

**From:** Doug Kidd <dkidd@xtra.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Monday, 19 May 2025 7:37 am  
**To:** Susana Figlioli  
**Subject:** RosemaryWatsonSupplementHearingPresentationMay25 - Hi Susana, Please table this e-mail to accompany my oral presentation at the hearing, thank you, Rosemary Watson\_and\_Kidd\_RoxburghfeedbackDec22.docx; Agenda of Strategy & Finance Committee - Wednesday, 22 March 2023 - Report Item 15.pdf; Public comment re agenda item 15, \_Part Waterloo Park - Proposal to exchange land \_- upcoming Strategy & Finance Committee meeting.pdf; RoxburghTilburyfoodmap.pdf; Personal speech for hearing.docx; Petitionspeech.docx; Draft Plan Change E\_ Roxburgh Crescent Residential Area - timing of recent mailout etc..pdf; Draft Plan Change E - Roxburgh Crescent - feedback.pdf; Waterloo Park - Land Exchange Proposal Decision - comment.pdf; Pictures\_WaterlooLabourDayandPumpkins.docx; Notice of motion - Monday, 18 December 2023.pdf; Notice of motionRW reply.docx; 20240202 - Letter from Tangi Utikere.pdf

**Rosemary Watson**  
**Presentation to RMA Hearing**  
**of**  
**PNCC Proposed Plan Change E : Roxburgh Residential Area hearing**  
**20 May 2025**

**References and Supplementary Information**

Introduction

This document is intended to accompany my oral presentation.

It contains extra information and references, to be taken as part of my overall submission to the hearing panel.

I have tried to provide 'live' links where possible, either in the main body text or as e-mail attachments. Apologies where I have been unable to do this successfully, mostly due to my unfamiliarity with the technicalities involved.

I have deliberately not given live links to the LGOIMA requests I mention, as I am unsure of my authority to release these documents publicly. Instead I have just quoted the PNCC LGOIMA request reference numbers.

Personal e-mails have been converted into .pdf format and placed as attachments to this main e-mail, where possible.

References R1, R2 etc. below refer to those in brackets in the written version of my oral presentation, and give either a link to the item or the title of the e-mail attachment.

References

- R1. [Industrial land in residential suburb tipped for riverside housing | Stuff](#)
- R2. Feedback, via e-mail 9/12/22 to Tara Lennard PNCC, file (renamed for clarity) as attached
- R3. [Meeting Minutes from 22 March 2023](#)
- R4. [Report Item 15 from meeting agenda 22 March 2023](#)
- R5. [Public comment presentation, pre-submitted to Councillors, first of 2 parts](#)
- R6. [Public comment presentation, pre-submitted to Councillors as part of above e-mail, second of 2 parts](#)
- R7. [Hokowhitu residents want to love their threatened slice of reserve | Stuff.co.nz](#)
- R8. Meeting agenda, see [Item 8 \(Submissions\)](#) and [Item 9 \(Summary of submissions\)](#)
- R9. Personal speech at Reserve exchange hearing, file attached  
(Personal speech for hearing.docx)
- R10. Petition speech at Reserve exchange hearing, file attached  
(Petitionspeech.docx)
- R11. E-mail letter to CEO, file as attached  
(Draft Plan Change E\_ Roxburgh Crescent Residential Area - timing of recent mailout etc..pdf)
- R12. Feedback to Draft Plan Dec 23, e-mail, file as attached  
(Draft Plan Change E - Roxburgh Crescent - feedback.pdf)
- R13. E-mail to Councillors before 15/11/23 meeting, file attached  
(Waterloo Park - Land Exchange Proposal Decision - comment.pdf)
- R14. Picture files from above e-mail to Councillors, converted to single document file as attached  
(Pictures\_WaterlooLabourDayandPumpkins.docx)
- R15. [Battle for Waterloo almost won in Palmerston North | Stuff.co.nz](#)
- R16. [Notice of Motion from 18/12/23 meeting agenda](#)
- R17. E-mail to Councillors re above Notice of Motion, file attached  
(Notice of motionRW reply.docx)
- R18. [Palmerston North's Battle of Waterloo decided by a surprise offensive | Stuff.co.nz](#)

- R19. [Council meeting 18/12/23 video, Part A, item starts approx. 15:30 minutes into running time](#)
- R20. [Frances Holdings Ltd \(Paul Thomas\) Roxburgh Crescent Reserve Classification hearing submission](#)
- R21. [FHL prehearing meeting minute - see structure plan actions](#)
- R22. [Waterloo Park Land Exchange Proposal Decision](#)
- R23. [Aaron Phillips s42A evidence](#)
- R24. [Bird management plan](#)
- R25. LGOIMA 996075
- R26. LGOIMA 998635
- R27. LGOIMA SRC0152570
- R28. LGOIMA SRC0150279
- R29. [Strategy and Finance meeting 15/11/23 video, Part A, item starts approx. 1:47:00 into running time](#)
- R30. Tangi Utikere letter to Minister, file attached  
(20240202 - Letter from Tangi Utikere.pdf)

#### Supplementary information

#### **Some comments on the Council's Reserve exchange public consultation process**

- As outlined in section 22 of my main presentation, the decision to proceed with the Reserve exchange, as per the tabled Notice of Motion, was made at the full Council meeting on 18/12/23. That final decision was made with an 8 in favour and 7 against vote, the closest margin possible, which followed a similar (8 in favour, 7 against) vote to not uphold the 15/11/23 decision. The voting at the 15/11/23 Strategy and Finance meeting was 5 for and 8 against the original Reserve exchange motion, and then a 10 to 2 ( plus 1 abstention) vote in favour of Option 3, retaining the existing Reserve *in situ*, with a new link into the RRA at the current dead-end of the buffer strip, to create a through path (R22), in support of the public interest in a future community orchard. We were delighted by this initial stage result, and about the congratulatory e-mails I received afterwards from the Mayor and the Committee chairperson (pers.comms, from official PNCC contact addresses). The final outcome was thus a huge disappointment. The community came into

the whole exchange process without any preconceived expectations about 'winning', and it was the 'turnaround', and the way that happened, that were the most upsetting parts.

- I am aware that full Council has the right to adopt, amend, or not adopt a recommendation from a Council Committee, and also that a Councillor has the right to bring a Notice of Motion to the Council if certain criteria are met. The Notice of Motion in this case is essentially similar to the first motion that failed on 15/11/23, with no new information except the final clauses a) to d), and is undated. (The 6/12/23 Council meeting agenda, when the Committee recommendation was originally scheduled for debate, contained no such Notice of Motion, just the recommendation.) The new information clauses all relate to the 'major landowner' in some way, yet, as pointed out in part 23 of my main presentation, FHL and/or its representatives did not submit to the earlier formal land exchange public consultation. Is this situation right or fair?
- Setting aside its content, the timing of the presentation of the Notice of Motion is interesting. At the 18/12/23 meeting, in response to a Councillor's questions about when the Notice of Motion was presented, the answer was "Ten days prior." ... "To this agenda." (R19). It is not clear whether this refers to working days, or calendar days, or to the date of the actual meeting, or the release of the meeting agenda on 13/12/23. None of these seem to tie in with information received later, from various LGOIMA requests (R25, R26, R27), which tells me that:
  - i) there was notification by the Chair to the CE, verbally, on 6/12/23, of the Councillor's intention to put an alternative motion, at approximately 5.15 pm, after closure of the Council meeting that day
  - ii) the CE received the signatures to the Notice of Motion on 13/12/23, the same day the agenda for the 18/12/23 meeting was released
  - iii) the minutes of a Roxburgh project meeting between PNCC Officers and FHL representatives, held in the afternoon of 13/12/23, note "Final decision on swap has been deferred to Monday - there will potentially be a motion to revisit..." The inclusion of the word 'potentially' appears to indicate that either the Notice of Motion had not been presented at that stage, and/or that at that time the agenda for the Council meeting had not yet been formally released.
- Standing order 2.7.1 states that "Notices of motion must be in writing signed by the mover, stating the meeting at which it is proposed that the notice of motion be considered, and must be delivered to the Chief Executive at least seven working days before such meeting." Standing order 2.25.1 relates specifically to Repeat Notices of Motion and states "When a motion has been considered and rejected by the Council or a committee, no similar notice of motion which, in the opinion of the Chairperson, may be accepted within the next six months, unless signed by not less than one third of all members, including vacancies.". From this, it would appear that a compliant, *i.e.* signed and in writing, repeat Notice of Motion was not provided to the CE with the required amount of notice.
- PNCC governance and legal teams "believe the purpose of 2.7.1 was met" and that "there is no issue with the decision making" (R28). However to the layperson considering all the above, the process which resulted in the 'turnaround' might be seen as somewhat flawed in certain aspects, not best practice and possibly breaching official PNCC procedure and principles of natural justice; and if that were so, what might the forward implications be?
- Several of the Councillors at the 18/12/23 meeting, and afterwards, apparently also thought there to be poor process involved. Some of their comments include: "I'm a little uncomfortable to be honest about what it says about our consultation processes as a Council"; "we should be ashamed if that is the process we have undertaken"; "that is a reason for us to have a long hard look at ourselves at how we consult with the community"; "this attempt for a 11<sup>th</sup>-hour reversal with a you know Notice of Motion coming from an unnamed developer has got to be uh one of the worst examples of local government decision-making on record"; "We are applying different rules to different parties in our process that is a flagrant breach of section 82 of the Local Government Act but also of the principles of natural justice and the right to a fair hearing, which requires that all parties have equal access to the relevant material and information and as a decision maker I certainly expect to have all of that information"; "we now have a motion in front of us that asks us to disregard months of our own procedure, reverse the recommendation that's been based on transparent evidence, submissions, debate and deliberations and to do that on the basis of four

unsubstantiated bullet points, so I am objecting to this motion because there is no action that we could take now which would more truly show our hearing and consultation processes to be completely bogus, than this does”; “what I won't vote for today is this inference, gossip, innuendo, that is being brought into the chamber. I feel that that's inappropriate to our processes um we engaged with the community in good faith”, and “It is fair to say I was not proud to be an elected member after yesterday’s “about-face” by eight of my councillor colleagues”. Even the press reporter there told me “It really was a bad look!”.

- So, if you want to understand the Council’s final Reserve exchange decision better, please don’t just read the Agenda and Minutes of the 18/12/23 Council meeting, as suggested by Mr. Phillips (R23). Please watch the relevant part of the video of the Council meeting (R19) from a Maybe consider also watching the earlier debate from the 15/11/23 meeting (R29).
- Whilst community members were investigating the ‘poor process’, and, ultimately unsuccessfully, seeking legal assistance via Te Ara Ture, the Council’s application to DoC to approve the Reserve exchange was proceeding. Several of us met with our local M.P. Tangi Utikere, previously a PNCC Councillor and deputy Mayor, to discuss our concerns about the PNCC process. In light of those concerns, he wrote to the Minister of Conservation on our behalf and asked for consideration of the appropriateness of continuing to process the Council’s application while we were still doing our fact-finding (R30). We were advised there would be no delay to proceedings. I followed the progress of the Council’s DoC application as best I could via LGOIMA requests (refs). The request processing times meant I was always at least a month or so behind the times. One of the requests revealed an e-mail written to DoC in January 2023, a year before the official application and three months before public notification of the Reserve exchange, expressing Council’s desire for “some certainty around the likelihood of the proposed exchange...”. To me this appears once more as if there was no consideration of the possibility that public input would influence the Reserve exchange going ahead, and that DoC approval was seen as the only potential hurdle.
- After a reluctant start on their part, I also engaged with DoC directly to express my concerns about the procedures which led to the Council’s decision, and they did ask the Council for more information in light of this. However, on behalf of the Minister of Conservation, DoC approved the Council’s application in July last year.

And thus, the Reserve situation we have today was reached...

## **Roxburgh Crescent residential area development (Palmerston North Plan Change E) - feedback**

Rosemary Watson and Doug Kidd  
27 Tilbury Avenue, Hokowhitu, Palmerston North 4410

Supplement to, and to be read in conjunction with, on-line feedback form  
Prepared on 8/12/22  
Please note we are direct neighbours of the proposed development.  
Please note we recognise the need for more housing per se.

### **1) Proposal to change zoning of Roxburgh Crescent from industrial to residential, to provide for housing**

Agree in principle, with reservations.

Obvious need for more housing for city accepted, anomaly of industrial area among housing agreed, site potentially meets Government directives to develop housing within limits rather than expand out, acknowledged.

But, have had few real problems with current industrial zone as 'neighbour'. Southern part of site was catchment board nursery land when our property was purchased - poplar and willow pole coppicing for river bank erosion control. Worst noise then was gravel crusher located out by river. Dust was initially an issue after Higgins purchased much of the old nursery land (rezoned industrial) for over-spill parking and storage, before it was 'sealed'. Now some minor truck shunting noise and occasional 'earthquakes' when moving compacting equipment. No real issue with light industry moving in if Higgins had moved out without initiating proposed plan change. Site still zoned as industrial could have been useful for storage units, or for development of shared-space co-operative areas for small businesses etc., with additional screening plantings if needed. Would not then have required expensive potential contaminant remediation, as will be required for residential rezoning.

General reservation re the medium density aspect of the plan - citywide proposal for medium density housing areas apparently based on walking distance criteria. Roxburgh Crescent falls outside the proposed yellow zone areas, presumably because it does not meet one or more of the criteria (intuitively, shopping centre not within 800 m). A 'bespoke' set of rules for the site does not magically make this distance smaller... conspiracy theory might indicate hidden agendas for enabling outside the yellow zone here... bigger developer profit potential maybe...

Do agree with suitable residential development to blend in with local area. Could also have been a good site to develop residentially as a tiny home park with suitable communal/community facilities.

### **2) Proposed standards enable houses to be built on 150 m<sup>2</sup> sections (current minimum 350 m<sup>2</sup>); proposed maximum lot size 400 m<sup>2</sup>**

Do not agree with minimum.

Intuition is just too many/too crowded/too close for regular homes, especially if 3 storeys. Computer generated views 'as seen' from the river walkway just seem ugly and dominating (and these don't seem to be the smallest sections either...)

Vehicle parking in development an issue with smaller sections. Whilst central government removed PNCC ability to specify minimum car parking requirements, a car-less society is still a good way off in regional centres without mass transit public transport. A somewhat larger minimum section size might enable easier inclusion of garaging and/or on-site car-parking options for developers within the

building coverage and other design standard rules. Without that, parking on streets would lead to narrower effective roads, less visibility and safety for road users and pedestrians, inconvenience for neighbours, delivery, trade and emergency vehicles etc. Is 13 m road width sufficient to allow angle parking, which would increase the number of available street parks compared to parallel parking?

Fire safety: closer houses, especially with more storeys equals more potential for rapid fire spread between properties and human danger/loss of life. Not Pudding Lane or Towering Inferno, but worthy of consideration.

Storage: small homes still need storage for Kiwi 'stuff', hobbies, lifestyle/sport equipment for the residents etc. Another reason for including a garage or at least a shed on site (within the 50% maximum building covering allowed, assuming the same as the general proposed medium density housing areas...)

Gut feel - compromise of reduced lot size down from current minimum 350 m<sup>2</sup> to 250m<sup>2</sup>.

Unsure re maximum lot size, probably do not agree. Somewhat dependent on other 'bespoke' design standards. Understand desire to use land efficiently, and land involved is a somewhat discrete entity and development may not be seen by many. However, unconvinced about "enhance the residential character of Hokowhitu", and concerned about the visually jarring juxtapositional jolt between the new tightly packed development and the existing residential properties surrounding it. Enhanced choice maybe; enhanced appearance/character, not in our humble opinion.

**3) Proposed standards enable up to 3 storeys (11 m) instead of existing 2-storeys (9 m), allows for river walkway area views.**

Do not agree.

3-storey buildings on small sections as proposed just too heavy/domineering/overlooking, despite whatever bulk form standards are part of the 'bespoke' rules.

Though nominally this proposed increase is only 2 m, the extra height allowing for the inclusion of 3-storey buildings would lead to increased building bulk at high level = increased enclosure, more shading and less light, increased blocking of sunshine and views etc., and likely increased difficulty in/limited choice for achieving other design standards such as re privacy and overlook. Potential problems of shading out solar power installations in neighbouring properties. Possible disincentive for owners of adjacent lower height properties to consider installation of solar power.

3-storey apparently proposed to be made possible over entire site. This is different (why?) from the proposed design standards for the yellow zone medium density housing, which requires buildings to step down from 3 to 2 storeys at the interface between the proposed medium density zone and the existing residential zone; and if effected, would be detrimental to adjacent residential properties surrounding the development (see also NIMBY bit below...)

Views out to river walkway area: 3-storey not needed for river views for much of the length of the site; especially at the northern end where the stopbank is lower compared to the Higgins site than at the southern end. There are a couple of 2-storey buildings in this area where the windows on the top storey are definitely high enough; one appears to be a residential building where second storey living spaces look directly out to the river walkway above the level of the stopbank.

Walkway safety: agree safety is an important consideration, but what exactly is the safety issue here please? As nearby residents we walk, both together and separately, across /along this area, both by the river and higher up the open ground, and along the stopbank, at various times of day, and sometimes dusk/night too. Not aware of any issues, various neighbours also use this space regularly and have never shared any knowledge of safety concerns or negative personal safety experiences. The area concerned is probably one of the most open areas of any along the whole length of the walkway, the dense vegetation areas that are there are right down on the slope of the riverbank itself,

past and below the level of any real passive surveillance benefits from overlooking housing, whether 2- or 3-storey. If any passive surveillance value is gained by the development, it would likely be from the increased number of users of the adjoining walkway space, not people looking out of their windows.

Views towards Roxburgh Crescent area from the river walkway: as previously mentioned, the computer-generated model of the site viewed from the river appears dominating, and completely alters the 'rural' expansive look and feel of 'country in the city' that this unique open area of the walkway reserve offers. The 'almost-terrace' look of the of 3-storey houses is a heavy block which jolts against the open vistas that people come to this part of the walkway to enjoy. The area will look/feel more like 'just another city park' if overlooked by whole row of 3-storey housing - an insult to the awa and the development of the walkway zone thus far...

Two-storey maximum in this area would be way less visually domineering/enclosing.

Site precedent: agree not often large blocks of land in city limits become available for housing, and desire to use land 'efficiently'. However, without further specific knowledge, it appears that the housing development around the old Manawatu Teachers' College site near the Hokowhitu lagoon is one such site still in development. Presumably the land in the structure plan there was also deemed to be used 'efficiently', or the plan change would not have been accepted by PNCC... However there do not seem to be any 3-storey buildings in the already-developed part of the site there, even though construction of such might have enabled more properties to have lagoon views etc. (This site might apparently also be used as a precedent to support our arguments re section sizes, above?)

The NIMBY bit: we would be devastated if a 3-storey building similar to that at the far left of the wide angle computer-generated view were to be built in that position, and our neighbours along the north side of Tilbury Avenue would feel the same if 3-storey buildings were erected along the south side of the proposed development site. The area is our northern boundary, our outdoor and main indoor living areas face in that direction, and tall development would definitely compromise light, sunlight, privacy through overlook etc. One neighbour already has solar panels installed, and concerns that tall dense buildings in the area would likely affect power generation, especially in winter when sun angles are lower and the extra power is most beneficial. We have also been considering solar power, and tall development as above would be a definite disincentive. Our immediate neighbour is largely housebound, spends her days in her living room with its large windows facing the proposed development, and is very worried about her security and loss of privacy if overlooking properties were developed on the northern Tilbury boundary.

Two storeys is enough, please and thank you PNCC...

#### **4) Any other thoughts on the plan change?**

Yes. See below.

##### **A) Proposed development/design standards**

Difficult to comment here specifically because unaware of what exactly the 'bespoke' housing rules for the site actually are...

Including below some comments copied/adapted from our recent submission on the general proposal for design standards for medium density housing areas in Palmerston North, as assume that many are also relevant to/valid for the Roxburgh Crescent site.

Unsure of specifics of / justification for standards for a lot of these as not ourselves planners... also, like other paid-up Joe Public members, find some things difficult to visualise/understand...

Permeable surface: need to ensure sufficient, and sufficient stormwater collection capability, to avoid flash or other flooding, taking climate change weather patterns into account.

Separation distances: 1 m from side and rear boundaries just seems too close: potential for minor living areas to be only 2 m apart, loss of privacy OK for holiday in a campground but not for



permanent living; increased fire spread risk; increased difficulty achieving other design standards re shading/sunshine/windows and outlook/overlooking, especially if 3-storeys involved. Does proposed 1 m boundary separation distance for accessory buildings such as sheds replace the MBIE rule that small buildings less than 30 m<sup>2</sup> must be at least their own height away from boundary (which itself replaced previous District Plan 1 m requirement)?

Height in relation to boundary: understand the general concept of building envelopes and recession planes, but still have concerns over enclosure, shading and light loss, blocking of sunshine and views etc., as above, both within the development and for neighbouring properties, even with bulk and form standards.

Outlook space: overlooking and low/reduced privacy a definite issue within development, and an amenity loss in neighbouring properties. Especially difficult to control/mitigate where multi-storey buildings have multi-family capacity with some main living areas on upper floors.

Car parking: see also above discussion on minimum section size. No carpark on site restricts choice e.g. for disabled people who need vehicles for mobility, or need regular care visits. Visitor as well as resident parking on street needs to be considered if no parking on individual sites.

General: design standards seem to mainly relate to new development, rather than to existing properties on neighbouring sections.

i) Older properties do not necessarily have layouts with directly connected main indoor and outdoor living space, may not even have a defined outdoor living space, may have a different internal room layout orientation etc. Do/ how do the proposed design standards for new development in the area sufficiently take these sort of factors into consideration to protect such neighbouring properties against 'excessive shading', privacy issues, loss of light, sunshine hours etc.?

ii) Are the standards adequate to protect against loss of amenity for existing properties on neighbouring sections? People buying into the new developments have the choice to accept the living conditions and features they will experience in their new property. People already living in the area may well have chosen their property because of some particular feature(s)/aspect(s)/view(s), and may well lose such features/amenities through adjacent development. More choice for some equates to loss of choice/amenity for others...

It seems a level of 'collateral damage' to these people and their properties is deemed 'acceptable' in the planning process, in the interests of overall community benefit...

Example: as home food gardeners, both hobby and as part of home-making, our outside 'living' area is effectively the entire garden, and garden sunshine, light and privacy etc. are important for our welfare, leisure activities, and living costs (and we are not anti-community, offering excess plants and produce to others both nearby and in the wider area). We would likely have a different perception from non-gardeners (and city planners and the information sources they evaluate...) about what is 'excessive shading', 'appropriate' minimum sunshine hours over 'appropriate' minimum outdoor living space area etc.

Who defines what is 'acceptable', 'appropriate' and 'excessive' when it comes to such amenities?

Some standards are needed, but differences are important too.

## **B) Extent of the zone**

i) Staggered site development - is there not some possibility of first-off-the-block developer having advantage over others in the area trying to develop later, due to issues with overlooking/outlook space and shading etc. (even with proposed design standards in place) limiting later design options?? and might this result in a 'messy' hotch-potch development over the planned area?

See a need for PNCC overview (pun, ha ha) of this aspect, regardless of permitted height etc., so as to get cohesive overall site development.

ii) Proposed reserve land 'swap' of the 'buffer' zone on the north side of Tilbury Avenue with an area in the centre of the Roxburgh site.

The Tilbury Avenue residents have an admittedly NIMBY-ish desire to retain this open piece of 'buffer' land with its trees and birdlife and access via back gates to the river walkway: to avoid losing light,

sunlight, privacy etc. from their north-facing living areas, gardens and solar panels; and also to prevent overlooking from developments directly on their northern boundaries.

The proposed new location for the 'swapped' land is currently mostly under asphalt/concrete and potentially contaminated after years of industrial use, and might thus require considerable remediation before being a useful reserve area where children might play or families might sit etc. Neither does it extend as far as Ruahine Street to form a safe pedestrian thoroughfare for general public access to the river walkway area. Thus it doesn't seem to be a particularly beneficial reserve swap for the current grassed 'buffer' land with its area of large trees.

Granted an access to the river walkway is needed/highly desirable for the development, and likely best placed at the planned point, but is a reserve there actually necessary in the first place, when the main reserve is just metres away? As long as there is safe and open access, might that not be sufficient? And in such developments, don't the Development Contributions normally cover much of the cost of any parks etc. required in the structure plan anyway? 'Swapping' the 'buffer' reserve just seems like a bit of a 'land grab' to enable more housing to be built by the developer...

Tilbury Avenue is getting denser housing development on both sides, between the proposed Roxburgh site and the Kainga Ora Tilbury Avenue/Ayr Place site. We are pinched in the middle between these two, and it's tough to see adjacent green space land and trees being potentially taken away too. One suggestion, that the Tilbury residents purchase the re-zoned buffer land strip, is likely not feasible.

A more realistic, more community-focussed idea is to keep the current buffer zone as PNCC reserve land and develop it as a community garden and/or orchard. Tilbury residents have discussed this possibility in the past. Then new housing at the south end of the Roxburgh site could have direct gated access to the river walkway area via the garden/orchard area. Possibility of general pedestrian access directly from the site too?

Some fruit trees have already been planted recently (presumably by PNCC?) on the adjacent part of the reserve land between the stop bank and the end of the Tilbury Avenue cul-de-sac, near the Scout Hall off Ayr Place (the Waterloo Park extension). And previously the area has been considered for a community garden, but this did not eventuate (unsure quite why).

Perhaps now is the time to seriously consider the community garden/orchard option again, to include both parts of the reserve land. Any such garden development would benefit residents of both the new housing developments, as well as existing Tilbury /Ayr residents, other local residents and users of the river walkway in general. It would also be a fitting acknowledgement/reference back to the previous use of the land as a tree nursery. The local soil is good, generally sandy loam, not stony, free-draining, and the area mostly gets good light. We grow a lot of fruit and vegetables on our own property, so know it could be very possible just outside our 'back gate' as well.

PNCC councillor Lorna Johnson is in the process of making enquiries with Council staff about these community garden possibilities.

iii) Indicative extension to Higgins property - possible purchase of Horizons land  
Still fact-finding...

Higgins apparently plan/hope to purchase an area of Horizons land between current Higgins property and the stopbank, along the length of the proposed development south of the walkway access. It seems that the idea for this is to re-zone the area and remove a significant number of trees to allow more homes in the development per se, and/or to get more homes with walkway/riverside views.

Apart from the anathema of felling mature trees in the current era of climate concern, these trees, mostly poplars, act as somewhat of a windbreak for the southern part of the development site, sheltering it from easterlies and south-easterlies. Whilst these are not the most prevalent winds, they are the coldest and most unwelcome... They also contribute to the 'country' vistas of the walkway area, and are a vestigial reference back to the past use of the site as the catchment board nursery, a part of the river's history.

Now to be aspirational!

Might it not be more environmentally sound and more visually pleasing from the walkway to keep the green area with its border of trees, which is a natural and uninterrupted extension of the current PNCC reserve land, and extend the community garden/orchard into that space too? So very close to the proposed new Roxburgh site river access, in a sheltered bowl of land... is there any way PNCC can liaise with Horizons/Higgins re community orchard/garden development in that area too?

### C) Other

Privacy for new residences from stopbank users.

The top of the stopbank between the river access points on Ruahine Street and Ayr Place is used regularly by pedestrians, cyclists and sometimes others. Privacy of housing on the stopbank side of the Roxburgh development may well be compromised because of this pedestrian/cyclist traffic, especially in the case of multi-storey buildings where the traffic would be at the same or very similar level, and close to, the outlooking windows. Buyer beware yes, but a point worth noting maybe. Privacy would be further reduced at the south end of the site if the Horizons land purchase by Higgins went ahead, the trees were removed, and buildings were placed even nearer to the stopbank than the current Higgins boundary.

Any efforts to prevent, limit or discourage public access along the stopbank in the area would definitely not be in the interests of the wider community. It is a flatter and shorter alternative to going further towards the river and joining the main walkway area, thus more accessible to the public with lower mobility, families with young children (in buggies, on foot or on bikes), the time-poor etc. It also offers the best nearby views of the expansive open area down to the river, the land on the other side, and the hills and wind turbines in the distance, another reason it is so popular.

Event access: vehicle access over the stopbank through Higgins yard has been used in the past by organisers of events like Relay for Life and the Riverside Festival. How will this access and thus such events be affected by site development?

Smaller industrial business future: yes, existing use rights under RMA, but how does this actually work out once the whole area has been zoned residential? Might complaints/pressure from new residents, although not enforceable by law, possibly subtly or not so subtly push existing businesses out before they would ideally have wanted to go?

‘Future-proofing’ for the development.

No mention in publicly available design standards of future-proofing requirements or incentives for areas such as:- solar power or other power source choices /advanced passive design; provision for storm-water/grey water collection and storage; EV charging points (there will be EVs before there are no private cars - another reason to encourage developers to provide on-site parking, unless household-dedicated charging points are installed along streets, or more public charging stations made available).

Realise some of these may be specified separately in Building Code?

General comments, mostly not specifically related to this single proposed development:-

i) Rating system in relation to development.

Under current land-value based rating system, owners of neighbouring properties stand to pay more rates than those on the smaller adjacent sections in the newly-developed site despite same local facilities and similar use of resources; whilst also having lost amenity value, and maybe even capital value via loss of sunshine, privacy, views etc. Exacerbated if rezoning were to increase land values. Some of those people are just not in a position to sell and move on, or redevelop themselves, and are thus disadvantaged in a double-whammy by the new development under present system.

ii) ‘Future-proofing’ for residents/community/city.

Is this small section size, potentially 3-storey housing, really the future the city and its people wants/needs? Government requirements and acknowledged current housing shortage notwithstanding, where are we going with this?

Maybe now house-buyers want choices that include smaller sections and no/minimal section upkeep as they have other interests and leisure time activities. However much effort and many resources presently being put into projects such as school gardens, plant-to-plate education and similar. Will the next generation want to live in houses where they cannot garden and help feed themselves and their families? If so, then it will be because there are community gardens nearby, unless the whole education effort has been in vain. If not, then they will move to satellite or more rural communities where larger sections are still available, and hopefully affordable.

Are tertiary students post-COVID really going to come back here to study in person now that on-line learning has become the norm for all or part of many courses?

How much does Palmerston North want to grow and in what way? Industry versus population growth, so that there are enough jobs for people, maybe then less reliance on state housing? Balance between owner-occupied and rental housing in general?

Surely there is a real argument here to limit 'growth' to match resources, to be the best Tier 2 city we can be whilst living within our means, rather than trying for unlimited 'growth' for its own sake and becoming a sad smaller iteration of a Tier 1 city, with Tier 1 city problems?

How does this all work in with the current 10-year plan and future goals after that?

No specific answers here, just ponderings...

iii) Public feedback: short timeframes for submission, noting DX mailout delays; ease of public understanding of proposals and overall process; presenting the right amount of information for useful consultation without the risk of 'fait accompli' public perception and thus engagement disincentive; how to maximise contribution by the whole public and not just the extremes... again, no answers here, just observations...

#### Final thought

Let's get really visionary! A chance for Higgins and PNCC and other parties to make award-winning housing history here in the redevelopment of a suburban industrial area into residential housing - do it really well, plan to avoid hotch-potch development by different landowners, incorporate genuinely green thinking not just housing, truly consider the views (all meanings...) of neighbours and the neighbourhood... if done well it could be as 'world famous in New Zealand' as Savage Crescent... instead of a protruding pimple in the Hokoahitu landscape...

Thanks for taking the time to read and consider our submission.

Rosemary Watson and Doug Kidd

### **Personal speech for hearing**

Good afternoon.

I'm Rosemary Watson of 27 Tilbury Avenue, next to the Reserve in Waterloo Park, the subject of this land exchange proposal.

You may remember me from my previous public comment on this matter.

I oppose the proposed exchange of Reserve land, and my written submission explains that more than I can do here.

I've heard rumours of residential development in the Roxburgh Crescent industrial zone for years, and support the general concept of appropriate housing in that area.

But when the Plan Change was announced last year, it was a huge surprise to discover that the Reserve exchange was part of that plan.

I thought that a "Reserve" was just that - "reserved" - for whatever reason it was designated as such. The Waterloo Park Reserve area is a local green-space recreational Reserve.

But the Reserves Act 1977 does allow for exchanges, as long as the land acquiring Reserve status is used for the same objectives and purposes as the land given up.

Council officers have advised that a local Reserve was not deemed necessary in the Roxburgh development, and the original exchange proposal Report makes no mention of a local Reserve there either.

The Report does however mention several times that the proposed new recreational Reserve is intended to enhance and support the Manawatu River Park and access to it.

Since the River Park is a citywide asset, and the proposed Reserve is to include increased road width and car parking for visitors to the river from outside the immediate neighbourhood, it surely classes as a **citywide destination** Reserve, and **not** a local Reserve. Neither is it like-for-like with the existing Reserve in green-space terms.

**So, with these different objectives and characteristics, does the proposed exchange actually meet the requirements of the Reserves Act legislation?**

**It seems to me that it does not.**

The current Reserve is labelled by Council as a "buffer strip" between industrial and residential areas. The exchange proposal contends that the "buffer" role would no longer be required if the Plan Change goes ahead, and appears not to adequately acknowledge all the other inherent values of this green space to the current community.

The District Plan **does** however recognise the effects that new subdivision and residential development have on the character and amenity values of existing communities, and notes the importance of striving for the best possible outcomes for the neighbourhood as a whole. It also recognises various resource management issues associated with new developments in existing areas, and includes policies to mitigate some of those issues.

Thus, the Council's good intentions, to not diminish the quality of life for a current neighbourhood whilst building a new community, are there. And yet that diminution is just what seems to be happening here.

The bespoke rules proposed for the Roxburgh area allow the developers to build up to 11 m site-wide on small sections, and I haven't come across anything to suggest that the public pre-consultation has altered this.

Tilbury Avenue lies at the south end of the Roxburgh site. Without the current Reserve, and without resource consent and neighbour notification requirements, a row of 3-storey buildings could well be sited just 1 m away from the northern boundaries of Tilbury Avenue homes, with huge impacts on sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking, privacy, noise etc. Definitely a reduced quality of life, plus of

course the loss of the green-space outlook, access, trees, wildlife, and other amenity values of the Reserve itself.

**The best protection against amenity loss and consequent reduction in property values that the Council can actually offer to Tilbury Avenue residents is to retain the existing Reserve.**

If that stance makes me appear 'NIMBY', so be it.

But surely it's natural, and valid, that community members have opinions on what is happening, both good and bad, in their community?

When one takes action against other issues seen as negative - littering, safety hazards etc. - that's viewed as positive engagement and involvement.

So I suggest that 'IMBY' is actually more appropriate. In My Back Yard. It's about concern for my area, and having a sense of pride in it, which is surely better than not caring and apathy.

And that's why, with similarly invested neighbours, I'm promoting an alternate vision for our community...

The main stated aims for a local recreational Reserve are to break up the urban environment and provide for passive recreation.

Retaining the current Reserve as a buffer between existing housing and the new Roxburgh development absolutely achieves the first of those, especially when also considering the future housing intensification on the other side of Tilbury Avenue, and in Ayr Place, through Kainga Ora redevelopments.

It will be the green lungs of a large new body of concrete.

But while valued by locals, the current Reserve isn't as well used as it could be. The Roxburgh development offers the opportunity to address this: to open up the current 'dead-end' of the buffer strip into the new housing area, so that it could become a through route for pedestrians, part of another neighbourhood walking option, linking Ruahine Street to the river access beside the Scout Hall in Ayr Place.

Thus, the access issue which was once a barrier to using the end of Waterloo Park for community food is addressed, and so earlier ideas about this are being revived and investigated further. The current idea is a community orchard similar to that at Ahimate Park in Awapuni. What better way, for both existing and new residents, and visitors, to further enhance the public use and enjoyment of the new through-route Reserve area, and the quality of the green-space itself, than to plant suitable trees and shrubs that will contribute to community food security?

Council literature states several benefits to residents of planting fruit and nut trees in parks. These are:

- bringing communities together
- providing a nutritious food supply
- contributing to an eco-friendly city
- promoting community well-being
- strengthening community connections and interactions
- providing educational resources for children

I didn't see that until recently. It's part of the Fruit Tree Guardians - Community Orchards project, where PNCC is planting fruit and nut trees in various locations around the city, with community groups or dedicated neighbours prepared to take care of them.

But please look at my submissions to date. Different words maybe, but the vision is the same.

With the Hokowhitu Scouts as Guardians, the Council has recently planted some fruit trees near the Scout Hall as part of this project, within the overall orchard/walking route area proposed here.

**Can we work together to expand on this? Surely, with the right will, "Yes We Can".**

One last thing.

I'm not opposed to the Council aspirations for the enhanced river access at Roxburgh Crescent, simply against losing the current green-space Reserve to achieve that outcome.

So I have asked before about the possibilities for **both/and**, rather than **either/or** Reserve area. There was a little discussion on that at your meeting in March where the official land exchange proposal was first presented.

In my written submission, I have mentioned this both/and scenario again, and asked that ways to achieve it be seriously considered, as potential alternatives to the land exchange. I've even made some suggestions that, from the outside, seem worthy of investigation.

Section 2.6 of the Summary of Submissions Memorandum, Item 9 here today, notes two submissions suggesting the both/and scenario, but there is no further specific mention of this in Section 3 "Matters to be addressed in the final report".

I'd like to suggest, that while not in the literal brief of the 'exchange' proposal, possibilities for a both/and option merit serious examination at this time.

So I'm asking again now.

Dear Council, please seriously consider the various possibilities and opportunities for having both Reserves, and include these considerations in the deliberations report for Councillors, as mentioned in Section 6.1 of the above memorandum.

And Dear Councillors, please seriously consider voting to "Retain the Reserve".

Thank you all for listening.

I'm afraid I haven't left much time for questions, but I'm happy to discuss anything here with any of you in future if you would like.

### **Petition submission speech.**

Good afternoon again.

I'm still Rosemary Watson, and I still live at 27 Tilbury Avenue in Hokowhitu.

I co-ordinated the "Retain the Reserve" petition submitted as part of the public consultation on the Waterloo Park land exchange proposal, and I also ended up doing a lot of the collection of the nearly 220 signatures on the petition.

At the March meeting where I made a public comment, I was asked if there was local support, other than from the immediately affected Tilbury Avenue residents, for retaining the 'buffer strip' reserve for possible community food production in the future.

My basic answer was yes, among those in the nearby Tilbury Avenue/Ayr Place community that I had spoken to at that stage.

As far as wider support in the local community, I was optimistic - it would just be a case of getting out there, walking and talking to people in the neighbourhood.

This petition is the result of that walking and talking... much of which was done via door-knocking in the immediate area concerned, nominally the same area that received the Council letter on the land exchange proposal.

Although you've received some information about the petition, I understand that for privacy reasons, you haven't seen the actual petition pages and the names and addresses thereon.

Signatures were obtained from most homes in Tilbury Avenue and Ayr Place, and also from many in Waterloo Crescent, Dorset Crescent, Earl Place, Manawatu Street, Ruahine Street, Pahiatua Street and Harrow Place. Other signatures were from people accessing the river walkway via the Ayr Place car park, using Waterloo Park for recreation, and from the wider Hokowhitu area. Further signatories include people from the Manawatu community gardening /food sharing/ food resilience sector.

I'd just like to remind you of the wording of the petition:

"We request that Palmerston North City Council decline the proposed land exchange of part of Waterloo Park reserve. We believe that retention of the existing green-space Reserve area enables the opportunity to develop it as part of an accessible 'orchard'-style community food production zone, which would provide a place-making area and a new pedestrian route in the neighbourhood."

That wording was chosen carefully. There is no guarantee of the future community orchard, as there will be more processes to follow and goals to meet, in order to achieve that, once the Reserve land is retained.

Similarly, there is no direct mention of the proposed new Reserve at Roxburgh Crescent, as there is no opposition to that *per se*, only to the exchange of Waterloo Park land in order to obtain that Reserve. Those points were reinforced when speaking to potential signatories.

The petition focuses on solely on retaining the existing reserve, to hopefully use it in future for food and other benefits for the local community, including future residents of the Roxburgh Crescent housing area and the local Kainga Ora redevelopments, especially those in Tilbury Avenue and Ayr Place.

Whilst I can speak about the petition, I cannot of course speak directly for all those who signed it, apart from noting that their signatures obviously imply their support for its objectives.

However I would like to offer some personal reflections from my experiences of "street-walking" to present the petition.



“Do you remember getting this letter from PNCC recently?” proved to be a reasonably useful conversation starter after “Hello, I’m Rosemary from Tilbury Avenue... if I promise I’m not here to sell you anything, could I please have a few moments of your time?” But in several instances there had been no letter received where the mail drop was supposed to have happened, and so, at those houses, I ended up offering photocopies of the PNCC letter we personally received. I later found out that some people on nearby streets outside the advised mail drop area had actually received the letter.

I was humbled and pleasantly surprised by the amount of time that many people took to talk with me and understand the relevant issues, and the many who said “well done” or “good on you” or similar, for seeing an alternative to the Council’s exchange proposal and getting organised and out there to tell people about it and try to do good for the neighbourhood.

I was also heartened by the amount of support received for the petition stance. I estimate that over 90% of those I spoke with signed the petition. There were some offers of practical help and even a couple of potential financial or in-kind assistance for a future orchard.

With more time and resources, I’m sure many more names could have been collected. (Better weather, less sickness, and fewer barking dogs and locked security gates might have helped too! I guess many of you can relate to that sort of thing from your own door-knocking campaign efforts...)

The visions of holding on to existing public green space, and providing community food, are definitely alive and well in the community. The potential loss of this relatively small Reserve area is seen as part of a wider issue, a foreboding of an unwelcome future precedent. Whilst PNCC might see the land exchange as a convenient option to meet its aspirations, the local community view is of a different type of ‘low-hanging fruit’...

I got invited in to some houses to sit and spread out paperwork, was given tea and juice and offered other refreshments, and often spent time discussing a range of community and society issues, as well as the immediate Waterloo Park topic.

A repeating theme was that it is sad that the general ‘busyness’ of personal and family lives often gets in the way of getting to know more than just the immediate neighbours, unless there is an easy opportunity or a good reason for wider interaction.

The goal of saving the reserve, with the future possibility of a community orchard, has provided that good reason.

I now know many of my wider neighbours, at least a little, and I get people I never knew before waving and greeting me as I walk round the local area.

It has been suggested to me that the petition, with its offering of an alternative to the original Council proposal, has significantly increased the anticipated level of public engagement with the issue at hand.

It has united people around a specific cause.

If the petition on its own can do that, I urge you to consider just how much more the Hokowhitu neighbourhood could literally come together through place-making on some actual “common ground”: a future community orchard and new pedestrian route at Waterloo Park.

Please vote on behalf of that local neighbourhood to decline the proposed land exchange and “Retain the Reserve”.

Thank you.

**Subject:** Draft Plan Change E: Roxburgh Crescent Residential Area - timing of recent mailout etc.

**From:** "Doug Kidd" <[dkidd@xtra.co.nz](mailto:dkidd@xtra.co.nz)>

**Sent:** 8/11/2023 11:11:04 PM

**To:** [waid.crockett@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:waid.crockett@pncc.govt.nz)

**CC:** [planchange@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:planchange@pncc.govt.nz); "[mayor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:mayor@pncc.govt.nz)" <[mayor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:mayor@pncc.govt.nz)>

Dear Mr Crockett,

This afternoon I received the Council's mailout to homeowners/residents, titled 'Draft Plan Change E: Roxburgh Crescent Residential Area', requesting public feedback on the proposed Plan Change.

Whilst the invitation to give feedback is welcomed, I am truly concerned and disappointed about the timing of this mailout release, bearing in mind some of the content thereon, and in the updated [pncc.govt.nz/roxburgh](https://pncc.govt.nz/roxburgh) website it references.

Though the mailout document does state "Open space subject to a final decision under the Reserves Act 1977 regarding a land exchange with Waterloo Park", it also says "We are proposing to exchange existing reserve land on Waterloo Park to be in the middle of the new housing area...", and the site layout shown includes the open space as if the exchange is a *fait accompli*. The website mentions rules for lot boundaries along existing residential properties in Tilbury Avenue, which again assumes that the Reserve exchange does occur.

In fact, as you will know, the Councillor deliberations and vote on the Reserve exchange have not even taken place, so no final decision has yet been made either by the Strategy and Finance Committee, full Council, or the Minister of Conservation, if the process does indeed go that far...

In my opinion, the release of this mailout and updated website information at this time shows a measure of seeming, but hopefully unintended, disrespect by the PNCC planning team to all the parties above, as well as to the public who have been involved in the consultation/submission/hearing process re the Reserve exchange.

The timing appears to assume that the Reserve exchange proposal will be supported at the upcoming Strategy and Finance Committee vote, which I think is due next week, 15th November, and that the rest of the process to ratify that vote will be just procedural.

To be blunt, it seems to me that it ignores the opinions of the large majority of the public who have engaged with the Reserve exchange issue and oppose the exchange, makes a lip-service mockery of the recent public consultation and hearing process re the exchange, and assumes that Councillors are just puppets of the Council who will 'toe the Council line'.

Surely the Reserve exchange proposal should have been allowed to run its full democratic course before this second round of public feedback on the Plan Change was sought?

Surely, at least, the timing of the release of this document and updated website information should have been held back until after any full Council decision on the Reserve exchange (which I believe is to be on 6th December?).

Surely it cannot be correct to assume how Councillors will vote, or potentially influence or usurp their democratic decision-making by presumption of an outcome?

Surely PNCC can do better than this in future?

Kind regards,

Rosemary Watson

**Subject:** Draft Plan Change E - Roxburgh Crescent - feedback  
**From:** "Doug Kidd" <[dkidd@xtra.co.nz](mailto:dkidd@xtra.co.nz)>  
**Sent:** 8/12/2023 12:04:26 PM  
**To:** [planchange@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:planchange@pncc.govt.nz)

Hi planning people,

We were waiting until 'final' decision on buffer strip proposed exchange on 6th Dec before writing, but since that never happened...

N.B. Most of these points already discussed with planning officers at drop-in session on 30th November.

1) Very pleased to see that minimum/maximum lot sizes increased from previous

2a) Very pleased to see that 9 m maximum height ie 2 storeys now planned adjacent to existing Tilbury/Ruahine residential to allow for better integration/blending of new development with current housing

2b) If buffer strip is exchanged, would like to see single storey limit at south of site along boundary with Tilbury Avenue properties, as per the initial 'artist impression' site plan drawn up a year ago (after all this is our northern boundary where our winter sunshine comes from...) - and a potential row of 2-storeys on 10m x 25m lots like Fig.1 would still block a lot of light out and have significant privacy and overlooking issues.

2c) If buffer strip is retained, would like to see 2-storey limit at south of site, as per present plan iteration, retained, and NOT reverted to 3-storey:

- better integration with existing homes especially if row of narrow 10 m x 25 m lots with buildings like Fig.2 were planned
- privacy and overlooking issues
- sunlight/shading issues for Tilbury Avenue houses and for potential orchard area (again, this our northern aspect...)
- potentially oppressive effects of overlooking/dominating buildings on public thoroughfare walkway

2d) Would appreciate proposed lot layout plans for site being available at time of public consultation please, so public can make informed submissions

3) Permeable surfaces - currently 100% permeable at south end of Roxburgh site (area once used as tree nursery), hence Tilbury Avenue residents' concerns re effects on stormwater/run-off etc. of building on this area.

Re R10.6.1.8d, 55% vs 35% permeable surface, would appreciate further information please on details/timeframes etc. for funding/construction/operability of new/improved stormwater outlet vs. decisions on site coverage. Does this clause mean the overall Roxburgh site, or does the 55%/35% refer to within each individual lot? Please explain, thank you.

4) Trees/climate mitigation

Understood that only certain trees in Palmerston North have protected tree status, and all others are "fair game" for owners/developers to fell... but development of this site is going to mean the loss of a very large number of mature trees, almost all the large trees in the area in fact. Gums and

wattles in the buffer strip, willows and poplars in the existing Higgins site, and poplars and gums in the Horizons land "indicative extension to Higgins property". This is a huge loss not only as a wildlife environment and for visual aesthetics in the area, but also in terms of climate effects, carbon dioxide absorption, shading, slowing down rainfall etc. Whilst unfortunately it might (but hopefully might not??) be too late to save these trees, in these times surely it behoves PNCC to consider ways to limit such extensive arboreal destruction in future developments? Please consider this!

#### 5) 3-storey houses along stopbank

Understood that this is 2-storey minimum, not 3-storey obligatory, but... in our opinion, and that of various others who walk riverside of the stopbank in this area, the row of houses as shown on the 'artist's impression' as viewed from the river is simply... UGLY. Such a bulk of buildings (some replacing a view of mature trees) looking down destroys any perceptions one might otherwise have about getting 'out of town, into the countryside', in this area - it might just as well be a central city park. And honestly 3-storeys does not seem necessary for the homeowners to get river views along most of the site - two storey already in the site looks out over the stopbank. Whilst these are not to be tenement buildings, unfortunately if tightly packed in and oppressive, they sure could look like them... how could PNCC planners help to mitigate these factors please?

Well that's probably enough for now...

Thanks for reading and considering/replying as requested.

Rosemary Watson and Doug Kidd  
27 Tilbury Avenue,  
Hokowhitu,  
Palmerston North 4410

















**Subject:** Waterloo Park - Land Exchange Proposal Decision - comment  
**From:** "Doug Kidd" <[dkidd@xtra.co.nz](mailto:dkidd@xtra.co.nz)>  
**Sent:** 13/11/2023 1:30:55 PM  
**To:** "[mayor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:mayor@pncc.govt.nz)" <[mayor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:mayor@pncc.govt.nz)>; "[debi.marshall-lobb@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:debi.marshall-lobb@pncc.govt.nz)" <[debi.marshall-lobb@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:debi.marshall-lobb@pncc.govt.nz)>; "[vaughan.dennison@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:vaughan.dennison@pncc.govt.nz)" <[vaughan.dennison@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:vaughan.dennison@pncc.govt.nz)>; "[karen.naylor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:karen.naylor@pncc.govt.nz)" <[karen.naylor@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:karen.naylor@pncc.govt.nz)>; [billy.meehan@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:billy.meehan@pncc.govt.nz); [brent.barrett@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:brent.barrett@pncc.govt.nz); [kaydee.zabelin@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:kaydee.zabelin@pncc.govt.nz); [leonie.hapeta@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:leonie.hapeta@pncc.govt.nz); [lew.findlay@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:lew.findlay@pncc.govt.nz); [lorna.johnson@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:lorna.johnson@pncc.govt.nz); [mark.arnott@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:mark.arnott@pncc.govt.nz); [orphee.mickalad@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:orphee.mickalad@pncc.govt.nz); [patrick.handcock@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:patrick.handcock@pncc.govt.nz); [rachel.bowen@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:rachel.bowen@pncc.govt.nz); [roly.fitzgerald@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:roly.fitzgerald@pncc.govt.nz); "William Wood" <[william.wood@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:william.wood@pncc.govt.nz)>  
**CC:** "Hannah White" <[hannah.white@pncc.govt.nz](mailto:hannah.white@pncc.govt.nz)>  
**Attachments:** LabourDayAtWaterloo1c.jpg; LabourDayAtWaterloo2c.jpg; LabourDayAtWaterloo3c.jpg; LabourDayAtWaterloo4c.jpg; pumpkins for Palmy1c.jpg; pumpkins for Palmy2c.jpg; pumpkins for Palmy3c.jpg; Bufferstripnativesc.jpg

From Rosemary Watson, to the Mayor, deputy Mayor, and Councillors; greetings to you all.

Council rules state that those presenting submissions at hearings are not allowed to speak again on that subject or participate in Committee deliberations, hence this e-mail.

You will already be aware of my earlier communications and presentations, or have access to records of such, so don't worry - I'm not going to repeat all that again.

Firstly I acknowledge the considerable amount of work that Council Officers have put into preparing the current Report (Waterloo Park - Land Exchange Proposal Decision), addressing various concerns raised in the submissions etc., and considering extra options to those offered in the original land exchange proposal.

I would like bring the following three items to your attention before your deliberations on Wednesday please.

### **1) Legality of the proposed exchange**

In my submission I raised the issue of the legality of the proposed exchange, based on the requirements of Section 15.6 (*italics below*) of the Reserves Act 1977 for any exchange to be like-for-like in terms of size and purpose etc.

*"The land acquired by the Crown or by the administering body, as the case may be, by way of that exchange shall be held as a reserve under this Act or as part of an existing reserve, as the case may be, subject to the same control and management and for the same objects and purposes as those for which the land given in exchange was held."*

Details of the proposed new reserve at Roxburgh Crescent have been changed in the current report, compared with the original 22 March land exchange proposal, such that car parking is no longer included on the reserve land area. This means that the proposed exchange is now like-for-like in terms of actual green space size.



The current report also confirms that land received in the potential exchange will be contamination-free, with topsoil and grass cover, thus addressing previous possible discrepancies in soil quality and status between the two areas.

Both the potentially received and given up land areas are also confirmed to have recreation reserve status.

However, the Act refers not only to how the reserve is classified but also what its objects and purposes were at the time it was established.

A preliminary professional legal opinion suggests that if the Waterloo Park part reserve area when created had a purpose as a buffer zone, then the proposed exchange would necessarily fail under section 15.6.

Council currently labels the area as a buffer strip, and views its primary function similarly, as a buffer separating industrial and residential areas, even though it is classified as recreational as part of the wider Waterloo Park reserve.

One has to regard that the original purpose of the area was also as a buffer strip.

***Why else would the odd little 90-degree 'dogleg' at the end of Waterloo Park have been included in the main Park reserve area, created at essentially the same time (late 1950s) as the Tilbury/Ayr residential subdivision was planned adjacent to industrial activities developing in what is now the Roxburgh Crescent industrial zone?***

***What other purpose could there have been? I have found no historical record of it being a 'paper road', though I did hear anecdotal evidence that it was once a route from the end of what is now Pahiatua Street, to a ford across the Manawatu river.***

I believe the above point requires due consideration.

## **2) Potential community orchard and through connection**

The future vision developed by the community, though unrefined, is somewhat different from that in the Report. With due respect, I feel that community aspirations re the additional path connection through the buffer strip, and the potential development of a community orchard, have not been fully recognised and represented in the current report.

-We see a significant orchard development in both A and B (Fig. 5); not A or B, or B instead of A, with considerable enhancement of the quality of the existing green space.

-We see an exciting, productive, interesting and educational new pedestrian route through a pleasant green corridor, which offers an additional choice, city-side of the stop bank, for the many regular recreational exercise walkers from around the neighbourhood; not a quicker route to the dairy for those in Ayr Place!

-We see a place that people want to visit regularly, not only to observe and learn from the changes of the seasons and gather a little fruit, but also because it is a beautiful calming green 'oasis' in the middle of residential densification.

-We see a safe place where people might want to slow down a bit, stay a while, a place to savour, maybe meet others, to appreciate natural surroundings, eventually with the inclusion of suitable outdoor furniture and structures.

- We see a currently underused public space (A and B), that through development of the path connection and orchard attains a much higher level of recreational activity by, and thus value to, the local neighbourhood (including the new Roxburgh housing area) and visitors to the nearby river park.
- We see that this increased activity should not be to the detriment of the owners/tenants of adjacent residential properties, both existing and new.
- We see that this vision realised would contribute to Goals 1 and 2 and greatly enhance access to and utilisation of the existing reserve (Section 9), as well as contributing to food security in the city.

More specifically, and without fully informed knowledge of standards etc.:

- We see 'natural' and permeable path material, rather than impervious concrete (less run-off to grass area between trees/shrubs where people are likely to wander), and apparently more economical too.
- We see the route appearing more 'natural' and inviting/interesting than just straight lines, if possible.
- We see the route away from, rather than adjacent to, both existing and new residential properties, as much as possible.
- We see retention of existing large trees in Area B, if possible.

I will be contacting Officer Phillips to enquire about/discuss these and other related issues in due course.

### **3) Current buffer strip status**

Please see attached photos.

The dead end of the buffer strip is not maintained by Council, and was noted in the original exchange proposal to be weed-infested. Weeds have also been allowed to develop in the area under the gum and wattle trees. Neighbouring residents were previously working to control weeds and beautify the latter area with native plantings, but lost heart somewhat when the land exchange proposal was revealed a year ago with the first public announcement of Plan Change E.

In the past, I have requested one-off Council action to address the weed issues in the area, but that has not happened for a few years, and with the land now under potential exchange status it seems unlikely that any extra Council resources would be allocated. Meanwhile the weeds and invasive climbers have continued to spread and grow, until recent weeks, when locals have again been tidying up the land as a labour of love.

Approximately 100 m<sup>2</sup> of the dead-end area has been cleared and reclaimed, removing ground weeds, invasive climbers and deadfall timber etc., with just hand tools and hard work. That included a working bee on Labour Day where we revealed a large previously hidden fallen tree...

To help prevent weed regrowth and avoid leaving barren soil, and allow the wider community to benefit from the land, over 100 pumpkins (chosen for maximum ground cover potential, low labour inputs and easy harvesting) were planted in the cleared area during Halloween week.

Sourced originally from Palmy Crop Swap, 250 seeds were sown and grown on. Some of the surplus plants were offered to, and taken by, the public at a more recent Crop Swap, and the remainder will be donated to Manawatu Food Action Network for use in community food projects around the city, including Growing Gardens and Communities - Manawatu.

Details of harvesting of the eventual pumpkin crop have not been finalised, but directly by the local public for personal consumption, and/or via Community Fruit Harvest for distribution to free food rescue organisations / food banks are obviously under consideration. After harvest would be an appropriate time to consider grassing the cleared area so that the mower could maintain it.

Work has also commenced on clearing under the grove of trees, and some of the natives that have survived being smothered have now been revealed again - this is a work in progress.

Just to reassure you, these two activities are in no way interfering with current scheduled Council maintenance operations. I hope they do however demonstrate to you that local residents value and care about the buffer strip, and do not want to lose it.

So yes, we support, and I hope you will support, keeping the current reserve by declining the proposed reserve exchange. Once public green-space has been lost, it can never be regained.

I recognise there are complex and often conflicting issues related to balancing various demands on overall City spending and resources.

For those whose main concern is the financial aspect, Option 2 to decline the exchange is the cheapest option. Option 4 (700 m<sup>2</sup> land purchase), though the most expensive, seems to offer the best of both worlds, two attractive Hokowhitu assets in future, contributing to a creative and exciting, innovative and growing city, along with a net increase of city-side public green-space. Why would one not expect that the best could also be the most expensive?

I wonder if an amended Option 4 could be considered, whereby the land exchange is declined, the minimum area of land needed for the river entrance (presumably area C east of road B in Fig. 4) and an eventual path connection into the existing reserve is purchased, but the development of the Waterloo Park connection is deferred?

This would enable certainty for faster progress of the overall Plan Change, and reduce the immediate financial cost of the Option, whilst ensuring the potential for future development of the through connection walkway and the community orchard. It would allow the issue of the Scouts lease in Waterloo Park (4.1f) to be settled, and other path design details etc. to be resolved. Though definitely out of the scope of my knowledge, it might even allow other funding sources for the connection to be investigated/accessed.

The community vision has always been for the future - good things take time and are worth waiting for.

Thank you all for taking the time to read and consider this e-mail.

Kind regards,

Rosemary Watson  
27 Tilbury Avenue,  
Hokowhitu,  
Palmerston North 4410  
13th November 2023

"Retain the Reserve"

From Rosemary Watson.

Greetings and best wishes for Christmas to the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and all Councillors.

I'm writing this e-mail to respond to Cr. Dennison's Notice of Motion in respect of the Waterloo Park land exchange proposal, due to be presented at the Council meeting this coming Monday, 18<sup>th</sup> December.

(Council rules do not permit me to speak to you in person again at a Council meeting, to address this new development, since I have already presented a submission at the hearing back in August.)

I offer these comments with due respect to all parties, and with apologies in advance if my chosen words don't come over to you quite the way I intend them to - this is a rapid response due to the limited time-frame available.

First of all, I understand that under Council rules, the Council may resolve to adopt, amend, receive, note or not adopt recommendations from Committee, and that Cr. Dennison's Notice of Motion is therefore a permissible procedure within the terms of that standing order.

I am however obviously disappointed with this turn of events, which from the outside, apparently seeks to re-litigate and reverse two of the voting decisions from a previous debate and discussion, about which the Mayor afterwards wrote to me, among other things: "The reserve will stay... It was a good solid debate and democracy won". Councillor Dennison himself included the following in an e-mail to me: "Well done on championing this issue. You have inspired a community response that has been sincere, incredibly creative and compelling. Best wishes for the future enjoyment of this land. "

I am also puzzled by the late timing of this action. There was no such Notice of Motion in the agenda for the Council meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> December, where the Strategy and Finance Committee recommendations from its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> November, including those regarding the reserve exchange, were originally due to be addressed, and a final Council decision made.

I have asked Cr. Dennison if he could explain the above for me, but as yet have not received any reply.

Re the Motion itself:

1c - alternative space for community orchard

Assuming that this refers to Area B shown in Figure 5 of the 15/11/23 proposal decision report - my understanding is that this area was previously (before my involvement) considered as a possibility for a community garden, but failed to meet the required criteria at that time. (Instead, a garden was established at Ashford Avenue, and this has now moved to form the basis of the Awapuni community garden.) Some of the factors that led to that failure have now been addressed (public toilet and water source nearby etc.), however one of the main 'fails' was apparently the dead-end nature of the site, seen as posing a safety/security risk. You may remember that overcoming this was a key point in my suggestion of the through route opportunity when I first presented the alternative option of the community orchard to the Strategy and Finance committee back in March.

Area 5 would become even more of a dead end if the original Plan Change E 'indicative extension to Higgins property' (through private purchase of Horizons land out towards the stop-bank on the south-eastern boundary of the proposed development) goes ahead, as is indicated on the revised structure plan released before the latest round of public feedback.

**Why is it, if the original dead-end nature of the site was a barrier previously, that an even more enclosed space is no longer viewed as such?**

The limited size of Area B, and the lack of direct access to/from the future Roxburgh development further limit the community orchard potential (see 1e below).

1e - community benefit

In my e-mail to you before the 15/11/23 proposal decision meeting, I stated some of the visions for the through route and orchard in Areas A and B.

To further elaborate on some of the benefits to the wider community:

- We see plantings of multiples of various species of fruiting trees and shrubs to provide education and information to the wider gardening public e.g. comparison of tree sizes grown in similar conditions on different root stocks (dwarf, semi-dwarf etc.) and in different styles (vase, central leader, espalier, cordon etc.)
- We see the opportunity for the public to be involved in pruning and care demonstrations/practice on these plantings
- We see the opportunity to further educate the public by growing and show some of the less common edible fruiting crops that can be cultivated in Palmerston North, to enhance potential food choices and food security for the community. This would include recognition of a) climate change and the increased viability of sub-tropical crops in suitable micro-climates, and b) the people from many different ethnic backgrounds in our city community who have brought (hopefully not literally!) some of their 'fruit culture' with them.
- We see that the larger total area (A and B) and the through access are significant factors in the attainment and success of these and our other visions for the orchard.

Re the reasons given for the Notice of Motion:

a) 'In good faith' and Council's preferred option

I'm afraid I don't see this *per se* as a specific reason for the Notice of Motion. Of course the landowner and the Council should be working together 'in good faith', and of course, as part of that, the Council will have a preferred option. In view of all the factors involved however, this should not be assumed in advance to be the final outcome.

I should like to point out that the public have also been working with the Council 'in good faith' throughout the public consultation and the following processes and procedures.

And that the local residents chose to live adjacent to the buffer strip reserve 'in good faith' that it would not be taken away in a move which strongly resembles 'taking away from (a present-day) Peter to pay (a future) Paul'.

b) Good faith affected

The Council has made it very clear to the interested public that the land exchange proposal involves a separate process, under separate legislation, and with a separate public consultation, within the main Plan Change E, and prior to the main Plan Change E consultation. The public has diligently followed that process, to get to the current stage of the recommendation from the Strategy and Finance committee meeting to the Council, with hope, positivity and persistence, but without prior expectations. If the landowner's good faith were to be affected by adoption of the Committee recommendation, possibly it is because of prior expectations that should not have been held... though to an outsider the Council processes do sometimes appear as somewhat of a *fait accompli*.

Again, I don't see this as a valid reason for the Notice of Motion.

c) Access leg and link

I believe the access leg in question is that next to the Winchester Street dairy, which leads off Ruahine Street (not Manawatu Street as stated) into the current Zander Engineering business premises. And yes, adopting the Strategy and Finance Committee recommendation of Option 3 in the 15<sup>th</sup> November report would, as outlined in the report and discussed at that meeting, require the planning for and purchase of 125 m<sup>2</sup> of land from the landowner, to link the existing 'buffer strip' reserve with that access leg.

There is nothing new here, and once more, I don't see it as a valid reason for the Notice of Motion.

d) Opposition by landowner to pedestrian and cycle links

I assume that this refers to the current Zander Engineering entranceway as above, and also to the other entrance to the site from between 557/557A and 567/567A Ruahine Street.

For the landowner only now, after several years of prior planning, and only apparently in response to a potentially unexpected Committee recommendation, to deem these links unsafe and unnecessary seems incredible to me. Why have they suddenly potentially become unsafe? How can they both now



potentially not be necessary, when both lead out of the site very close to a bus stop on Ruahine Street?  
How does the potential retention of the buffer strip reserve affect either of these factors?  
Regarding development yield, what else would the landowner use these 2 links to Ruahine Street for, if not as links? I'm not a planner, but it would seem they are too narrow for site lots.

Regarding development yield in general, the overall site area appears to me to be the same whether the reserve exchange goes ahead or not, though obviously the potential road and lot layouts would be somewhat different. Changes to lot size as a result of the first public feedback on Plan Change E (from the original 150 m<sup>2</sup> min. and 400 m<sup>2</sup> max. to the revised 250 m<sup>2</sup> min. and 500 m<sup>2</sup> max.), with a much larger overall impact on development yield than a 125 m<sup>2</sup> Council purchase for a link into Waterloo Park, as above, have already been agreed on.

In addition, whilst I am as yet unaware of all the relevant details, the unknowns regarding funding, construction and operation of the stormwater outlet from Roxburgh Crescent to the Manawatu River, and in turn its effect on permitted net site permeable surface areas (R10.6.1.8, New proposed provisions to be inserted into the Palmerston North City Council District Plan), would seem to have far more effect on potential development yield and land value to the landowner, and on potential planning cost and time for the Council. This however seem to be accepted by both parties as part of the overall process.

Again from an outside viewpoint, and with due respect, taking the presentation of this Notice of Motion along with the stated reasons for it, it seems that the landowner appears to be putting some 'mischievous' pressure onto Council, because a potential Council decision is maybe not heading in the expected/desired direction. Councillor Dennison's strong opinions in favour of the proposed land exchange, and against the Option 3 proposal, as expressed at the Strategy and Finance meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> November, have apparently led to his involvement.

Whilst it is vital that the Council and the landowner continue to work well together for a positive outcome to the proposed industrial area rezoning and residential development, that process should surely not involve pressure being applied, or succumbed to, by either party, which unfortunately, in the absence of any alternative explanation being offered, does seem to be the case here.

Once more, I apologise to all concerned if these outside perceptions are unfounded, but they are genuine perceptions, and I'm not the only outsider with them. It saddens me that this is so.

One further point unrelated to the Notice of Motion:

If the whole land exchange proposal is to be revisited, I would like to remind you of my most recent previous comments to you (e-mail 13/11/23) regarding the legality or otherwise of the proposed buffer strip exchange.

\*\*\*\*\*

To end on a lighter note...

From the "Retain the Reserve" supporters:

Dear 'Santa Claus', (or should that be 'Santa Councillors'),

We have been good city-zens this year. We have engaged actively and respectfully with the public consultation and all the Council processes and procedures around and following that, we are trying our best to look after a piece of land that Council does not love as much as we do, and we have hopes and aspirations for the future development of a significant Hokowhitu community resource which would also benefit the wider city. (We also pay our rates on time, keep our pets under control, don't have loud parties, and pick up litter etc.)

We think we deserve to be on your 'nice' list this Christmas.

All we are asking for Christmas is please, may we "Retain the Reserve"?

\*\*\*\*\*

Thanks to all for taking the time to read this.

Kind regards,

Rosemary Watson

**Parliament office**

04 817 8835

[tangi.utikere@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:tangi.utikere@parliament.govt.nz)

Freepost PO Box 18 888

Parliament Buildings, Wellington 6160

**Palmerston North electorate office**

06 356 5958

[palmerston.north@parliament.govt.nz](mailto:palmerston.north@parliament.govt.nz)

53 Queen Street, Palmerston North

PO Box 1430, Palmerston North 4440

 /tangi.utikere.nz

Hon Tama Potaka  
Minister of Conservation  
Private Bag 18 888  
Parliament Buildings  
Wellington 6160

2 February 2024

Kia orana Minister,

Today I met with a group of local constituents who have raised concerns with me regarding due process adopted by the Palmerston North City Council when it made a decision about the proposed exchange of part of a reserve at Waterloo Park, Hokowhitu, Palmerston North.

I understand that the authorisation of the exchange will be made by you or your delegate under Section 15 of the Reserves Act 1977.

Generally, the opportunities for public input into this process takes place via the local territorial authority's public consultations in reaching a decision. The issues that have been raised with me by my local constituents relate to whether the legal processes were followed regarding this. They are also in the process of obtaining information under the LGOIMA.

I Invite you to consider whether it is appropriate to proceed with making a decision whilst my local constituents' complaints regarding this issue are under consideration. They would also be prepared to raise their specific concerns with you or your delegate before a decision is made if you consider that appropriate.

Kia manuia,



Tangi Utikere  
MP for Palmerston North

