

Medium Density Plan Change – PC:I - Summary Statement

David Charnley - Landscape

- [1] Since 2022 my role within Plan Change I: Increasing Housing Choice and Supply (“PC:I”) has involved defining the extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone (“MRZ”), producing visual materials to support consultation on proposed MRZ standards, preparing both s 32 and s 42A landscape reports, and contributing to the refinement of MRZ landscape-related provisions.
- [2] My s 32 report comprised analysing residential infill patterns in Palmerston North through desktop sampling and site observation, assessing the relevance of Medium Density Residential Standards (“MDRS”) landscape standards, identifying landscape related matters relevant to medium density housing and providing recommendations for informing MRZ landscape related standards.
- [3] Submissions received relating to landscape have been broadly categorised under the following themes:
- (a) Extent of the proposed MRZ;
 - (b) Vegetation and Landscaping (MRZ-P12);
 - (c) Landscape area (MRZ-S5);
 - (d) Percentage of Landscaped areas (MRZ-S5 (1) & MRZ-S5 (2)); and
 - (e) Specimen Trees (MRZ-S5(3) & MRZ-S5(4))
- [4] Responding to submission points relating to the extent of the MRZ and landscape related provisions (MRZ-P12 & MRZ-S5) the key conclusions of my s 42A report are:
- (a) Sampling and general observations within my s 32 landscape technical report highlight vegetation loss, reduction in permeable open space and contribution to street frontage quality and visual interest from residential development in Palmerston North.
 - (b) The important landscape related attributes to address within the proposed MRZ are:
 - (i) the retention of permeable open space;
 - (ii) minimising vegetation loss and retention of existing vegetation;
 - (iii) utilising landscaping to provide ecosystem benefits; and
 - (iv) frontage quality and visual interest.

(c) Recommending further amendments to MRZ-P12 and MRZ-S5

[5] Amendments to MRZ-P12 and MRZ-S5 have been made to improve their clarity of interpretation and effectiveness. Specifically:

(a) Include the wording 'where possible' within MRZ-P12(a) to reflect the practical site specific or development constraints on vegetation retention.

(b) Clarify MRZ-P12(b) to indicate a preference for indigenous and locally sourced plant species.

(c) Adding additional clause MRZ-P12(c) that promotes vegetation ecosystem benefits including improved soil, air and water quality, stormwater regulation, temperature moderation and biodiversity.

(d) Amend MRZ-S5(3) to read as four meters after ten years to align with advice provided in my technical report and improve consistency with specimen tree performance standards found elsewhere in the Operative District Plan.

[6] On the 25th August, I met with Mr Teo-Sherrell to further discuss points relating to my s 42A report and other MRZ provisions related to landscape. Specifically:

(a) the reason for the 20% landscaped area (MRZ-S5(1));

(b) street frontage vegetation height to support increased visibility between street and building (MRZ-S5(2));

(c) the use of permeable paving to meet 30% permeable surface (MRZ-S9); and

(d) Location of above ground attenuation tanks and interpretation of the wording 'above ground' (MRZ-S10).

[7] As a result of this meeting, I am not recommending any further changes.

Dated: 29 August 2025