'AT220' self-resetting traps which evidence suggests provide a much higher standard of rat control than traditional 'DOC200' manual traps, despite similar ongoing operations and maintenance costs. We expect to have sufficient evidence of whether Turitea rat numbers can be kept at levels suitable for Kōkako within current budgets by 2027.

Most costs will remain similar to Kiwi, however Kōkako are extremely difficult to capture in the wild. Consequently, translocation costs are likely to be significantly higher, perhaps as much as \$80,000.

2.6 Kākā

Kākā are periodically spotted in the Turitea and surrounds, likely having flown from Pūkaha or Southern Tararua 'Project Kākā' areas, so clearly, the habitat is well suited to them. Establishing a population of Kākā in the Turitea would have mutual resilience benefits for all three populations.

Key predators for Kākā are stoats and cats, meaning similar concerns to Kiwi discussed above, but without the need for dog training on nearby farmland.

Best practice for Kākā translocation involves the construction of 'barn-sized' acclimatisation aviaries on site. Construction costs are likely to be \$200,000 or more, depending on the ease of construction at the chosen site. Part-time support staff would need to be contracted to help manage this process, though some synergies with Wildbase could be explored.

2.7 Yellow-Crowned Kākāriki

The tall, unbroken forest within the Turitea Reserve is likely to be a highly suitable habitat for yellow-crowned Kakariki, though these are highly vulnerable to mustelids and rats and would require similar control standards to those of Kōkako. Thus, permitting is unlikely to be possible prior to 2027 without a significant increase in funding for permanent control measures.

It is unknown to what extent Kākāriki would face competitive pressures from the well-established population of Eastern Rosellas in the Turitea. Department of Conservation may require a study of the Rosella population before permitting.

Preliminary advice is that the availability of these birds is highly limited. As with Pāteke, delays are likely.

2.8 Weka

An alternative ground-browsing species to Kiwi are the charismatic Weka. These birds have similar predator control requirements to Kiwi, including measures to limit the impact of nearby dogs. Weka are extremely curious and are commonly injured or killed in predator traps. The Turitea trap network has not been designed with Weka in mind, and would require adjustments before any translocation could occur

(primarily raising the height of traps off the ground to put them out of reach of Weka), likely costing in the order of \$20,000.

Advice is that translocations tend to be more expensive than many other species due to the bird's nature and care requirements. Council should expect these costs to be as high as \$80,000.

3. NEXT STEPS

If Council wishes to proceed with further translocations, the following actions are recommended:

- Procure expert advice about the suitability of the Turitea Reserve for Kiwi and Weka in Spring 2024, and work with Rangitāne to discuss their requirements and desired involvement.
- Continue to improve stoat monitoring and action any expert/mana-whenua recommendations possible within existing budgets.
- Conduct the follow-up Toutouwai release as planned in Autumn 2025.
- Return to this committee with a report recommending proceeding with a particular species, detailing the translocation requirements, and seeking endorsement to begin the permitting and source mana-whenua engagement process.
- As required, provide detailed reporting to Council regarding funding requirements, potentially to be actioned through annual/long-term plan process as appropriate.

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 4: An Eco City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Environmental Sustainability	
The action is: Monitor Toutouwai reintroduction and develop a plan for further translocations	

<p>Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being</p>	<p>Memo provides advice regarding future translocations. Species reintroduction improves environmental well-being by improving biodiversity outcomes at the Turitea Reserve.</p>
---	--

ATTACHMENTS

1. Turitea Future Translocation Cost Estimate Summary [↓](#) 

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Sustainability Review 2024

PRESENTED BY: Olivia Wix, Communications Manager

APPROVED BY: Donna Baker, Acting Chief Executive Unit Manager

RECOMMENDATION TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee receive the Sustainability Review 2024, presented to the Sustainability Committee on 22 May 2024.
-

1. ISSUE

The Sustainability Review for 2024 is now complete. This is the third edition of the review. The first was completed in December 2020 and the second in May 2022.

2. BACKGROUND

The review demonstrates how Council is committed to improving our environmental footprint and highlights recent examples of what we've achieved since the last review.

It also provides an opportunity to highlight some businesses and/or organisations in our community that are making an impact in this space.

This review does contain some data, however due to how and when data is collected, some of it may not have changed since the last review.

Rangitāne and Environment Network Manawatū have reviewed the publication and provided feedback.

3. NEXT STEPS

The Sustainability Review 2024 will be published on the Council website and made available at our Customer Service Centre and libraries. The report will also be circulated to the organisations which feature in the review for their officers, customers, schools and stakeholders. Over the coming months we will be sharing some of the information and stories across our social media channels and in media interviews.

For the next edition, we'll look to work more closely with Environment Network Manawatū as our Sector lead in producing the report, and having a launch event.

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?	No
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council's policies or plans?	No
The recommendations contribute to Goal 4: An Eco City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Environmental Sustainability	
The action is: Prepare a biannual city sustainability report	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Reporting on Council's sustainability activities ensures that members of the community are aware of how Council is improving our environmental footprint.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Environmental Sustainability Review 2024 (attached separately) 

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Wastewater Treatment Plant - Nature Calls: Quarterly Update

PRESENTED BY: Mike Monaghan, Group Manager - Three Waters

APPROVED BY: Chris Dyhrberg, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee receive the report titled 'Wastewater Treatment Plant – Nature Calls: Quarterly Update' presented to the Sustainability Committee on 22 May 2024.
-

1. ISSUE

- 1.1 The Nature Calls Project Team completed the concept design and development of the resource consent application to Horizons Regional Council (Horizons) in late 2022. This was the culmination of four years of work developing the Best Practicable Option (BPO), which comprises highly treated wastewater being discharged to the Manawatū River or to land.
- 1.2 Quarterly updates for the project were requested by Council. This report provides an update on the project for the period from January to March 2024.

2. BACKGROUND

Resource Consent Application submitted to Horizons for the Nature Calls Project

- 2.1 The Nature Calls Consent application was lodged with Horizons on 19 December 2022. The consent application programme was driven by the need to satisfy the requirements of Condition 23C of the existing discharge consent, which required an application to be lodged for the discharge consent for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP).
- 2.2 On 31 March 2023, Horizons informed Council that the consent application had been rejected under Section 88 of the RMA. Horizons cited in their correspondence to Council that the application did not include sufficient information. Council formally objected to this decision whilst continuing to work constructively with Horizons on the consent application on the matters deemed as incomplete to get the application accepted.

- 2.3 Council resubmitted the application to Horizons on 20 July 2023 and it was accepted on 1 August 2023. Following the receipt of the acceptance notification from Horizons, Council formally withdrew its objection to Horizons' original decision.
- 2.4 On 17 August 2023, Council received Horizons' request for further information regarding the consent application (also known as a Section 92 request for further information of the RMA). This request contained over 200 questions - additional information requests are not unusual to receive on consent applications, and extensive information requests are normal to receive on applications of this magnitude.
- 2.5 Due to the complexity and anticipated duration required to formulate answers to the Section 92 request, the Project Team advised Horizons that Council anticipated being able to respond to the Section 92 request on 26 June 2024.
- 2.6 The Project Team have scoped the work required to respond to these questions and are now developing the technical work to support these responses.

3. NATURE CALLS STEERING GROUP

- 3.1 The Nature Calls Steering Group was established in December 2023. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this group have been finalised now with input from Elected Members and the Steering Group members. The final ToR were presented to and adopted by Council on 1 May 2024.
- 3.2 The Steering Group met on 24 April 2024. At this meeting, the group discussed the Manawatū Mixing Study and the Surface Water & Ecology Factual Report, which were pre-circulated to the Steering Group. The Steering Group will have a lunchtime session where the authors of these reports will discuss the findings in more detail. In addition, the group covered Section 92 response progress, how to manage bio-solids, the property strategy, and the ability to work with Fonterra regarding their Longburn WWTP. The cost of the project was also covered and areas where cost savings could be made.
- 3.3 Minutes from the first two Steering Group meetings are attached as Attachments 1 and 2.
- 3.4 The Steering Group will next meet on 18 June 2024.

4. IWI

Te Tūmatakahuki

- 4.1 Council have agreed a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) with Te Tūmatakahuki for both parties to continue to work together on the project. This MoA is currently with Te Tūmatakahuki for signing.

Ngāti Whakare

- 4.2 Project staff met with Ngāti Whakare in March to discuss the project and the scope of work for a Cultural Impact Assessment to be developed by Ngāti Whakare.

5. SECTION 92 REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION WORKSTREAM

- 5.1 The Project Team has been working through the numerous additional information requests. Technical workstreams that are being finalised in this initial tranche include:

- Planning
- River discharge effects and monitoring
- Air quality
- Land application and groundwater
- Groundwater at the WWTP
- Diurnal pH Monitoring Report
- River Modelling Report

These are the final tranches of responses being developed by the Project Team to address the matters raised by Horizons.

River Monitoring - Summer flow monitoring and mixing study

- 5.2 The river mixing study was undertaken in the Manawatū River to provide an indication of how mixing occurs in low flow conditions. The testing occurred in three locations downstream of the current discharge location over several days.
- 5.3 The study concluded that to achieve the best mixing results at the downstream gravel bed, the currently proposed discharge location would need to move upstream by approximately 100 – 150 meters.
- 5.4 The final report was circulated to Iwi and Elected Members for their information. This report is attached as Attachment 3.

Stream testing within the area of interest

- 5.5 In February 2024, consultants carried out water testing and ecological testing on four streams within the Area of Interest (Aoi). This work is required to support the consent application submitted to Horizons and was also requested by Horizons as part of the Section 92 additional information request.

- 5.6 The testing occurred in streams that were identified as streams that could be impacted by land application, and provides baseline information on their ecological health. These streams included Te Pora (Whiskey Creek), Bourkes Drain, Main Drain and Taonui Stream.
- 5.7 An invitation was extended to Iwi and Rangitāne staff, who then attended the site visits with the Project Team.
- 5.8 The Surface Water Quality and Ecological Values Report found that historic land use and flood protection works have impacted the major waterways intersecting the Aol. Poor aquatic habit and water quality were recorded at all sites, which are factors causing degradation of the aquatic communities recorded.
- 5.9 The final report was circulated to Iwi and Elected Members for their information. This report is attached as Attachment 4.

Biosolids strategy

- 5.10 Previous work identified that the Awapuni Landfill has limited capacity for future disposal of biosolids from the WWTP. Additional work has commenced on the Biosolids Strategy to determine opportunities for the use of biosolids going forward, with the focus on matters identified in the Biosolids Strategy Development Report that relate to:
- current biosolids disposal; and
 - progressing future short and medium-term disposal options for biosolids from the treatment plant.
- 5.11 In addition to the work outlined above, strategic conversations are ongoing with other local entities in the region on biosolids disposal as this is a regional challenge for other councils.
- 5.12 The Project Team have completed work to determine whether there is capacity at the existing Awapuni Composting facility. This work has determined that the slopes of the existing landfill may be able to be extended to accommodate additional capacity. Discussions are occurring with the relevant Council staff to determine whether this is a viable option.

Land opportunities

- 5.13 The Project Team continues to investigate property to receive the land discharge, as this is a fundamental part of the consent application. A specific property team has been identified and meet regularly to progress this workstream. Since the update in March 2024, the team continues to work on the following:
- Looking at suitability of land within the Aol;
 - MCA – has been developed to support site selection within the Aol. This work will support the Property Strategy;

- Initial discussions on detailed investigations that are required to address the further information received by Horizons.

Mangaone Stream flow monitoring

5.14 A flow monitoring station has been established to monitor flow levels from the Mangaone Stream. This was required to inform the model that has been developed on the Manawatū River. The monitoring station will also collect water quality data to assist and inform the model and develop baseline information on the Mangaone Stream.

6. BUDGET

6.1 The 2023/24 capital budget for the Nature Calls project is \$3,000,000. This will allow for the aforementioned work packages to continue throughout this financial year.

6.2 At the end of March 2024, \$1,373,536 has been spent, the bulk spent on Work Packages focusing on land application, Section 92 responses and monitoring and investigation works. Other areas of spend include the biosolids strategy and investigation work package and further work on adaptive management.

Post Lodgement RMA	\$765,792
Land Opportunities	\$142,471
Monitoring and Investigation	\$125,719
Iwi Engagement/ Wetlands	\$24,679
Biosolids Strategy and Investigation	\$41,467
Section 92 Responses	\$273,408

6.3 Work will continue at pace responding to Section 92 questions as we have a deadline of 26 June 2024.

6.4 Officers are currently reviewing the project estimates that have been submitted for the LTP consultation document. A number of workstreams have been identified to challenge and test current assumptions, and it is acknowledged that the current figure includes a high level of contingency, as detailed design cannot be costed at this stage.

7. NEXT STEPS

7.1 The Section 92 responses will be finalised in the next quarter.

7.2 We continue to connect and reach out to Iwi in relation to the project in anticipation of ongoing conversation and discussion relating to cultural impact.

8. 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 4: An Eco City	
The recommendations contribute to the achievement of action/actions in Waters The action is: Lodge resource consent application for future discharge of Wastewater Treatment Plant	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	Lodging for resource consent allows Council to continue to provide its wastewater services and allows for future-proofing of the city.

ATTACHMENTS

1. February 2024 Steering Group minutes [↓](#) 
2. April 2024 Steering Group minutes [↓](#) 
3. Manawatū River Mixing Study 2024 [↓](#) 
4. Surface Water and Ecology Factual Report [↓](#) 

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Palmerston North to Feilding Shared Pathway Project

PRESENTED BY: Glen O'Connor, Group Manager - Transport and Development and Michael Bridge, Service Manager - Active Transport

APPROVED BY: Chris Dyhrberg, Chief Infrastructure Officer

RECOMMENDATION TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Committee receive the report titled 'Palmerston North to Feilding Shared Pathway Project' presented to the Sustainability Committee on 22 May 2024.
-

1. ISSUE

- 1.1 There are two shared pathway projects that have been included for staged delivery throughout the proposed 2024-34 Long Term Plan through Programme 2057 (City-wide Shared Pathways New and Link Improvements). The projects are:
 - Palmerston North to Feilding Pathway (PNFP), connecting Feilding, Bunnythorpe and Palmerston North; and
 - Manawatū River Pathway (MRP), which connects Ashhurst and Palmerston North, following the river edge alignment.
- 1.2 Because the questions raised that led to this paper being produced were specifically directed at the Palmerston North to Feilding pathway, this report focuses on that pathway, providing detail on the potential route and what is required in the different sections of the pathway. It also provides a cost breakdown for the project and provides value engineering and scope change opportunities that could be considered as part of the Long-Term Plan (LTP) deliberations.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Both pathways proposed within Programme 2057 link with existing and future shared pathways, trails, footpaths and cycleways, growing the connected local and regional network for walking and cycling. Linkages include the Mangaone Stream Pathway, Linton and Massey pathways, urban cycle network and Te Ahu a Turanga pathway to Woodville (anticipating NZTA Waka Kotahi completion by 2026).

- 2.2 The PNFP follows the existing national Te Araroa Trail alignment alongside the rail track.
- 2.3 For the purposes of this report, the PNFP refers only to the sections of pathway within Palmerston North City Council's boundary and does not include the section of pathway belonging to Manawatū District Council (MDC). Please refer to Attachment 1, which shows a high-level overview of the path route.

Strategic Context

- 2.4 Our shared pathways are key links to our regional and urban networks, providing safe, functional and attractive walking and cycling options for everyone, whether for commuting to work and school, recreational use, connecting with whanau, getting to the shops, health and well-being.
- 2.5 The PNFP aligns with Council's 2019 Urban Cycle Network Masterplan.
- 2.6 The PNFP has a business case, is a project within the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative (endorsed by NZTA – Waka Kotahi) and features in the Regional Land Transport Plan.
- 2.7 The PNFP directly feeds into Council's Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative Transport Plan through 'Making it safer and easier for people to choose to walk, cycle or catch the bus'.

3. PALMERSTON NORTH TO FEILDING PATHWAY OVERVIEW

- 3.1 The PNFP is being delivered in partnership with MDC. MDC has completed most of their segment of the pathway between Feilding and the level crossing intersection of Waughs/Campbell Roads, north of Bunnythorpe at the council boundary.
- 3.2 Currently, some sections of this pathway route are narrow tracks, only suitable for tramping, and the Mangaone Stream and Jacks Creek crossings are often impassable following heavy rainfall.
- 3.3 The total distance of the Palmerston North to Feilding pathway is 12kms; MDC's portion is circa 4km, and Palmerston North's is circa double that at 8kms.
- 3.4 Both councils are seeking to provide a safe connection between where the pathway stops on MDC land and Tremaine Avenue.
- 3.5 The current scope will look to utilise quieter streets, paper roads, and KiwiRail land to achieve this in an efficient way. Please refer to Attachment 2 for designs of the different sections of the pathway.
- 3.6 From a practical construction standpoint, we are proposing to deliver the pathway progressively over the next 10 years, prioritising sections that will provide us connectivity as soon as possible.

3.7 There are several complexities that need to be worked through. A good example of this is navigating across the Waughs/Campbell Roads intersection through to Waughs Road.

Scope and Complexities

3.8 The pathway is 3m wide, which is the minimum NZTA – Waka Kotahi shared path standard, enabling people walking and cycling to use the space and pass safely. Strips of mown grass each side of both pathways provide additional space for passing and help address safety issues, such as sightlines.

3.9 The PNFP is designed as a sealed (AC/asphalt) pathway, which is consistent with the section already completed by MDC, as well as the business plan endorsed by NZTA – Waka Kotahi.

3.10 The PNFP will be mostly constructed within Council's formed and unformed road corridors. Some segments pass through KiwiRail land. Agreements are currently in place for the pathway to run inside KiwiRail land within the Bunnythorpe village, as well as a section near Tremaine Avenue.

3.11 As stated above, there are many complexities that we need to deal with, that MDC did not, which are summarised in the table below:

Complexity	PNCC Project Detail	MDC Project Detail
Terrain	There are some challenging sections with uneven terrain that require culverts, cut and fill and other engineered solutions, eg. section connecting Stoney Creek and Clevely Line	This portion is flat and straightforward and was able to follow the road corridor. We understand there were limited engineering challenges to overcome.
Paper Roads	We will be utilising the paper roads where possible instead of purchasing land. This allows us to proceed without having to acquire land in these sections. However, building on land with no existing infrastructure (currently being used by adjacent landowners) can be quite complex and will require negotiation with several individual landowners. This has an associated cost consequence.	This portion was able to follow the road corridor, therefore did not require property negotiation.

Complexity	PNCC Project Detail	MDC Project Detail
Level Crossings	The path crosses four level crossings, adding additional cost. This includes a proposal to construct a new, standalone level crossing in Bunnythorpe to Kiwirail.	The MDC path does not have level crossings.
Bridges	We are constructing two bridges over Mangaone and Jacks Creeks.	The MDC path did not have bridge construction.
Additional Value Adds	Our cost estimates for the LTP include landscape improvements (eg. planting, seating, and signage) as well as lighting.	MDC did not add any of these elements to their initial project. We expect this will need to be completed as a later stage.

3.12 The four level crossings are key contributors to the project and cost. Further detail on these is below.

- **Intersection of Waughs Road and Campbell Road, north of Bunnythorpe (section 1):** Currently, there is not any provision at this intersection for people walking and cycling to cross safely. We are engaging with KiwiRail on safety assessments of concept designs for shared pathway improvements at this level crossing. Separately, safety improvements to the wider intersection is included in the LTP through Council's Low Cost/Low Risk Programme.
- **Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road, in Bunnythorpe (section 1):** Currently, there is sub-optimal provision at this intersection for people walking and cycling to cross safely. We are engaging with KiwiRail on safety assessments of concept designs for shared pathway improvements at this level crossing.
- **Midhurst Street:** Currently, there is no provision at this intersection for people walking and cycling to cross safely, noting that use of this level crossing will cease once the final section along the Midhurst paper road is completed in 2034/35.
- **Tremaine Avenue (near intersection of Midhurst Street):** Currently, there is provision at this intersection for people walking to cross safely. The plan is to improve provision at this level crossing for people walking as well as people on bikes.

4. FINANCIAL

- 4.1 Please refer to Attachment 3 for a financial overview of Programme 2057, and a breakdown of the current total project cost in the proposed 2024-34 LTP.

5. VALUE ENGINEERING AND SCOPE CHANGE OPPORTUNITIES

- 5.1 The bulk of the construction costs for the pathway project are driven by:
- Material and contractor costs;
 - Stormwater works, such as culverts;
 - Civil works, such as retaining walls, cut and fill;
 - Bridges and level crossings.
- 5.2 Officers have explored value engineering and scope change opportunities that could be considered to reduce the cost in the 10-year period and provide direction on a minimum viable product to establish a connected route.

Construction Materials

- 5.3 Council could consider replacing AC/asphalt with a limestone pathway. The difference in construction cost is minimal (saving approximately \$1M over the whole project), however, the maintenance cost for limestone is higher. Limestone pathways are less resilient, require more maintenance and they provide a lower level of service. Replacing limestone with AC/asphalt later also requires additional work to re-shape the limestone prior to laying the new material. A high-level estimate of the life expectancy, before significant renewal work would be required, is 20+ years for AC, vs 5 years for limestone.

Landscaping and Placemaking

- 5.4 Landscape designs for the entire corridor for both pathways will be developed before procurement and construction, ensuring a cohesive and consistent product throughout implementation.
- 5.5 Officers propose, however, to defer implementation of some elements across both pathway projects, to better ensure affordability and delivery of the minimum viable product:
- Landscaping, including vegetation planting – Officers propose to deliver the landscaping elements of both pathways incrementally and iteratively, subject to available funding.
 - Seating, shelter, lighting, and amenities – Officers propose to construct seating and other amenity elements over time, subject to available funding.

Minimum Viable Product

- 5.6 The core connected pathway (minimum viable product) would combine new pathway construction with existing quiet roads, providing a significantly safer route for people walking and cycling, away from busy 100km/h roads. During implementation, and until all sections are complete, users will be navigating a mix of facilities: some sections of new off-road shared pathway plus some sections of open, narrow, and quiet roads.
- 5.7 The PNFP has been designed in nine sections over approximately 8km.
- 5.8 Completing four of the nine sections will deliver the core connected pathway (minimum viable product) at a cost of \$13.2M (2023 engineer's estimate for construction, including 30% contingency). The four priority sections are as follows:
- Priority section 1 – Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road to Waughs Road:
 - 470m, Engineers estimate \$4.8M.
 - Proposed to commence construction in year 1 of the LTP and continue into year 2.
 - This section will link Bunnythorpe to the existing pathway completed by MDC, at the council boundary. This section includes two bridges, over Mangaone Stream and Jacks Creek, plus two level crossings.
 - Priority section 2 – Stoney Creek Road to Clevely Line:
 - 620m, Engineers estimate \$2.1M.
 - Proposed to commence construction in year 2 of the LTP and continue into year 3.
 - This section extends the pathway from Bunnythorpe towards Palmerston North, and connects with residents along Sangsters Road.
 - Priority section 3 – Sangsters paper road:
 - 1.34km, Engineers estimate \$3.8M.
 - Proposed to commence construction in year 3 of the LTP and continue into year 4.
 - This section connects the formed Sangsters Road with Roberts Line.
 - Priority section 4 – Midhurst paper road:
 - 915m, engineers estimate \$2.5M.
 - Proposed to commence construction in year 4 of the LTP.

- 5.9 Constructing these four sections will complete the core connected pathway between Feilding, Bunnythorpe and Palmerston North.
- 5.10 Following completion of the four priority sections during the first four years of the LTP, construction of the balance of sections can then be undertaken in the future either as a programme of work or as individual projects.
- 5.11 Please refer to Attachment 3 for a comparison of the minimum viable product forecast to the current project costs in the proposed 2024-34 LTP.

6. NEXT STEPS




- 6.1 Providing the project is confirmed in the final 2024-34 LTP, construction of the first section of the project will commence in 2024/25 subject to NZTA – Waka Kotahi co-funding being confirmed.
- 6.2 Council will have a confirmed co-funding position for the first 3 years of the LTP in around August 2024. The co-funding position for the entire transport portfolio of programmes will be presented to Council after that point, providing the opportunity to make changes to the confirmed LTP position. If the shared pathway is not co-funded, Council would then need to decide whether to proceed with the project as proposed or to defer until co-funding was achieved.

7. 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?	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: Prioritise active transport programmes that deliver on 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	Our shared pathways are key links to our regional and urban networks, providing safe, functional and attractive walking and cycling options for everyone, whether for commuting to work and school, recreational use, connecting with whanau, getting to the shops, health and

	well-being.
--	-------------

ATTACHMENTS

1. Palmerston North to Feilding Pathway Route [↓](#) 
2. Palmerston North to Feilding Pathway Concept Designs - Section by Section [↓](#) 
3. Palmerston North to Feilding Pathway Financial Overview [↓](#) 

COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

TO: Sustainability Committee

MEETING DATE: 22 May 2024

TITLE: Committee Work Schedule

RECOMMENDATION TO SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

1. That the Sustainability Committee receive its Work Schedule dated May 2024.

SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE – MAY 2024

Estimated Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction & Clause number
22 May 2024	Develop a City-Wide Food Resilience and Security Policy	Chief Planning Officer		Council 31 May 2023 Clause 88.10
22 May 2024	Environmental Sustainability Report 2023	CE Unit Manager		<u>Terms of Reference of the Committee</u> Last report presented May 2022
22 May 2024	Opportunities for native species re-introductions in the Turitea Reserve area—Update (incl projected funding requirements)	Chief Planning Officer		17 November 2021 Clause 38.21 7 June 2022 Clause 16-23 Last update presented Jun 2023
	Options to transition out of small vehicle fleet ownership and long-term lease, with a view to utilisation of a carshare or similar	Chief Planning Officer & Chief Infrastructure Officer	Moved to Strategy & Finance Committee work schedule	Council <u>29 Nov 2023</u> <u>Clause 193.3-23</u>

	services Financial Year 2027 onwards			
21 August 2024	Wastewater Discharge Consent Project - Quarterly Update	Chief Infrastructure Officer		11 May 2022 Clause 26-22
21 August 2024	Manawatū-Whanganui Climate Joint Action Committee Update	Chief Planning Officer		Climate change plan ongoing Last report presented Aug 2023
16 October 2024	Citywide Emissions Inventory 2023 Annual Report	Chief Planning Officer		Climate change plan ongoing action #3 Last report presented Oct 23
16 October 2024	Low Carbon Roadmap - options to achieve the city-wide goal of 30% reduction in emissions by 2031	Chief Planning Officer		30 March 2022 Clause 6-22, Climate change plan ongoing action #5
16 October 2024	PNCC Organisational Emissions Inventory 2023/24 Annual Report	Chief Planning Officer		Climate change plan ongoing action #1 Last report presented Oct 23
16 October 2024	Waste management and minimisation plan 2019 - annual progress update for 2023/24 FY	Chief Infrastructure Officer		9 Sept 2020 Clause 17-20 Last report presented Oct 23
16 October 2024	6 monthly update on the Low Carbon Fund FY2023/24	Chief Planning Officer		

2025	Annual Sector Lead Report: Environment Network Manawatū	Chief Customer Officer		Terms of Reference
------	---	------------------------	--	--------------------