



PAPAIOEA
PALMERSTON
NORTH
CITY

PALMERSTON NORTH CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA

COUNCIL

ANNUAL BUDGET HEARINGS

9:00 AM,, WEDNESDAY 22 APRIL 2026

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

MEMBERS

Grant Smith (Mayor)

Debi Marshall-Lobb (Deputy Mayor)

Mark Arnott

Brent Barrett

Rachel Bowen

Vaughan Dennison

Lew Findlay (QSM)

Hayden Fitzgerald

Leonie Hapeta

Lorna Johnson

Bonnie Kuru

Billy Meehan

Orphée Mickalad

Karen Naylor

William Wood

Kaydee Zabelin

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

COUNCIL MEETING

22 April 2026

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. Appointment of Chairs for following sessions

Page 7

6. Extension of meeting time

- 7. Hearing of Submissions - Annual Budget 2026- 27 and Planning and Miscellaneous Services Fees & Charges 2026-27** Page 9

REPORTS FROM THE COUNCIL MEETING 25 MARCH 2026

- 8. Strategy and Policy Work Programme 2026/27** Page 19
Memorandum, presented by Peter Ridge, Manager Strategy and Policy.

- 9. 48 Cambridge Ave, Ashhurst - Interim management decision pending completion of Property Portfolio Review** Page 21
Report, presented by Perene Green, Property Officer.

- 10. Local Government Elections 2025** Page 23
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Manager Governance.

- 11. Inquiry into the 2025 Local Elections- Submission Approved Under Mayoral Delegation** Page 25
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Manager Governance.

- 12. Appointment of Council Representatives (Age Friendly and Food HQ)** Page 27
Memorandum, presented by Sarah Claridge, Governance Advisor.

REPORTS

- 13. Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road Indicative Business Case: Short List Programme Options and Sub-options** Page 29
Memorandum, presented by James Miguel, Senior Transport Planner.

- 14. Central Districts Water - Updated Shareholders' Agreement** Page 61
Report, presented by Chris Dyhrberg - Executive Director Central Districts Water.

- 15. **Reappointment of Trustees/Directors on Council Controlled Organisations** Page 101
Memorandum, presented by Hannah White, Manager Governance.

- 16. **Council Work Schedule** Page 111

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

- 17. **Presentation of the Part I Public Finance, Performance & Audit Committee Recommendations from its 1 April 2026 Meeting** Page 115

- 18. **Presentation of the Part I Public Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee Recommendations from its 15 April 2026 Meeting** Page 117

- 19. **Karakia Whakamutunga**

- 20. **Exclusion of Public**

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.

PRESENTATION

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Appointment of Chairs for following sessions

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That Council agree the Chairs for the remaining sessions as follows:

Date	Timeslot		Chair
22 April 2026	11.00am – 12.30pm	am	Councillor Kaydee Zabelin
	4.00pm – 5.30pm	pm	Councillor Hayden Fitzgerald
23 April 2026	9.00- 10.30am	am	Councillor Orphee Mickalad
	11.00am – 12.30am	am	Councillor Mark Arnott
	4.00pm- 5.30pm	pm	Councillor Debi Marshall-Lobb

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

SUBMISSION FROM CONSULTATION

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Hearing of Submissions - Annual Budget 2026- 27 and Planning and Miscellaneous Services Fees & Charges 2026-27

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

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

Copies of submissions are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

[Annual Budget 2026-27](#)

[Planning and Miscellaneous Services Fees & Charges 2026-27](#)

The tables of submitters are subject to change.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Procedure Sheet - Hearing of Submissions [↓](#) 

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Wednesday 22 April 2026

SESSION 1

TIME: 9.00am – 10.30am

MEMBERS: The Mayor (Grant Smith) (Chair) and Councillors

LEAD OFFICER: Waid Crockett, Chief Executive

GOVERNANCE OFFICERS: Natalya Kushnirenko, Governance Administrator
Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
9.00am - 10.30am	10	Mike Clement	10
	118	Takaro AFC – Netra Ghimire	10
	158	Environment Network Manawatū – Jean Hera	10
	2 – Fees Plg & Misc Svs 188 - AB	Property Task Force – Palmerston North – Phil Hindrup	20
	192	Peter Crawford	10
	302	Palmy BID – Matthew Jeanes	10
	304	Manawatū Gymsports - Kim Fenn	10
	354	J P McCartin (statement to be read)	10

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Wednesday 22 April 2026

SESSION 2

TIME: 11.00am – 12.30pm

MEMBERS: Councillor Kaydee Zabelin (Chair) and Elected Members

LEAD OFFICER: Cameron McKay, General Manager Corporate Services

GOVERNANCE OFFICERS: Natalya Kushnirenko, Governance Administrator
Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
11.00am - 12.30pm	216	Palmerston North Heritage Trust – Geoff Watson	10
	189	Age-Friendly Palmerston North - Russell Hallam & Kerry Hoquard	10
	238	Simon Barnett	10
	278	Sharon Sandgathe	10
	308	Queen Elizabeth College – Chris Moller	10
	329	Renee Dingwall	10

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Wednesday 22 April 2026

SESSION 3

TIME: 4.00pm – 5.30pm
MEMBERS: Cr Hayden Fitzgerald (Chair), and Elected Members
LEAD OFFICER: Waid Crockett, Chief Executive
GOVERNANCE OFFICERS: Natalya Kushnirenko, Governance Administrator
 Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
4.00pm - 5.30pm	166	Seniors Reference Group – Joan Spencer	10
	176	Sport Manawatū – Carl Johnstone	10
	182	Aaron Fox	10
	188	Property Task Force – Palmerston North – Phil Hindrup	10
	193	Manawatū Rugby League – Lawrence Benjimin	10
	223	Cancer Society Manawatū – Josephine Gutry	10
	256	Niuvaka Trust – Dana Kunaiti	10
	336	Malcolm Frith	10
	240	Richard Woolgar	10

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Thursday 23 April 2026

SESSION 4

TIME: 9.00am – 10.30am

MEMBERS: Councillor Orphee Mickalad (Chair) and Elected Members

LEAD OFFICER: Waid Crockett, Chief Executive

GOVERNANCE OFFICERS: Sarah Claridge, Governance Advisor
Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
9.00am - 10.30am	209	Julia Manssen	10
	242	Manawatū Regional Volleyball Association – Kelsey Higgins	10
	268	Te Manawa Art Society – David Crowley	10
	285	Palmerston North City Council Heritage Reference Group - Margaret Tennant	10
	185	Manawatū Tenants Union – Cameron Jenkins	10
	331	Cameron Jenkins	10
	355	Manawatū Lesbian & Gay Rights Association Incorporated (MaLGRA) – Cameron Jenkins	10
	335	Palmerston North Residents Group – Brenton Beach	10
	340	Kia Toa Rugby Football Club Inc – Ray Swadel	10
	352	David Chapple	10

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Thursday 23 April 2026

SESSION 5

TIME:	11.00am – 12.30pm
MEMBERS:	Councillor Mark Arnott (Chair) and Elected Members
LEAD OFFICER:	Kerry-Lee Probert, General Manager Development & Regulatory
GOVERNANCE OFFICERS:	Sarah Claridge, Governance Advisor Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
11.00am - 12.30pm	345	Ian Staples	10
	346	Christine Staples	10
	349	Maryanne Poole	10
	4		
	Plg & Misc Fees	Alcohol Healthwatch – Andrew Galloway (ONLINE)	10
	6		10
	Plg & Misc Fees	Resonant – Oliver Harper-Quayle	
	7		10
Plg & Misc Fees	Truebridge Associates Limited - Ross Bidlake		
	218	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - Ian Strahan, Provincial President Manawatu-Rangitikei (in person), Peter Matich, Regional Policy (ONLINE)	10
	234	MASH Trust – Karleen Edwards	10

ANNUAL BUDGET 2026/27

Thursday 23 April 2026

SESSION 6

TIME: 4.00pm – 5.30pm
MEMBERS: Debi Marshall-Lobb (Chair), and Elected Members
LEAD OFFICER: Waid Crockett, Chief Executive
GOVERNANCE OFFICERS: Sarah Claridge, Governance Advisor
 Hannah White, Manager Governance

Time:	Submission No:	Submitter	Minutes
4.00pm - 5.30pm	241	IPU New Zealand - Hiroyasu Tsumakura	10
	245	Greater Bunnythorpe Community Inc. – Rebekah Mudford	10
	246	Palmerston North Youth Council	10
	265	Bioeconomy Science Institute – Mike Piper	10
	279	Unions Manawatū – Ben Schmidt	10
	280	Dale O’Reilly	10
	347	Sarah Harris	10

Procedure Sheet
Hearing of Submissions

Presenting your submission	<p>You have indicated a wish to present your submission to Elected Members; you can do this either in-person or online. You may speak to your submission yourself or, if you wish, arrange for some other person or persons to speak on your behalf.</p> <p>We recommend that you speak to the main points of your submission and then answer any questions. It is not necessary to read your submission as Elected Members have a copy and will have already read it.</p> <p>Questions are for clarifying matters raised in submissions. Questions may only be asked by Elected Members, unless the Chairperson gives permission.</p>
Time Allocation	<p>10 minutes (including question time) will be allocated for the hearing of each submission. If more than one person speaks to a submission, the time that is allocated to that submission will be shared between the speakers.</p>
Who will be there?	<p>The Mayor and Councillors will hear the submissions. There will also be other people there who are presenting their submission. The Hearing is open to the media and the public.</p>
Agenda	<p>An Agenda for the meeting at which you will be speaking will be publicly available by 5pm Friday 17 April. It will be published on the Palmerston North City Council website (Agendas and minutes) and available to view at the Customer Service Centre. The Agenda lists the submissions in the order they will be considered, although there may be some variation to this on the day.</p>
Venue	<p>The meeting will be held in the Council Chamber, First Floor, Civic Administration Building, Te Marae o Hine, 32 The Square, Palmerston North.</p> <p>The Council Chamber will be set out with tables arranged appropriately. You will be invited to sit at the table with the Elected Members when called.</p>
Meeting Livestreamed	<p>Please note the meeting will be livestreamed and you will be on camera when speaking – please let us know in advance if you are not comfortable with this.</p>
Te Reo Māori	<p>You may speak to your submission in Māori. If you indicated your intention to do this when making your submission, we will arrange for</p>

a certified interpreter to attend the meeting. You may bring your own interpreter if you wish.

- NZ Sign Language** You may present your submission in NZSL. If you indicated your intention to do this when making your submission, we will arrange for a certified interpreter to attend the meeting. You may bring your own interpreter if you wish.
- Visual Aids** You may connect your laptop at the table to share a presentation. Please also send this to us ahead of time.
- Final Consideration of Submissions** Following the hearings, Elected Members will consider all submissions at the Council meeting on **Wednesday 6 May**, and then agree the final budget on **Wednesday 3 June 2026**. You can attend these meetings or watch them online on our Council website or Youtube channel.
- Changes to this Procedure** The Chairperson may vary the procedure set out above if circumstances indicate that some other procedure would be more appropriate.
- Further Information** If you have any questions about the procedure outlined above please contact governance@pncc.govt.nz.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Strategy and Policy Work Programme 2026/27

PRESENTED BY: Peter Ridge, Manager Strategy and Policy

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, General Manager Strategic Planning

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

- 1. That Council receive the memorandum titled “Strategy and Policy Work Programme 2026/27” presented on 22 April 2026.**
-

The full [report](#) can be found on the Council agenda 25 March 2026.

Copies of the agenda are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

REPORT

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: 48 Cambridge Ave, Ashhurst - Interim management decision pending completion of Property Portfolio Review

PRESENTED BY: Perene Green, Property Officer

APPROVED BY: Glen O'Connor, Acting General Manager Infrastructure

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council agree to progress one of the following options:
 - a. Seek Expressions of Interest for a community lease for 48 Cambridge Avenue, Ashhurst (located on part of Works Pit Park) on a tenant-led works basis; or
 - b. Demolish the existing building and land-bank the site.
 2. That if Council agrees to progress option 1.a, that Council endorse the intention to dispose of the building for \$1 to any future community group or organisation that has entered into a community occupancy agreement.
-

The full [report](#) can be found on the Council agenda 25 March 2026.

Copies of the agenda are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Local Government Elections 2025

PRESENTED BY: Hannah White, Manager Governance

APPROVED BY: Cameron McKay, General Manager Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

- 1. That Council receive the memorandum titled 'Local Government Elections 2025', presented on 22 April 2026.**
-

The full [report](#) can be found on the Council agenda 25 March 2026.

Copies of the agenda are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Inquiry into the 2025 Local Elections- Submission Approved Under Mayoral Delegation

PRESENTED BY: Hannah White, Manager Governance

APPROVED BY: Cameron McKay, General Manager Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council receive the report titled 'Inquiry into the 2025 Local Elections- Submission Approved Under Mayoral Delegation,' presented on 22 April 2026.
-

The full [report](#) can be found on the Council agenda 25 March 2026.

Copies of the agenda are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Appointment of Council Representatives (Age Friendly and Food HQ)

PRESENTED BY: Sarah Claridge, Governance Advisor

APPROVED BY: Cameron McKay, General Manager Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council appoint Councillor Bonnie Kuru as Council's representative on Age Friendly until October 2028.
 2. That Council appoint David Murphy, GM Strategic Planning as Council's nominated director for Food HQ Innovation Limited, with Waid Crockett, Chief Executive as his proxy, effective from 1 July 2026.
-

The full [report](#) can be found on the Council agenda 25 March 2026.

Copies of the agenda are publicly available at the Central Library, Customer Service Centre and on our website.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road Indicative Business Case: Short List Programme Options and Sub-options

PRESENTED BY: James Miguel, Senior Transport Planner

APPROVED BY: David Murphy, General Manager Strategic Planning

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council approve the ten short list programme options and five sub-options detailed in section 4 and Attachment Two of the memorandum titled ‘Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road Indicative Business Case: Short List Programme Options and Sub-options’ presented on 22 April 2026.
-

1. ISSUE AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road (‘the Ring Road’) is a significant strategic project for the city. It is a key part of the Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative (PNITI) and a catalyst project for Te Utanganui, Central New Zealand Distribution Hub.
- 1.2 Work is ongoing on ‘the Ring Road’ Indicative Business Case (IBC).
- 1.3 A previous update report was provided to the [27 August 2025 Economic Growth Committee](#).
- 1.4 An update report was scheduled but not presented to the [11 February 2026 Council Meeting](#). The report was not presented due to there being insufficient time to present on the day.

2. LONG LIST DEVELOPMENT & ASSESSMENT

- 2.1 To develop the Long List of options for the Ring Road, the project team split the project area into discreet sections with each section having multiple options. Due to the number of options available to the project team this was the most practical way to assess the options at the long list stage.
- 2.2 The Long List of options are publicly available on the council website [here](#).

- 2.3 The Long List was assessed through combining technical assessments and feedback from the community, stakeholders & partners.
- 2.4 The technical assessment was a Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) using a 7 points scale. Across the criteria each option was assessed against a baseline 'Do Minimum option' for the relevant section. For example, in the case of the options for section 1 each option was compared against the 'Do Minimum option' for section 1. There was no assessment done on the options between the sections.
- 2.5 The Criteria used to assess the options are outlined in the table below:

Critical Success Factor	Criteria
Investment Objectives	Efficiency and reliability: Ability to improve network efficiency and journey reliability. Improve travel time reliability for freight vehicles accessing key freight destinations within Palmerston North.
	Safety: Ability to improve road safety on the network. Reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries (DSIs) across the Palmerston North / Manawatū road network.
Indicative cost range	Indicative relative cost range difference between options (this will be shown as an range from \$ to \$\$\$\$\$).
Deliverability	Evaluates the physical and technical feasibility of delivering the option, considering engineering complexity, construction risks, and potential disruptions during implementation and consenting complexity. Evaluates the physical and technical feasibility of delivering the option, considering complexity, construction risks, and potential disruptions during implementation.
Affordability	The likelihood of the option on obtaining Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) funding. Consideration of staging options for the options to improve affordability.

- 2.6 The table below outlines the long list scoring scale used for each criteria:

Magnitude	Definition	Score
Large positive (+ve)	Major positive impacts resulting in substantial and long-term improvements or enhancements of the existing environment.	3
Moderate positive (+ve)	Moderate positive impact, possibly of short-, medium- or long-term duration. Positive impacts may be in terms of new opportunities and outcomes of enhancement or improvement.	2
Slight positive (+ve)	Minimal positive impact, possibly only lasting over the short term. May be confined to a limited area.	1
Neutral	Neutral – no discernible or predicted positive or negative impact. Counterfactual could be the do-minimum or do-nothing.	0

Magnitude	Definition	Score
Slight negative (-ve)	Minimal negative impact, possibly only lasting over the short term, and definitely able to be managed or mitigated. May be confined to a small area.	-1
Moderate negative (-ve)	Moderate negative impact. Impacts may be short-, medium- or long-term and are highly likely to respond to management actions.	-2
Large negative (-ve)	Impacts with serious, long-term and possibly irreversible effect leading to serious damage, degradation or deterioration of the physical, economic, cultural or social environment. Requires major rescope of concept, design, location and justification, or requires major commitment to extensive management strategies to mitigate the effect.	-3

2.7 A summary of the long list options and their scores in the MCA can be found in **Attachment 1**. These scores reflect only their technical assessment and not wider community feedback.

2.8 Alongside the technical assessment, the project team engaged with the community on the long List of options. Their feedback was recorded in our engagement report which can be found [here](#).

2.9 A more detailed report is currently being prepared that combines the technical assessment, community engagement and cultural assessment of the options.

3. SHORT LIST DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

3.1 In evaluating and combining the long list options to develop the short list programme options, the project team applied the following key considerations:

- Long List MCA.
- Community and stakeholder engagement results.
- Cultural assessment findings.
- Tie-ins and connections between each section option.
- Ability to stage delivery.
- Clear differentiation between short list programme options for the purpose of ascertaining relative benefits.
- Applicable additional options and sub-options proposed by the community.

3.2 There are three long list options proposed for progression to the short list in section 1:

- 1A existing route
- 1D Hacketts Road
- 1E Grade Separation of SH3.

3.3 There are three long list options proposed for progression to the short list in section 2:

- 2A Campbell Road signals upgrade
- 2C Dixons Line
- 2E Southern grade separation bypass.

3.4 There are two long list options proposed for progression to the short list in section 3:

- 3B school bypass
- 3C Rongotea Road intersection improvements.

3.5 There are three long list options proposed for progression to the short list in section 4:

- 4C Hybrid Central Bridge
- 4D Akers Road bridge
- 4E Upgrade SH56.

3.6 Due to the strategic function of SH57, it was recognised that Old West Road would require investment regardless of the outcome in the other sections. While both long list options 5A and 5C included investment in Old West Road, 5A was identified over 5C for the short list. As a result, 5A has been used in all programme options.

4. IDENTIFIED SHORT LIST

4.1 The project team identified 10 programme options for the short list. These programme options will be carried forward for further transport modelling and technical assessments.

4.2 Maps of the programme options for the short list are included in **Attachment 2**. The Long List maps on the website provide more zoomed in illustrations of the different sections for the programme options.

4.3 Programme option 1 is made up of long list options 1A-2A-3C-4E-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors. This option does not include a bridge crossing.

- 4.4 Programme option 2 is made up of long list options 1A-2A-3B-4C-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and Bunnythorpe. This option includes a bridge crossing at Camp Road.
- 4.5 Programme option 3 is made up of long list options 1A-2A-3C-4D-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and Bunnythorpe. This option includes a bridge crossing at Akers Road.
- 4.6 Programme option 4 is made up of long list options 1A-2C-3B-4C-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and the Northern Bunnythorpe bypass (Dixons Line). This option includes a bridge crossing at Camp Road.
- 4.7 Programme option 5 is made up of long list options 1A-2C-3C-4D-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and the Northern Bunnythorpe bypass (Dixons Line). This option includes a bridge crossing at Akers Road.
- 4.8 Programme option 6 is made up of long list options 1A-2E-3B-4C-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and the Southern Bunnythorpe bypass. This option includes a bridge crossing at Camp Road.
- 4.9 Programme option 7 is made up of long list options 1A-2E-3C-4D-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and the Southern Bunnythorpe bypass. This option includes a bridge crossing at Akers Road.
- 4.10 Programme option 8 is made up of long list options 1D-2A-3C-4E-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors for all section except Ashhurst. Includes Hacketts Road bypass of Ashhurst.
- 4.11 Programme option 9 is made up of long list options 1E-2A-3C-4E-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors for all section except Ashhurst. Includes Southern grade separated bypass of Ashhurst.
- 4.12 Programme option 10 is made up of long list options 1A-2E-3B-4C-5A. This option upgrades existing road corridors through Ashhurst and the Southern Bunnythorpe bypass. This option includes a bridge crossing at Camp Road. This option is an alternative to Option 6 as it uses Roberts Line instead of Te Ngaio Road.
- 4.13 In addition to the 10 programme options, 5 sub-options are proposed to be tested using the transport model to determine the suitability for consideration in the short list or recommended options phase. These are:
- Campbell Road being used as an alternative to Waughs Road between SH54 and Dixons Line (sub-option of programme Option 4).
 - Newbury Line and Aranui Road being used as an alternative to Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Road between Waughs Road and Rongotea Road (sub-option of programme option 1).

- An alternative alignment utilising Works Road with potential alternate bridge alignment parallel to the railway line connecting onto SH56 (sub-option of programme option 4).
- Using Whitmore Street instead of Camp Road and adjusted bridge alignment slightly West of the location for option 4C (sub-option of programme option 2).
- Extension of Roberts Line to connect over the Oroua River on to Kawakawa Road from the end of existing Roberts Line North (sub-option of programme option 10).

5. SHORT LIST ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 The proposed short list programme options will undergo further detailed modelling and technical assessments.
- 5.2 It is proposed that the short list MCA will utilise an 11-point scoring range to allow for greater distinction between the options. The table below outlines the 11-point scale.

Score	Scoring Description
5	Substantial benefits and a high degree of confidence of benefits being realised and/or long term / permanent benefits
4	High extent of benefits and confidence of benefit being realised and/or medium - long term benefits
3	Good benefits and/or medium term
2	Low or localised benefits and/or short term
1	Very low benefits and/or very short term
0	No change in benefits, impacts or difficulties from current situation
-1	Few difficulties, very low cost or low impact on some resources/values and/or very short term
-2	Minor difficulties, low cost or minor impacts on resources/values and/or short term
-3	Some difficulties, moderate cost or some impact on resources/values and/or medium term
-4	Clear difficulties, high cost or high impact on resources/values and/or medium - long term
-5	Substantial difficulties, very high cost or substantial impact on resources/values and/or long term / permanent

5.3 In addition to the 11-point scale the short list MCA criteria will have more detail under which the programme options will be scrutinised. This is outlined in the table below.

Criteria Type	Potential Criteria	Alignment to MRFRR MCA
Critical success factors	Investment objectives	Aligns with 'Efficiency and reliability' and 'Safety' criteria
	Potential achievability	Technical and Safety in Design align with 'Constructability' criteria Consentability aligns with MRFRR 'Consenting Complexity' criteria
	Potential affordability	Cost included as a separate non-scored consideration to inform decision making
	Potential value for money	BCR assessment included as a VfM assessment
	Supplier capacity and capability	Aligns with 'Constructability' criteria.
	Scheduling / programming	Not considered under this MCA as it is not considered a key differentiator at the IBC stage. It is noted that all potential ring route options will be stageable and this would be further explored in the DBC stage.
Environmental impacts and opportunities	Environmental effects	Aligns with 'Environmental' criteria
	Social and cultural impacts	Aligns with 'Social' criteria
	Climate change and mitigation	Not considered under this MCA. To be considered at DBC phase once greater level of design and mitigations are understood
	Climate change and adaptation and resilience	Aligns with 'Resilience' criteria
	Impacts on te ao Māori	Aligns with 'Impacts on te ao Māori' criteria
	Property impacts	Aligns with 'Property impacts' criteria

5.4 A workshop is planned for 8 May to undertake the short list MCA. The workshop will involve officers from PNCC, Manawatu District Council, New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi and Horizons Regional Council. In addition to the officers the workshop will include representatives for Rangitāne and Ngati Kauwhata.



6. NEXT STEPS

- 6.1 Undertake the MCA short list workshop on 8 May.
- 6.2 Continue to report key updates and milestones to Council prior to seeking final approval of the IBC.

7. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Council 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 objectives?	Yes
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?	No
<p>The recommendations contribute to: Whāinga 1: He tāone auaha, he tāone tiputipu Goal 1: An innovative and growing city</p> <p>Whāinga 4: He tāone toitū, he tāone manawaroa Goal 4: A sustainable and resilient city</p>	
<p>The recommendations contribute to this plan:</p> <p>3. Mahere tūnuku</p> <p>3. Transport Plan</p> <p>The objective is: 1 Provide a safe, low carbon, integrated and multi-modal transport network.</p>	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	This project will enable the efficient and safe movement of freight around the city. This will help to relieve the impact that these movement have on the city.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. MRFRR Long List MCA Summary [↓](#) 
- 2. Short List Programme Option Maps [↓](#) 

MANAWATŪ REGIONAL FREIGHT RING ROAD

Indicative Business Case – Long List Technical Multi Criteria Analysis Summary Report

Palmerston North City Council

April 2026





COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Copyright ©. This copyright work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to Palmerston North City Council and abide by the other licence terms. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

DISCLAIMER

Palmerston North City Council has endeavoured to ensure material in this document is technically accurate and reflects legal requirements. However, the document does not override governing legislation. Palmerston North City Council does not accept liability for any consequences arising from the use of this document. If the user of this document is unsure whether the material is correct, they should refer directly to the relevant legislation and contact Palmerston North City Council.

MORE INFORMATION

Palmerston North City Council
Published April 2026

If you have further queries, call our contact centre on 0800 699 000 or write to us:

Palmerston North City Council
Private Bag 10034
Te Marae o Hine – The Square
Palmerston North 4442

This document is available on our website at www.pncc.govt.nz



DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document version history

Date	Version	Author	Changes
14/04/2026	Long List MCA Summary	GHD	

Document review

Role	Name	Review status

Related documents

Title of document	Version number	Location
Palmerston North Integrated Transport Initiative (PNITI)	Final	Palmerston North Integrated Transport (PNITI) - network options report
PNITI Recommended Programme Summary	Final	Palmerston North Integrated Transport (PNITI) - recommended programmer summary



Contents

Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road	1
1. Introduction	5
1.1. Scope and limitations	5
2. Long list technical MCA assessment.....	6
2.1. Section 1 – Ashhurst to Bunnythorpe	6
2.2. Section 2 – Bunnythorpe to Feilding.....	8
2.3. Section 3 – Bunnythorpe to Kairanga	10
2.4. Section 4 – Kairanga to SH57	11
2.5. Section 5 – SH57 to Summerhill Drive.....	13

1. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the long list technical Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) summary results for the Manawatū Regional Freight Ring Road (MRFRR) Indicative Business Case (IBC). It has been prepared as a stand-alone extract from the broader MRFRR IBC – Long List Report, at the request of Palmerston North City Council, to support focused review of the technical MCA outcomes only.

The information contained in this report is limited to the technical MCA results by corridor section and option, based on the assessment of efficiency and reliability, safety, indicative relative cost range, deliverability, and affordability. These results reflect the comparative technical performance of long list options relative to the Do Minimum at an early stage of the optioneering process.

Importantly, the technical MCA results presented in this document do not, on their own, determine which options are taken forward to the short list. Shortlisting decisions are informed by a broader and integrated assessment approach, which also includes community and stakeholder feedback, and the cultural assessment undertaken by Rangitāne o Manawatū. These additional inputs are documented and considered in the full Long List Report.

This extract should therefore be read in conjunction with the wider MRFRR IBC documentation, and not as a definitive statement of recommended options or programme direction.

1.1. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This report: has been prepared by GHD for Palmerston North City Council and may only be used and relied on by Palmerston North City Council for the purpose agreed between GHD and Palmerston North City Council as set out in section 1 of this report.

GHD otherwise disclaims responsibility to any person other than Palmerston North City Council arising in connection with this report. GHD also excludes implied warranties and conditions, to the extent legally permissible.

The services undertaken by GHD in connection with preparing this report were limited to those specifically detailed in the report and are subject to the scope limitations set out in the report.

The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on conditions encountered and information reviewed at the date of preparation of the report. GHD has no responsibility or obligation to update this report to account for events or changes occurring subsequent to the date that the report was prepared.

The opinions, conclusions and any recommendations in this report are based on assumptions made by GHD described in this report. GHD disclaims liability arising from any of the assumptions being incorrect.

ACCESSIBILITY OF DOCUMENTS

If this report is required to be accessible in any other format, this can be provided by GHD upon request and at an additional cost if necessary.

2. LONG LIST TECHNICAL MCA ASSESSMENT

This section summarises the technical MCA assessment of the long list options by corridor section. At this stage, the assessments were predominantly qualitative and based on technical judgement.

2.1. SECTION 1 – ASHHURST TO BUNNYTHORPE

The Section 1 Ashhurst to Bunnythorpe options assessment summary is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Section 1 - MCA Assessment Summary

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Do Minimum (present state)	0	0	0	0	0
Do Minimum (future state - 2054)	-1	-1	-	-	-
Option 1A – Existing route with intersection upgrades	1	1	\$\$\$	-1	-1
Option 1B – Short Street	2	2	\$\$\$\$	-3	-2
Option 1C – Napier Road to Ashhurst Road	1	-1	\$\$\$\$	-3	-2
Option 1D – Hacketts Road to Ashhurst Road	3	3	\$\$\$\$\$	-2	-3
Option 1E – Grade separation of SH3 and rail line	2	3	\$\$\$\$\$	-2	-3

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Option 1F – SH3 and Stoney Creek Road	-1	0	\$\$\$	-2	-2
Option 1G – Stoney Creek Road (zig zag connection)	-1	0	\$\$\$	-3	-2

A summary of the technical MCA assessments per option is outlined below.

- **Option 1A – Existing route with intersection upgrades:** Delivers modest efficiency and safety improvements over the Do Minimum through intersection and corridor upgrades, with relatively low cost and deliverability concerns, but limited transformational benefit.
- **Option 1B – Short Street:** Performs well for efficiency and safety due to a new, more direct connection and rail grade separation, but is constrained by higher cost and deliverability challenges due to property and constructability impacts.
- **Option 1C – Napier Road to Ashhurst Road:** Achieves moderate efficiency gains but performs poorly for safety and deliverability due to reliance on a new at-grade rail crossing, limiting its overall technical performance.
- **Option 1D – Hacketts Road to Ashhurst Road:** Strongest efficiency and safety benefits by bypassing urban areas and fully grade separating rail, though at high capital cost and with moderate deliverability risk.
- **Option 1E – Grade separation of SH3 and rail line:** Performs strongly for safety and efficiency through full grade separation, with similar benefits to Option 1D but slightly reduced efficiency due to routing, and high-cost implications.
- **Option 1F – SH3 and Stoney Creek Road:** Performs poorly overall due to indirect routing, continued interaction with urban areas, and limited ability to attract freight off Ashhurst Road, despite moderate cost.
- **Option 1G – Stoney Creek Road (zig-zag connection):** Lowest-performing option, with poor efficiency, safety, and deliverability outcomes driven by a long, indirect route and multiple intersections, offering little improvement over the Do Minimum.

2.2. SECTION 2 – BUNNYTHORPE TO FEILDING

The Section 2 Bunnythorpe to Feilding options assessment summary is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Section 2 - MCA Assessment Summary

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Do Minimum (present state)	0	0	0	0	0
Do Minimum (future state - 2054)	-1	-1	-	-	-
Option 2A – Ashhurst to Campbell Road upgrades with signalised crossing	1	0	\$\$	-1	-1
Option 2B – Ashhurst to Campbell Road upgrades with roundabout	0	-1	\$\$\$	-2	-1
Option 2C – Kairanga Bunnythorpe Road signals with Ashhurst to Dixon	1	0	\$\$\$\$	-2	-2
Option 2D – Southern and western at-grade bypass	1	-1	\$\$\$\$	-3	-2
Option 2E – Southern grade-separated bypass	2	2	\$\$\$\$\$	-2	-3
Option 2F – Stoney Creek Road bypass	2	2	\$\$\$\$\$	-2	-3

A summary of the technical MCA assessments per option is outlined below.

- **Option 2A – Ashhurst to Campbell Road upgrades with signalised crossing:** Provides small efficiency and safety improvements through incremental upgrades, with relatively low cost and good deliverability, but retains freight through Bunnythorpe.
- **Option 2B – Ashhurst to Campbell Road upgrades with roundabout:** Performs poorly due to operational and safety risks associated with a complex roundabout interacting with the rail corridor, with higher cost and deliverability risk than 2A.
- **Option 2C – Kairanga Bunnythorpe Road signals with Ashhurst to Dixon:** Delivers some efficiency benefits through new connectivity and intersection upgrades but retains urban freight movements and incurs higher cost and deliverability complexity.
- **Option 2D – Southern and western at-grade bypass:** Improves efficiency by partially bypassing Bunnythorpe but is constrained by safety and deliverability risks from a new at-grade rail crossing and new road requirements.
- **Option 2E – Southern grade-separated bypass:** Strong performer for efficiency and safety by removing freight from Bunnythorpe and grade separating rail, though with high capital cost and moderate deliverability challenges.
- **Option 2F – Stoney Creek Road bypass:** Similar technical performance to Option 2E, with good efficiency and safety outcomes, but higher cost and complexity due to additional new road sections and interfaces.

2.3. SECTION 3 – BUNNYTHORPE TO KAIRANGA

The Section 3 Bunnythorpe to Kairanga options assessment summary is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Section 3 - MCA Assessment Summary

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Do Minimum (present state)	0	0	0	0	0
Do Minimum (future state - 2054)	0	1	-	-	-
Option 3A - Kairanga School bypass with realignment	2	2	\$\$\$\$	-2	-1
Option 3B - Kairanga School bypass with realignment and Rongotea Road connection	3	3	\$\$\$\$	-2	-1
Option 3C - Kairanga Bunnythorpe Road and Rongotea Road intersection upgrade	1	2	\$\$\$	-1	-1

A summary of the technical MCA assessments per option is outlined below.

- **Option 3A – Kairanga School bypass with realignment:** Delivers improved efficiency and safety by removing freight from the school frontage, though with higher cost and deliverability risk due to new alignment and utility constraints.
- **Option 3B – Kairanga School bypass with realignment and Rongotea Road connection:** Best-performing option, providing strong efficiency and safety benefits through improved geometry and full bypass of the school area, albeit at higher cost.
- **Option 3C – Kairanga Bunnythorpe Road and Rongotea Road intersection upgrade:** Delivers modest safety and efficiency improvements at lower cost, with better deliverability than realignment options, but retains freight past the school.

2.4. SECTION 4 – KAIRANGA TO SH57

The Section 4 Kairanga to SH57 options assessment summary is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Section 4 – MCA Assessment Summary

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Do Minimum (present state)	0	0	0	0	0
Do Minimum (future state - 2054)	-1	-1	-	-	-
Option 4A - Northern Bridge - Shirriffs Road to Camp Road	3	1	\$\$\$\$	-2	-3
Option 4B - Central Bridge - Walkers Road to Camp Road	2	1	\$\$\$\$	-2	-3
Option 4C - Hybrid Central Bridge - Shirriffs Road to Walkers Road to Camp Road	3	1	\$\$\$\$	-2	-3
Option 4D - Southern Bridge – Karere Road to Akers Road	3	2	\$\$\$\$\$	-3	-3
Option 4E - Upgrade existing roads and SH56	0	0	\$\$\$	-1	-1
Option 4F - Central Bridge Walkers Road to Camp Road with Longburn Rongotea Road cut through	3	1	\$\$\$\$\$	-3	-3
Option 4G - Southern Bridge Jackeytown Road to Lochmoigh Road	1	0	\$\$\$\$\$	-3	-3

A summary of the technical MCA assessments per option is outlined below.

- **Option 4A – Northern Bridge (Shirriiffs Road to Camp Road):** Performs well for efficiency by providing a new river crossing and strong connectivity but has high capital cost and moderate deliverability challenges.
- **Option 4B – Central Bridge (Walkers Road to Camp Road):** Provides good efficiency and safety benefits from a new bridge, though slightly reduced performance compared to 4A due to additional intersection complexity on SH56.
- **Option 4C – Hybrid Central Bridge (Shirriiffs Road–Walkers Road–Camp Road):** Performs strongly for efficiency, similar to 4A, but with added complexity and comparable cost and deliverability risks.
- **Option 4D – Southern Bridge (Karere Road to Akers Road):** Strong efficiency and safety performance due to a direct southern connection, but with the high cost and significant deliverability complexity across jurisdictions and floodplains.
- **Option 4E – Upgrade existing roads and SH56:** Lowest-cost and most deliverable option, providing minimal efficiency and safety improvements without a new bridge, with limited transformational benefit.
- **Option 4F – Central Bridge with Longburn Rongotea Road cut-through:** High efficiency benefits through a new bridge and improved connectivity, but among the highest cost and deliverability.
- **Option 4G – Southern Bridge (Jackeytown Road to Lochmoigh Road):** Delivers some efficiency gains from a new bridge but performs less well than other bridge options due to indirect routing and high cost.

2.5. SECTION 5 – SH57 TO SUMMERHILL DRIVE

The Section 5 SH57 to Summerhill Drive options assessment summary is shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Section 5 - MCA Assessment Summary

Option	IO1 – Efficiency and reliability	IO2 - Safety	Indicative Relative Cost Range	Deliverability	Affordability
Do Minimum (present state)	0	0	0	0	0
Do Minimum (future state - 2054)	-2	-1	-	-	-
Option 5A - Upgrade SH57 and Old West Road	1	1	\$	-1	-1
Option 5B - Upgrade SH57 and Tennent Drive	-1	1	\$	-1	-1
Option 5C - Upgrade SH57 and Tennent Drive and Old West Road	2	2	\$	-1	-1

A summary of the technical MCA assessments per option is outlined below.

- **Option 5A – Upgrade SH57 and Old West Road:** Provides modest efficiency and safety improvements at low cost, with good deliverability and affordability.
- **Option 5B – Upgrade SH57 and Tennent Drive:** Improves local access but performs poorly for through-route efficiency and may encourage freight through urban areas, despite low cost.
- **Option 5C – Upgrade SH57, Tennent Drive and Old West Road:** Best-performing option in this section, delivering the strongest efficiency and safety outcomes by upgrading both corridors, with low cost and good deliverability.



REPORT

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Central Districts Water - Updated Shareholders' Agreement

PRESENTED BY: Chris Dyhrberg - Executive Director Central Districts Water

APPROVED BY: Waid Crockett, Chief Executive

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council, as a shareholder of Central Districts Water, approve the attached Shareholders' Agreement with the recommended amendments, and delegate to the Chief Executive to sign any documents required to approve the Shareholders' Agreement on behalf of Palmerston North City Council.
2. That Council delegate to the Chief Executive the ability to agree any minor, non-material changes to the Shareholders' Agreement prior to the final approval, and to report back to Council on any changes made under this delegation.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS ANALYSIS FOR

Problem or Opportunity	Approving the amendments to the Shareholders' Agreement enables Central Districts Water to become a signatory to the Shareholders' Agreement and allows for additional amendments to be made to the Agreement.
OPTION 1: (Recommended)	Approve the attached updated Shareholders' Agreement
Community Views	The three Council's three waters networks are strategic assets under their representative Significance and Engagement Policies. The Councils have consulted with their respective communities on the future service delivery model in line with the provisions in the Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024 and the Local Government Act 2002. No further community consultation or engagement is required to make the decisions recommended in this report.
Benefits	Aligns with the decisions the three Councils have made to date. Is consistent with the timeframes and commitments the Councils have made in their Joint Water Services Delivery Plan to establish the Water

	<p>Organisation.</p> <p>The amendments to the Shareholders’ Agreement give effect to agreements and understandings reached between partner Councils and Iwi.</p> <p>Provides the governance framework for effective delivery across the three Council areas.</p>
Risks	No known risks.
Financial	None.
OPTION 2:	Do not approve the attached updated Shareholders’ Agreement
Community Views	<p>The three Councils’ three waters networks are strategic assets under their representative Significance and Engagement Policies. The Councils have consulted with their respective communities on the future service delivery model in line with the provisions in the Local Government (Water Services Preliminary Arrangements) Act 2024 and the Local Government Act 2002.</p> <p>No further community consultation or engagement is required to make the decisions recommended in this report.</p>
Benefits	No known benefits.
Risks	<p>Does not align with the decisions which the three Councils have made to date.</p> <p>Does not deliver on the timeframes and commitments the Councils made in the Water Services Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Does not meet the agreements and understandings reached with partner Councils and with iwi.</p>
Financial	None.

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM OR OPPORTUNITY

- 1.1 The Shareholders’ Agreement is one of the principal foundation documents for the Horowhenua District Council, Palmerston North City Council and Rangitikei District Council in establishing the joint Water Services Council-Controlled Organisation, Central Districts Water Ltd.
- 1.2 The three Councils are being asked to approve the updated version of the Shareholders’ Agreement to allow for Central Districts Water to be a signatory and to incorporate additional changes.

2. BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS COUNCIL DECISIONS

- 2.1 As part of the development of the foundation documents for the establishment of Central Districts Water (CDW), a Shareholders' Agreement was drafted and approved by Horowhenua District Council, Palmerston North City Council, and Rangitīkei District Council in December 2025. This was completed by Palmerston North City Council at the Council Meeting on 10 December 2025.
- 2.2 The Shareholders' Agreement includes sections that establish the Shareholders' Committee and set its terms of reference. The Shareholder's Committee is a Joint Committee established under the Local Government Act 2002, which requires the member councils to formally agree to its establishment and set its terms of reference.
- 2.3 It was always intended that CDW become a party to the Shareholders' Agreement. Now that the Shareholders Committee has been established, the Board has been appointed and CDW has been incorporated, a new version of the Shareholders' Agreement has been prepared that allows for CDW to become a signatory. In addition, there are other changes set out below, that are also required, which are proposed to be incorporated in the same version.
- 2.4 These proposed amendments were also presented at a combined Elected Member workshop held on 8 April.

3. CONTEXT FOR CHANGES TO THE SHAREHOLDERS AGREEMENT

- 3.1 The proposed changes to the Shareholders' Agreement fall into four areas set out below. Simpson Grierson have also provided a summary of changes in the table attached as **Attachment A**, which includes clause references that may be helpful with finding the changes in the marked up draft Shareholders' Agreement, which is attached as **Attachment B**.

Changes required to make CDW a party to the Shareholders' Agreement:

- 3.2 These changes are not material and update the document to allow for CDW to be a signatory. There are a number of places where the previous wording anticipated the incorporation of CDW, which have been changed to reflect a post-incorporation context.

Fixing a technical non-compliance with the joint appointment of the three mana whenua representatives to the Shareholders' Committee:

- 3.3 The original Shareholders' Agreement sets out that each shareholder will appoint three members to the Shareholders' Committee. At least one, and no more than two, being an Elected Member and one being a mana whenua representative. In addition, there is also a non-voting independent Chair appointed by the Shareholders' Committee itself.
- 3.4 When the original Shareholders' Agreement was signed by the three shareholding councils, the intent was that Nga Tapūwae o Hau would make three nominations, one to each council. The three councils would then confirm these nominations when they made their appointments to the Shareholders' Committee. However, when it came time for Nga Tapūwae o Hau to make the nominations they encountered difficulties attributing each member to a specific council. In the end, it was agreed by the three councils that the nominations could be made as one block of three, which would then be appointed to the Shareholders' Committee jointly by all three shareholding councils.
- 3.5 This meant that, while the intent of the requirement to appoint three mana whenua representatives across the three councils was achieved, the process was not technically in accordance with the Shareholders' Agreement. At that time, this was accepted by the three Shareholding Councils as a minor technical non-compliance that could be corrected by updating the Shareholders' Agreement to allow for the method of nomination and appointment that was used.

Changes to the Shareholders' Committee Terms of Reference:

- 3.6 At the first meeting of the Shareholders' Committee, it was agreed that two changes to the Terms of Reference would be made. Any changes to the Terms of Reference is required to be made by updating the Shareholders' Agreement.
- 3.7 The first change is to update the quorum of the meeting to require that at least one mana whenua representative, in addition to one member from each shareholding council, be present for there to be a quorum.
- 3.8 The second change is to add to the Shareholders' Committee responsibilities to include: 'engaging with the company on behalf of the Shareholders' Committee in relation to how the Company shall engage with mana whenua to give effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi and its principles and establish and implement its Te Ao Māori framework'.

Updating provisions relating to guarantees to be provided by the shareholding councils:

- 3.9 At the time the original Shareholders' Agreement was signed, it wasn't clear what the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA) standard terms would require in relation to guarantee provisions. The original Shareholders' Agreement was drafted

so the guarantee in favour of LGFA would be given in proportion to the shareholding of each shareholder.

- 3.10 Since then, during the LGFA’s negotiations with other water entities, it has been confirmed that LGFA want the guarantee to be in proportion to each shareholding council’s proportion of drinking water connections. This change does not make a significant change to the proportions for each council. The shareholding proportions are PNCC 65%, HDC 25%, and RDC 10%, and the drinking water proportions are PNCC 66%, HDC 25%, and RDC 9%. The advantage of using drinking water connections is that it will adjust for growth over time, whereas the shareholding proportion is not expected to change unless a new council is added to CDW.
- 3.11 The CDW Establishment Team have worked with PwC and Simpson Grierson on the proposed treasury arrangements for CDW and debt transfer methodology. It has been recommended that CDW should also be able to borrow from non-LGFA lenders. LGFA have confirmed that the guarantee structure they require is only in respect of LGFA’s lending and cannot be extended to other parties. To ensure CDW has the option to retain the flexibility of alternative financing from non-LGFA lenders, councils are required to sign an additional global guarantee for any non-LGFA lenders.

4. NEXT ACTIONS



- 4.1 The Board of Central Districts Water approved the new Shareholders’ Agreement at their first Board meeting on 8 April 2026. All three shareholding councils are considering these documents at meetings in April and May 2026.
- 4.2 Following approval of the updated Shareholders’ Agreement by each Council, the Shareholders’ Committee will continue to work to provide oversight of the Central Districts Water Board to support the establishment of Central Districts Water and work towards an operational day one of 1 July 2027.

5. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does the Council have delegated authority to decide?	Yes
Are the decisions significant?	Yes
If they are significant do they affect land or a body of water?	Yes
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 objectives?	Yes
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?	No
The recommendations contribute to:	

<p>Whāinga 4: He tāone toitū, he tāone manawaroa Goal 4: A sustainable and resilient city</p>	
<p>The recommendations contribute to this plan:</p> <p>13. Mahere wai 13. Water Plan</p> <p>The objective is:</p> <p>Plan, develop, maintain, upgrade and provide stormwater infrastructure to manage capacity and accommodate growth;</p> <p>Plan, develop, maintain, upgrade and renew water infrastructure;</p> <p>Plan, develop, maintain, upgrade and provide wastewater infrastructure to manage capacity and accommodate growth.</p>	
<p>Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being</p>	<p>Council has resolved to form a joint WS-CCO with Horowhenua District Council and Rangitikei District Council, which will be able to borrow funds without affecting Councils balance sheet. A WS-CCO is a more affordable delivery model for delivering 3 Waters services to the community. The jointly submitted WSDP, which details the strategic direction for the establishment of the WS-CCO has been approved by the DIA.</p>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment A - SHA - Summary of Changes [↓](#) 
2. Attachment B - SHA - Compare (30 March 26 vs 2 Dec 25)(43766162.1) [↓](#)


MEMORANDUM

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Reappointment of Trustees/Directors on Council Controlled Organisations

PRESENTED BY: Hannah White, Manager Governance

APPROVED BY: Cameron McKay, General Manager Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION(S) TO COUNCIL

1. That Council extend Murray Georgel’s term on the Palmerston North Airport Ltd Board until 31 December 2027.
2. That Council reappoint Sarah Everton to the Palmerston North Airport Ltd Board for a term of up to three years until August 2029, to support the terminal redevelopment project and continuity of board knowledge at the retirement of the Chair.
3. That Council advertise for up to two roles for the Regent Theatre Trust Board and one role for the Globe Theatre Trust Board.

1. ISSUE

To commence the appointment process of Trustees/Directors to the following Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) and Council Controlled Trading Organisations (CCTOs):

CC(T)O	Retiring	Board requests re-appointment	Reason	Council appointments	Total Board positions ¹	Total for Council to fill
Palmerston North Airport Limited (PNAL)	Murray Georgel (Chair)	Yes	End of term (October 2026)	5	5	2
	Sarah Everton	Yes	End of term (August 2026)			
Globe	Russell	No	End of term	4	6	1

¹ Total includes ordinary Council-appointed members and co-opted Board members.

CC(T)O	Retiring	Board requests re-appointment	Reason	Council appointments	Total Board positions ¹	Total for Council to fill
Theatre Trust	Harris		(August 2026)			
Regent Theatre Trust	Tania Kopytko	Yes	End of term (November 2026)	6	10	2
	Simon Ferry	Yes	End of term (June 2026)			

Current Trustees/Directors are as follows:

CC(T)O	Council appointed Trustees	Co-opted Trustees
Palmerston North Airport Limited (PNAL)	Murray Georgel (Chair) Sarah Everton Chris Cardwell Shelly Mitchell-Jenkins Russell Wilson	None
Globe Theatre Trust	John Adams (Chair) Chris Wilson Mikel O’Connell Russell Harris	Ralph Sheppard Georgiana Taylor
Regent Theatre Trust	David Lea (Chair) Tania Kopytko Simon Ferry Mark Mabbett Kane Parsons Neil Ulrich	Tessa Lyons Reihana Haronga Amy Cheung-Rhodes Rhia Taonui
Te Manawa Museums Trust	Geoffrey Jameson (Chair) Chris Gallavin Gillian Lawn Simon Barnett Sarah Rusholme	Peter Te Rangi (Tangata Whenua appointment) Terry Hapi (Tangata Whenua appointment) Carol Thum

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The [Appointment of Directors and Trustees Policy 2022](#) ('the Policy') outlines the process for Council appointments to CCOs/CCTOs. The Policy's expectation is that all Board vacancies will be advertised, unless there are exceptional circumstances to reappoint expressed by the Board that are accepted by Council.
- 2.2 Exceptional circumstances is a high threshold. Whilst the Policy does not specifically define exceptional circumstances, Council's Appointment of Directors Policy for the Central Economic Development Agency (CEDA) describes exceptional circumstances as including, '*such things as when CEDA is in the midst of a major project where continuity of the existing directors is accepted by the Council as a critical factor for the success of the project.*'
- 2.3 As per the Policy, if a Board Chair recommends reappointment of a rotating member, Officers bring a report to Council seeking Council's decision as to whether to reappoint the retiring member or to advertise the position.
- 2.4 Four Board Members (who will complete their respective terms this year) have indicated their interest in reappointment. Council Officers have received letters from PNAL and the Regent Theatre Trust which support the reappointment of their Board members. These are included as Attachments 1 and 2 for Council's consideration.
- 2.5 No letter of recommendation was received from the Board of the Globe Theatre Trust. The Board Chair has indicated the Trustee reaching the end of their term this year will not be seeking reappointment. Therefore, Council will be advertising for this position.

3. COMMENTARY ON PNAL BOARD'S REASONS TO REAPPOINT

- 3.1 The PNAL Board requests the extension of Murray Georgel's term. Murray's initial term was only two years at his own request. He is keen to steward the Terminal Redevelopment project to completion and is happy to continue for the further year. An extension to 31 December 2027 would be within the maximum term length allowed for in the Company's constitution. 'With the company in the midst of the terminal development and a number of other projects and plans either underway or under consideration, continuation of Murray's stewardship and leadership is welcomed. Extension of his term allows the existing good working relationships with the Chief Executive, Mayor, Council and other external parties to continue over this crucial period of time, and for PNAL to make best use of his extensive commercial and company knowledge and experience.'
- 3.2 The PNAL Board requests the reappointment of Sarah Everton as 'the Board requires governance experience, particularly with regards to infrastructure ownership,

commercial development and financial acumen. Sarah has all of these attributes already, and has gained specific knowledge and skills around the activities of Palmerston North Airport Limited. These not only assist with the company in its immediate ambitions, but will also become more pertinent in terms of continuity after Murray Georgel retires at the end of 2027.’

- 3.3 The Terminal Redevelopment Project is scheduled to be completed by December 2027. Officers agree with the Board that the success of the terminal redevelopment project would benefit from the continuity of directors, and consider securing the success of this project meets the definition of an ‘exceptional circumstance.’ Since Murray has been a board member since October 2015 and the Chair since December 2016, continuity in the transition is critical.
- 3.4 Officers recommend that Council forego advertising – extending Murray Georgel’s term and reappointing Sarah Everton to the Palmerston North Airport Limited Board.

4. OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

- 4.1 The Board of the Regent Theatre Trust has listed various reasons for supporting the reappointment of their current members, yet ‘exceptional circumstances’ suggests more than experience/knowledge of the role. On this basis, Officers recommend that Council advertises for the two available Board positions on the Regent Theatre Trust, noting that the Policy does not preclude any of the retiring Board members re-applying for the positions and demonstrating their understanding of the role and the usefulness of their skills to the Board make-up.
- 4.2 The Board of the Globe has noted their member whose term is expiring is not seeking to continue.

5. NEXT STEPS



- 5.1 The boards will be informed of Council’s decision regarding appointment or commencement of a recruitment process. Retiring members will be encouraged to apply. Letters of thanks will be sent to those stepping down.
- 5.2 Vacancies will be advertised in one recruitment round in May and term lengths varied to group the ends of terms and allow for future efficiencies.
- 5.3 Te Manawa will next be considered in 2027, when there are terms up for expiry.

6. COMPLIANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Does Council 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 objectives?	Yes
Are the recommendations inconsistent with any of Council’s policies or plans?	No
<p>The recommendations contribute to:</p> <p>Whāinga 1: He tāone auaha, he tāone tiputipu Goal 1: An innovative and growing city</p> <p>Whāinga 2: He tāone whakaihihi, tapatapahi ana Goal 2: A creative and exciting city</p>	
<p>The recommendations contribute to this plan:</p> <p>14. Mahere mana urungi, kirirarautanga hihiri 14. Governance and Active Citizenship Plan</p> <p>The objective is: Review Governance systems and structures.</p>	
Contribution to strategic direction and to social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being	By carefully considering appointments, Council will ensure that there is effective representation within the Council Organisations in which the Council has a financial interest or strategic interest. This will contribute to the desired outcome of an effective and responsible Council that excels in good governance.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Palmerston North Airport Limited_Letters of Support [↓](#) 
2. Regent Theatre Trust_Letter of Support [↓](#) 

COMMITTEE WORK SCHEDULE

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Council Work Schedule

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That Council receive its Work Schedule dated 22 April 2026.

COUNCIL WORK SCHEDULE APRIL 2026

#	Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction & Clause
	22 April 2026	Appointment to Age Friendly Palmerston North	GM Corporate Services		3-Dec-2025 Clause 194-25
	22 April 2026	Manawatū Ring Road Business Case – Update and Short list of options	GM Strategic Planning	-	-
	22 April 2026	Hearings for the Annual Budget 2026	Chief Executive	-	Terms of Reference
1	27 May 2026	Civic and Cultural Precinct Master Plan Steering Group - 6-monthly update	GM Strategic Planning	To incorporate material from April stakeholder workshop	Terms of Reference of the CCMP Steering Group
2	27 May 2026	Review of PNCC Appointment of Directors Policy.	GM Corporate Services	Not a post-election priority.	2 Oct 2024 Clause 172
3	27 May 2026	Elected Members Expenses Policy	GM Corporate Services	Reviewing feedback from Feb Workshop	Terms of Reference
4	27 May 2026	Food HQ Director’s Company Progress Report	Deputy Chief Executive		Moved from Finance 13 April
5	6 May 2026	Deliberations on the Annual Budget 2026-27	Chief Executive	Including Fees and Charges (consulted on)	Terms of Reference
6	27 May 2026	Remits received from other Territorial Authorities	GM Corporate Services	None received	Terms of Reference

#	Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction & Clause
7	27 May 2026	Wastewater Treatment Plant -Nature Calls: Quarterly Report	GM Infrastructure		Terms of Reference
8	27 May 2026	Arena 5 Development Six Monthly Update	GM Infrastructure	Delayed to reconsider options.	Council 12 Feb 2025 Clause 24-25
9	3 June 2026	Adopt Annual Plan (Budget) 2026-27	Chief Executive		Terms of Reference
10	3 June 2026	Adoption of Fees and Charges following consultation (Trade Waste/ Planning)	GM Corporate Services	Consider alongside Annual Budget 12 Feb	Terms of Reference
11	3 June 2026	Approve Borrowing for 26-27	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
12	3 June 2026	Set the Rates for 2026-27	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
13	24 June 2026	Aokautere Business Case	GM Strategic Planning		3 Sept 2025 Clause 168-25
14	24 June 2026	Parking Contract Review Update - Frog Parking	GM Infrastructure	Following specialist staff recruitment	Council 4 Sept 2024 Clause 156-24
15	24 June 2026	Deliberation and Adoption of Public Spaces Bylaw – Electoral Signage.	GM Strategic Planning		
16	24 June 2026	Agree draft Future Development (FDS) Strategy 2026 for consultation	GM Strategic Planning		Council 28 June 2023 Clause 109-23
17	24 June 2026	Adopt amended Triennial Agreement	GM Corporate Services	If changes are recommended by Mayoral Forum.	Terms of Reference
18	26 August 2026	Appointment of Trustees on Council Controlled Organisations	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
19	30 Sept 2026	Appointment of Community Members to the District Licensing Committee	GM Corporate Services	Appointments by Nov.	Terms of Reference
20	30 Sept 2026	Hearings Commissioners List 2027-2030 - Appointment of external commissioners	GM Corporate Services	Appoint before 30 Nov 2026	6 Dec 2023 Clause 204-23
21	30 Sept 2026	Adopt Annual Report 2025/26	GM Corporate Services		<u>Terms of Reference</u>

#	Report Date	Subject	Officer Responsible	Current Position	Date of Instruction & Clause
22	30 Sept 2026	2026 Residents Survey Results	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
23	28 Oct 2026	Adopt Future Development Strategy (FDS) 2026	GM Strategic Planning		Terms of Reference
24	25 Nov 2026	Appointment of CEDA Directors	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
25	31 March 2027	Remits from PNCC for consideration	GM Corporate Services		Terms of Reference
26	TBC	Nature Calls – Agree revised BPO	GM Infrastructure		Council 29 May 2024 Clause 95.11 - 25 (rec 2)
27	TBC	Local Water Done Well - Assets and Liability Assessment	GMs Infrastructure and Corporate Services.		Terms of Reference

Proactive Release of Confidential Decisions

Date of meeting	Report Title	Released	Withheld

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Presentation of the Part I Public Finance, Performance & Audit Committee Recommendations from its 1 April 2026 Meeting

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Finance, Performance & Audit Committee meeting Part I Public held on 1 April 2026. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

18-26 Draft Speed Management Plan - deliberations on submissions and adoption
Report, presented by Peter Ridge, Manager Strategy and Policy.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council adopt the Final Draft Palmerston North Speed Management Plan 2026 (Attachment 1).
2. That the Chief Executive is given delegated authority to approve the Final Draft Palmerston North Speed Management Plan 2026 (Attachment 1), to include the revised technical maps and text descriptions of the proposed speed limit changes, as described in the document in Attachment 1.
3. That Council endorse the analysis of issues raised in submissions (Attachment 2), to be used as the basis for providing responses to submitters.
4. That the Palmerston North Speed Limits Bylaw 2020 is revoked.

23-26 Traffic situation and calming options for Ascot and Pahiatua Streets
Report, presented by Glen O'Connor, Acting General Manager Infrastructure.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council install a mid-block pedestrian refuge island on Ascot Street near the intersection with Pahiatua Street (option 2).

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEE

TO: Council

MEETING DATE: 22 April 2026

TITLE: Presentation of the Part I Public Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee Recommendations from its 15 April 2026 Meeting

Set out below are the recommendations only from the Arts, Culture & Heritage Committee meeting Part I Public held on 15 April 2026. The Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt any such recommendations. (SO 2.18.1)

11-26 Caccia Birch Masterplan

Memorandum, presented by John Lynch, Manager Venues + Events and Kris Herman / James Marsh, Local Collective Architects.

The **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

1. That Council adopt the Caccia Birch Masterplan to guide future development of the grounds and inform future Long-term Plan processes.