MEMORANDUM

TO Plan Change C Hearings Panel

FROM David Murphy, City Planning Manager
Keegan Aplin-Thane, Planner

DATE 31 October 2019

SUBJECT THIRD RESPONSE TO COMMISSIONERS’ MINUTE OF 13 SEPTEMBER 2019 DIRECTION 2 AND 3

Introduction

1. This Memorandum has been prepared by David Murphy and Keegan Aplin-Thane and addresses Direction 2 and 3 of the Commissioners’ Minute 13 September 2019 which say:

   Direction 2: In relation to our request for a commitment to build a safe intersection between Pioneer Highway and Te Wanaka Road prior to the completion of any development within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area, we direct the Council advise the details of the process it will follow to make a decision on this request, and its estimate as to when the Council and NZTA could grant the approvals necessary for us to regard the commitment as firm. We anticipate that this information can be supplied by the end of October 2019.

   Direction 3: In relation to our request for further information on the identification, and protection if appropriate, of the three sites of significance to Rangitāne, we direct the Council to discuss these issues with Rangitāne, and with relevant land owners as necessary, and report to us on the way in which each site should be spatially identified, and on whether specific measures are required, as part of PC C, to preserve or protect any of the sites. This report should be sent by 31 October 2019.

Direction 2 – Safe Intersection

2. Given the comments at paragraph 24 of the Minute that the Council’s position is not understood, clarification is provided.

3. A performance condition is suggested for the Commissioner’s consideration, as one means of providing for a safe intersection, reflecting the evidence of Ms Fraser.

4. Details of the process and timeframe Council and NZTA will need to follow to change the speed limit of Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway and complete an upgrade to the intersection to provide for a safe intersection are also provided.

Council Position and Recommended Performance Standard

5. With regards to the commitment to build a safe intersection, this can be achieved through a combination of speed reductions, intersection upgrade(s) and District Plan provisions. The
only commitment that can be made through Plan Change C is the content of any District Plan provisions. The position of the reporting officers is as follows:

a) Ms Fraser’s transport assessment and evidence concluded that there would need to be changes to the speed limits of Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway\(^1\) and that the intersection modelling has shown that there is capacity with a right turn bay treatment to accommodate the additional traffic up to 2025, which included the full development of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area. Beyond 2025 consideration would need to be given to a further upgrade taking into account the speed environment at that time, the status of residential development within the City West area and anticipated pedestrian and cyclist activity\(^2\).

b) Any subdivision within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area is a restricted discretionary activity under proposed Rule 7A.5.2.1 and is supported by the relevant assessment criteria in Rule 7A.5.2.3. Assessment criteria requiring an applicant to address any adverse effects of a subdivision on the safe and efficient operation of the roading network is a standard provision in the Palmerston North City District Plan, and can result in a subdivision condition requiring an upgrade to the transport network prior to development or the decline of a subdivision consent.

c) Proposed Rule 7A.5.2.1 is a restricted discretionary activity with a number of performance conditions and supporting assessment criteria within Rules 7A.5.2.2 and 7A.5.2.3, including the following assessment criteria:

\[ \text{Whether any adverse effects of the subdivision on the safe and efficient operation of the roading network can be effectively managed.} \]

d) The assessment criteria in amended Rule 7A.5.2.3 will be relevant to the assessment of subdivision within Kikiwhenua because the Kikiwhenua Residential Area is specifically defined as a Greenfield Residential Area. The assessment criteria in amended Rule 7A.5.2.3 provides the Council with an opportunity to assess and manage the effects of subdivision through the resource consent process in a manner that is consistent with the regulatory and policy framework established through the District Plan.

e) A performance standard within the District Plan can be a useful tool to determine activity status in conjunction with policy and assessment criteria. With regard to Ms Fraser’s evidence, in particular the potential for other urban development within the area to create a “tipping point” at which a safe intersection requires a full upgrade, the following additional performance standard is recommended to be added to amended Rule 7A.5.2.2:

\[ \text{Rule 7A.5.2.2 Performance Conditions for Restricted Discretionary Activity} \]

\[ (g) \text{ Kikiwhenua Residential Area - Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway (State Highway 56) Intersection conditions} \]

\[ i. \text{ Prior to any subdivision within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area:} \]

---

\(^1\) Cover page of Harriet Fraser transportation assessment dated 24 July 2018.
\(^2\) Paragraph 28 of Harriet Fraser evidence.
• The intersection of Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway (State Highway 56) must be upgraded to incorporate a right turn bay treatment that is approved by the relevant road controlling authorities.
• the speed limit on Pioneer Highway (State Highway 56) between Te Wanaka Road and Mangaone Stream must not be higher than 80km/hr.
• the speed limit on Te Wanaka Road must not be higher than 50km/hr.

ii. Any Subdivision consent applications within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area must be accompanied by a transportation assessment report prepared by a suitably qualified transport engineer that includes an assessment of the safety of the intersection of Te Wanaka Road with Pioneer Highway (State Highway 56). If the subdivision consent application precedes the full upgrade of the intersection of Te Wanaka Road with Pioneer Highway, through the provision of a signalised intersection or a roundabout, the Report must include an assessment of whether a full upgrade should be provided.

f) The performance standard above would allow the Kikiwhenua Residential Area to be developed with a safe intersection with a partial upgrade, together with a speed limit reduction on Te-Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway. It ensures that the justification for a ‘full upgrade’ to the intersection will be tested in any subdivision development within Kikiwhenua. The suggested performance standard will also be the subject of further review as part of the Kakatangiata District Plan Change resolved to be undertaken by the Council.

g) The performance standard aligns to the levels of funding commitments in Council’s Long Term Plan which provides further certainty that there will be a safe intersection. Programme 1072 – City West – Pioneer Highway/Te Wanaka Rd intersection of the 2018-2028 Long Term Plan specifically includes $300,000 in 2020/21 for the partial upgrade of the intersection and $2,500,000 in 2021/22 for the full upgrade.

**Speed Limits and Intersection Upgrade - Process and Timeframes**

6. With regards to the matters that sit outside the District Plan, we have consulted with NZTA and the Council Bylaw officer. The following process and timeframes will need to be followed to reduce the speed on Pioneer Highway and Te Wanaka Road and complete a partial / full upgrade to the intersection:

a) Speed limit of Pioneer Highway:
   - NZTA proposes to review the speed limit on SH56 from Palmerston North to Longburn in its next tranche of speed limit reviews. The list of roads for review will be confirmed in November 2019, with consultation/engagement expected to start in early 2020, with speed limits to be confirmed in May 2020 (assuming a smooth process).

b) Speed limit of Te Wanaka Road:
   - March 2020: initial scoping starts (stage 2 of a rolling speed limit review)
   - May-June 2020: informal engagement
   - July – September 2020: analysing community feedback and drafting bylaw for Council approval
   - October 2020: Council approves draft bylaw for public consultation
   - Late October – early December 2020: public consultation on draft Bylaw
   - February/March 2021: hearings for oral submissions on Bylaw.
   - April 2021: deliberations/adoption of Bylaw.
c) Partial Intersection upgrade (Right turn bay):
   - Less than $1M can be added to low cost / low risk activities and funding can be approved as a matter of course. This option would be used for a partial upgrade.

d) Full intersection upgrade (signalised or a roundabout):
   - Will require a business case.
   - Vary the Regional Land Transport Plan to include in National Land Transport Plan – relatively swift and requires a variation paper to Regional Transport Committee. NZTA can amend NLTP on condition it is included in the RLTP at next quarterly meeting of Regional Transport Committee. This confirms the point of entry for the business case.
   - No guaranteed funding in next 18-20 months.
   - Early 2020 would be the earliest that funding could be committed.

7. Recent correspondence from NZTA and Council’s Bylaw officer is attached as Appendix 1.

*Direction 3 Protection of Sites of Significance to Rangitāne*

8. The significance of the sites to Rangitāne and the concerns expressed by Commissioners are understood and appreciated. The planning response on this direction is impacted by the following considerations:

a) Minor inconsistencies between the Commissioners’ Plan Change material and the Plan Change material made available to all other parties. This has led to regrettable uncertainty regarding the intended protection of the Kikiwhenua site.

b) The confidential status of the Cultural Impact Assessment and the issues and risks associated with spatially identifying the sites of significance from a cultural and planning perspective.

c) Following further consultation with Rangitane, the need for an amendment to the delineation of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area on the Structure Plan Map 7A.2 to exclude the Urupa located on land owned by Rangitāne.

d) The lack of a submission on Plan Change C or explicit written support from Rangitāne.

9. We address each of the four matters separately.

*Inconsistencies between Plan Change material and uncertainty regarding the protection of Kikiwhenua.*

10. In reviewing all the Plan Change material to gain a better understanding of the Commissioners’ concerns regarding the protection of the sites of significance, it was identified that there were some minor inconsistencies between the Commissioners’ Plan Change material and the Plan Change material made available to the public, submitters and the Council.

11. A number of minor amendments to Plan Change C were approved by the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning and Strategy Committee after it was approved for public notification. This is not uncommon, but unfortunately the version without the approved minor amendments was printed for the Commissioners instead of the amended version.
12. The printing error occurred after the closing of submissions, and accordingly the public version of Plan Change C as notified was the correct version, (including the approved minor amendments). A copy of the approved minor amendments absent from the Commissioners’ Plan Change material is attached as Appendix 2.

13. With respect to Direction 3, the key minor amendment missing from the Commissioners’ Plan Change material was the proposal to rezone Part of lot 214 Pioneer Highway (the Kikiwhenua site) to Residential, not “Recreation” as shown in the Commissioners’ version of Plan Change C. The effect of this is the Commissioners may not have been aware that the Kikiwhenua Residential Area subdivision provisions are intended to apply to Part of lot 214 Pioneer Highway.

14. The other minor amendments missing from the Commissioners’ Plan Change documents do not appear to be material to the key issues addressed at the hearing.

15. For the purposes of clarity, rezoning of Part of lot 214 Pioneer Highway to Residential was deliberate, despite it being understood that the Kikiwhenua site is unsuitable for residential development. In the medium to long term a more appropriate zoning may be warranted such as Recreation or a bespoke zone that better reflects Rangitāne’s aspirations for the site and other sites of significance within the City. In the meantime the proposed Residential zoning ensures the site is captured by the broader planning framework developed for the Kikiwhenua Residential Area, including the Structure Plan that spatially defines Kikiwhenua (in a general sense) and the various assessment criteria intended to address the sites of significance and related archaeological processes.  

16. While Kikiwhenua is spatially defined, the exact boundaries of the site are yet to be surveyed and will only be determined at the time of subdivision. Therefore subdivision is proposed to be in ‘general accordance’ with the Structure Plan, as opposed to including a performance condition that requires compliance with the Structure Plan. This planning method provides a high degree of certainty that Kikiwhenua will be set aside in the general location and size spatially defined on the Structure Plan, but also provides an element of flexibility for the mutual benefit of Rangitāne, Council and the developer to determine the exact boundaries of Kikiwhenua at the time of the subdivision. The area spatially defined on the Structure Plan was identified in consultation with RACE and Rangitāne.

17. The site spatially defined on the Structure Plan is also protected under section 17 of the District Plan that requires a discretionary land use consent for excavation, alteration, reconstruction or destruction of any scheduled site or object of cultural and natural heritage value to tangata whenua.  

18. While Kikiwhenua is spatially defined on the Structure Plan, the exact spatial definition of certain sites of significance in a Cultural Impact Assessment or District Plan can be problematic. This is the case with the Urupa and Awapuni sites. This is explained in further detail below, and as reaffirmed following further discussions with Rangitāne.

Cultural Impact Assessment and Spatial Identification of Sites of Significance

19. The spatial definition of certain sites of significance can be problematic from a cultural and planning perspective.

---

3 Assessment criteria (c) (i) – (vi)
4 Rule 17.8.1(b)
20. Rangitāne requested that the Cultural Impact Assessment remained confidential. This at least highlights that making certain information regarding sites of significance available to the public is a very sensitive issue for Rangitāne. The spatial definition of certain sites of significance within a publicly accessible District Plan is problematic for the same reason, but also because the site of significance may not be suitable for spatial definition if there is limited information available on a site, which is the case for the Urupa, or the site covers a broad area, which is the case for Awapuni.

21. From a planning perspective, spatial definition where the provisions of a District Plan are specifically linked to a site via a performance condition or specific rule is not always the most appropriate method to protect a significant site. This method can be inflexible and prevent the protection or management of significant areas that may in fact sit outside of the spatially defined boundaries.

22. We would recommend spatial definition where there is a high degree of certainty regarding the location of the site and Rangitāne are comfortable that the location is made available to the public.

23. Further discussions with Rangitāne have reaffirmed the following:
   a) It is not considered appropriate to spatially define the Urupa in the District Plan due to the sensitivity of the site and uncertainty regarding its precise extent / location.
   b) It is not considered appropriate to spatially define Awapuni. It is the name of the general area / former lagoon, it does not have a specific location within the plan change area capable of spatial definition, and it is not limited to the location shown in the Cultural Impact Assessment.

24. Plan Change C proposes a restricted discretionary rule and a series of assessment criteria\(^5\) that require these matters to be addressed in further detail at the time of subdivision and development, including further archaeological assessment. RACE also have an agreement with Rangitāne to guide the residential development process. Under this approach the sites are provided a level of protection without encountering the potential drawbacks of spatial definition of these sites through the Structure Plan.

25. The approach outlined above is supported by Rangitāne, although it has been requested that the assessment criteria that addresses whether an archaeological assessment has been undertaken\(^6\) be amended to include a geophysical survey and that the requirement for an assessment is strengthened. Because there is no submission from Rangitāne there is an issue whether these amendments can be made at this time. Despite this, the six assessment criteria addressing the sites of significance and the agreement between Rangitāne and RACE collectively provide an appropriate level of certainty that the interests and expectations of Rangitāne will be addressed as part of the pre-application and resource consent process.

**Minor Amendment to the delineation of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area on Structure Plan 7A.2**

26. It is understood that the Urupa is largely located within land owned by Rangitāne that is outside of the area proposed to be rezoned Residential and outside of the area intended to be defined as the Kikiwhenua Residential Area on Structure Plan 7A.2.

---

\(^5\) R7A.5.2.3 (c) (i) – (vi).
\(^6\) R7A.5.2.3(c)(i)
27. The long narrow piece of land adjoining the Mangaone Stream owned by Rangitāne was included in the Structure Plan to provide context as it will act as green space adjoining the subdivision. The spatial definition of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area on the Structure Plan should not have included the land owned by Rangitāne as it is not proposed to be rezoned as part of the plan change. In effect nothing is changed for this land under the District Plan, except that it is now shown on the Structure Plan for context only.

28. It is recommended that the spatial definition of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area on Structure Plan 7A.2 only includes the land proposed for rezoning and excludes the land adjoining the Mangaone Stream not proposed for rezoning. The Kikiwhenua Residential Area is therefore likely to exclude the Urupa from the area proposed for residential development. An amended Structure Plan 7A.2 is included as Appendix 3.

29. In the event that it is identified that part of the Urupa is located in the area proposed for residential development and this is confirmed via further archaeological assessment and / or cultural monitoring, the proposed rule framework and agreement between RACE and Rangitāne enables this matter to be managed at the time of subdivision.

*No submission or written support from Rangitāne.*

30. The approach described in this memorandum was discussed in detail and agreed by Rangitāne, RACE and Council during the development of Plan Change C. For this reason there was no formal submission from Rangitāne.

31. As directed we have discussed the protection of the three sites of significance with Rangitāne who have reaffirmed their support for Plan Change C. A copy of our correspondence with Rangitāne is attached as Appendix 4.

David Murphy Keegan Aplin-Thané
*City Planning Manager* *Planner*
APPENDIX 1: NZTA and Council Bylaw Correspondence
A bit unknown really...

I expect this sort of timeframe
- Approved for consultation/engagement in Nov
- Engagement in Jan-Feb-Mar 2020
- Speed limit set April/May 2020

BUT this assumes that:
1 -as we roll out speed limits we get faster at engagement
2 – there is no strong opposition
3 – The govt and Agency doesn’t get cold feet about the process and slow it down (we are getting strong pushback at the moment)
4 – we have the resources to use for the engagement

So there are a lot of caveats

Give me a call if you like.

Dan

---

Hi Dan,

If included in November 2019, what is the broad timeframe before any changes are confirmed?

Cheers

David
Hi David

Just to let you know, I have proposed SH56 from Palmerston North to Longburn has its speed limit reviewed in the next tranche of speed limit reviews. This list will be confirmed in November 2019 and consultation/engagement should start in the new year.

There is a moderation process to happened to ensure resourcing to adequate and that our internal prioritizations it met. I assume I can advise that PNCC will be supportive of the Agency reviewing this route based on your email below?

Happy for you to give me a call to chat on the phone (numbers below) if you need me to clarify anything with respect to the speed limit process.

Regards

Dan Tate
Team Leader – Safety Engineer
Transport Services – System Design
DDI 64 6 953 6070 / M 64 21 382 839
E dan.tate@nzta.govt.nz / w nzta.govt.nz
Palmerston North Office
Private Bag 11777, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand

---

From: David Murphy <david.murphy@pncc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 22 October 2019 8:28 AM
To: Sarah Downs <Sarah.Downs@nzta.govt.nz>
Cc: Keegan Aplin-Thane <Keegan.Aplin-Thane@pncc.govt.nz>; Michael Duindam <michael.duindam@pncc.govt.nz>; Robert van Bentum <Robert.vanBentum@pncc.govt.nz>; Joe Harriet <joe.harriet@xtra.co.nz>; Kelly Standish <Kelly.Standish@nzta.govt.nz>; Dan Tate <Dan.Tate@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: Kikiwhenua Residential Growth - Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway (SH 56) Intersection Upgrade

Hi Sarah,
We recently proposed to rezone the Kikiwhenua area for residential development. See here for the structure plan [https://www.pncc.govt.nz/media/3131249/district-plan-map-7a2-kikiwhenua-residential-area.pdf](https://www.pncc.govt.nz/media/3131249/district-plan-map-7a2-kikiwhenua-residential-area.pdf)

A key issue at the hearing was the safety of the current intersection, the speed of SH 56 and the need for an intersection upgrade. NZTA submitted and were represented by Dan Tate and Kelly Standish (consultant) at the hearing.

The Commissioners have given us the following direction:

*Direction 2: In relation to our request for a commitment to build a safe intersection between Pioneer Highway and Te Wanaka Road prior to the completion of any development within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area, we direct the Council advise the details of the process it will follow to make a decision on this request, and its estimate as to when the Council and NZTA could grant the approvals necessary for us to regard the commitment as firm. We anticipate that this information can be supplied by the end of October 2019.*


Can you or someone at NZTA please provide us with a brief written summary of the steps / processes Council and NZTA will need to follow to:

a. Reduce the speed of SH 56  
b. Secure funding and approval to upgrade the intersection  
c. Likely timeframes for a) and b)

I understand there is the possibility we could lead the process for reducing the speed of SH 56.

We only need something brief – but would like something this week so we can finalise our response to the Commissioners.

Regards

David

**DAVID MURPHY | City Planning Manager**  
Palmerston North City Council | Private Bag 11034 | Palmerston North  
P: +64 (6) 3568199 | F: +64 (6) 3554115 | M: +64 (27) 2223736 | [www.pncc.govt.nz](http://www.pncc.govt.nz)
Hi David,

Sarah has forwarded onto me your email re: next steps for the proposed SH56/Te Wanaka Road upgrade to progress. Here’s my advice. The process will be the same regardless of whether this is a PNCC or NZTA-led activity:

a. Speed Limits – I understand Dan has already been in touch on this matter
b. Approvals process – As its likely the intersection upgrade will be over $1M implementation cost, this will trigger the requirement for a business case (Note: should implementation be <$1M, then then then activity can be added to the Low Cost Low Risk list of activities, in which case funding can be approved as a matter of course, however an existing activity(s) will need to drop off the list as the approved bulk allocation for LCLR cannot change). As the activity is not in the current RLTP or NLTP, the first step is to firstly vary the RLTP and then the NLTP to include the activity. This process can be relatively swift, i.e. a variation paper to the next Horizons RTC to get the RLTP variation endorsed and then completion of a Point of Entry document to a) get the activity included in the NLTP and b) the agreed entry point for the business case. This process can happen in a matter of weeks and as the RTC only meets quarterly, NZTA can approve inclusion of activities into the NLTP on the condition that it be varied into the RLTP at the next most appropriate time.

c. Timeframes for funding approval – this is where it gets a bit tricky. As the funding for the roading improvements is currently fully committed in the current NLTP period (2018-21) we can give no guarantees that funding for implementation of the activity will occur in the next 18-20 months. To secure NLTF funding we assess against what we call the Investment Assessment Framework, effectively how the activity rates against the direction of the current GPS. To secure NLTF funding in this NLTP, the IAF profile would have to achieve a funding priority of 4 or above, i.e. it would have to have a High Results Alignment and Medium Cost-benefit appraisal (BCR of 3-4.9). Should the IAF profile be above the line for funding, NZTA are currently re-prioritising the NLTP on a quarterly basis so it would be early next year at the earliest before we could give any funding commitment.

If you have any questions regarding this advice, feel free to ask.

Thanks David,
Wayne

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Murphy <david.murphy@pncc.govt.nz>
Date: 22 October 2019 at 8:48:50 AM NZDT
To: Sarah Downs <Sarah.Downs@nzta.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Kikiwhenua Residential Growth - Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway (SH 56) Intersection Upgrade
Hi David

We recently proposed to rezone the Kikiwhenua area for residential development. See here for the structure plan [https://www.pncc.govt.nz/media/3131249/district-plan-map-7a2-kikiwhenua-residential-area.pdf](https://www.pncc.govt.nz/media/3131249/district-plan-map-7a2-kikiwhenua-residential-area.pdf)

A key issue at the hearing was the safety of the current intersection, the speed of SH 56 and the need for an intersection upgrade. NZTA submitted and were represented by Dan Tate and Kelly Standish (consultant) at the hearing.

The Commissioners have given us the following direction:

*Direction 2: In relation to our request for a commitment to build a safe intersection between Pioneer Highway and Te Wanaka Road prior to the completion of any development within the Kikiwhenua Residential Area, we direct the Council advise the details of the process it will follow to make a decision on this request, and its estimate as to when the Council and NZTA could grant the approvals necessary for us to regard the commitment as firm. We anticipate that this information can be supplied by the end of October 2019.*

The full direction document also includes some discussion on the intersection and
Can you or someone at NZTA please provide us with a brief written summary of the steps / processes Council and NZTA will need to follow to:

   a. Reduce the speed of SH 56  
   b. Secure funding and approval to upgrade the intersection  
   c. Likely timeframes for a) and b)

I understand there is the possibility we could lead the process for reducing the speed of SH 56.

We only need something brief – but would like something this week so we can finalise our response to the Commissioners.

Regards

David

DAVID MURPHY  I  City Planning Manager  
Palmerston North City Council  I  Private Bag 11034  I  Palmerston North  
P: +64 (6) 3568199  I  F: +64 (6) 3554115  I  M: +64 (27) 2223736  I  www.pncc.govt.nz

Find the latest transport news, information, and advice on our website:  
www.nzta.govt.nz

This email is only intended to be read by the named recipient. It may contain information which is confidential, proprietary or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must delete this email and may not use any information contained in it. Legal privilege is not waived because you have read this email.
Hi Keegan,

We’re still in the midst of stage one of the Speed Limits review, planning to take a draft Speed Limits bylaw to Council in February or March for approval for public consultation. Once we’ve got that underway, we’ll be starting the planning for stage two. So we don’t anticipate starting anything on stage two until about March or April.

When we’ve got the scope confirmed (based on the pre-consultation engagement we did on stage one), we’ll start the early engagement for stage two, likely in May or June. This should put us in a position to bring a draft Speed Limit Bylaw to Council in September or October. We have to give people a minimum of one month to make written submissions, followed by hearings, and then deliberations. If the Council approves the draft bylaw in October, then the written submission period could start later that month, close say early December, with hearings in February 2021, and deliberations/adoption probably in April 2021. I’ve kept the timeframes fairly loose here, because it’s quite hard to predict how long things will take, as it largely depends on the volume and complexity of submissions we receive.

It would be best to align any changes that NZTA make to SH56 with any changes we make to Te Wanaka Road. If NZTA don’t prioritise a speed limit change for SH56 on account of resources, we can work with them to undertake the informal community engagement as part of our stage two work, however it will be up to them to take it from there to make the final speed limit change formally through their own processes. Conversely, if they proceed faster than we have planned for stage two, then the speed limit on SH56 could drop before we are in a position to make a commensurate change on Te Wanaka Road. Ideally, we would want NZTA to agree to take action on SH56, but line up their work with our own stage two work.

Here’s a summary timeframe:

- March 2020: initial scoping for stage two starts
- May-June 2020: informal engagement on stage two changes
- July – September 2020: analysing community feedback and drafting bylaw for Council approval
- October 2020: Council approves draft bylaw for public consultation
- Late October – early December 2020: public consultation on draft Bylaw
- February/March 2021: hearings for oral submissions
- April 2021: deliberations/adoption of Bylaw.

Once the bylaw is adopted, the speed limits come into effect once the new speed limit signs are erected. I would allow a couple of weeks for this to happen.

I hope this helps. Let me know if you need anything else.

Cheers
From: Keegan Aplin-Thane  
Sent: Tuesday, 29 October 2019 8:14 AM  
To: Peter Ridge <peter.ridge@pncc.govt.nz>  
Cc: David Murphy <david.murphy@pncc.govt.nz>  
Subject: RE: Te Wanaka Road / SH56 Speed Limit Review  

Kia ora Peter,

Can you please help me fill the gaps here?:

1. Consultation period starting July 2020  
2. Consultation period lasting one month  
3. Submissions analysed from August – September 2020  
   Prepare report to Planning & Strategy Committee  
   Re-draft Speed Limits Bylaw  
4. Planning & Strategy Committee approves proposed Bylaw  
5. Council ratifies Committee recommendation  
6. Ratified Bylaw updated on website and statutory bodies notified

Nga mihi,

KEEGAN APLIN-THANE | Kaiwhakamahere Kaupapa Here | Planner  
Palmerston North City Council | Private Bag 11034 | Palmerston North  
P: +64 (6) 3568199 | M: 021 731 887 | Placemaking Palmerston North | Linkedin

From: Keegan Aplin-Thane  
Sent: Wednesday, 23 October 2019 8:14 PM  
To: Peter Ridge <peter.ridge@pncc.govt.nz>  
Cc: David Murphy <david.murphy@pncc.govt.nz>  
Subject: Te Wanaka Road / SH56 Speed Limit Review  

Kia ora Peter,

In relation to intersection and speed limit considerations for the Kikiwhenua Residential Area, Council has been instructed by the Commissioners’ Minute from Proposed Plan Change C to advise the details of the process it will follow to make a decision on this request, and its estimate as to when the Council and NZTA could grant the approvals necessary for us to regard the commitment as firm. We anticipate that this information can be supplied by the end of October 2019.

With respect to the process required to review the section of SH56 adjacent to the Kikiwhenua...
Residential Area, NZTA has provided the attached explanation for their organisation to prioritise and initiate the review of speed limits in this location. As Council would be reviewing the speed limit on Te Wanaka Road in the next phase of the Speed Limits Bylaw Review, could you please provide us with a bullet-pointed process and timing for Council’s next speed limit review phase. Please also explain the likelihood of Council having capacity to resource engagement on the speed limit on SH56 if NZTA fails to successfully include this road in their list of priority roads in November 2019 and any likely timing of us including this road in our engagement process.

Thank you in advance.

Nga mihi,

KEEGAN APLIN-THANE | Kaiwhakamahere Kaupapa Here | Planner
Palmerston North City Council | Private Bag 11034 | Palmerston North
P: +64 (6) 3568199 | M: 021 731 887 | Placemaking Palmerston North | Linkedin
APPENDIX 2: Minor amendments missing from the Commissioners’ Plan Change material
Hi Duncan and Aleisha,

We are preparing for public notification (submissions) on District Plan Change C.

Keegan and Jono have prepared a series of minor amendments for your approval.

The amendments are highlighted in yellow in the attached document and can be summarised as follows:

1. Further clarification on the planning assessment regarding high class soils, and the inclusion of the 2010 soil assessment for residential growth options as an appendix.
2. An edit to the proposed changes to the planning maps to align more accurately with the Kikiwhenua Structure Plan.
3. Amend the Kikiwhenua Meeting House site to be rezoned from Race Training to Residential Zone to provide a contiguous Residential Zone across the site until Kikiwhenua is realised as a cultural site. General accordance with the Structure Plan and S17 of the District Plan protects the site from subdivision and development.

You might recall there was some discussion at Committee regarding high class soils. A soils assessment was completed in 2010 as part of the earlier residential growth strategy. We have decided to include this as a technical appendix so the community has access to this information which informed the earlier Council decision to identify City West. I have not attached the actual document because it is 20MB. I can send you a download link if you would like to view the detail.

Can you please consider these amendments and let me know if you approve of them.

We anticipate notifying District Plan Change C on Monday 19 November.

Ngā mihi,

DAVID MURPHY  Acting General Manager Strategy and Planning
Palmerston North City Council  Private Bag 11034  Palmerston North
P: +64 (6) 3568199  F: +64 (6) 3554115  M: +64 (27) 2223736  www.pncc.govt.nz
Proposed Plan Change – Pages 1-3

1 Proposed amendments to the District Plan

(a) District Plan Provisions

Refer to Appendix 1 for all amendments proposed to the Definitions, Whakarongo Residential Area, and Residential Zone Sections. The proposed Kikiwhenua Structure Plan is also included in Appendix 1.

(b) Planning Maps

1. Amend Planning Maps 24 and 30 by rezoning the land from Race Training Zone to Residential Zone. The land parcels affected by rezoning are shown in red in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aerial</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Legal Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Aerial Image" /></td>
<td>154 Pioneer Highway</td>
<td>LOT 1 DP 32600 BLKS XIV KAIRANGA SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of lot 61-99 Te Wanaka Road</th>
<th>Lots 2 3 DP 32600 BLK XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of lot 149 Te Wanaka Road</td>
<td>LOT 1 DP 493470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Part of lot 61-99 Te Wanaka Road**
  - Lots 2 3 DP 32600 BLK XIV

- **Part of lot 149 Te Wanaka Road**
  - LOT 1 DP 493470

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pioneer Highway</th>
<th>PT RS 361 BLKS X XIV KAIRANGA SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Pioneer Highway**
  - PT RS 361 BLKS X XIV KAIRANGA SD
2. Amend Planning Maps 24 and 30 by rezoning the following from Race Training Zone to Recreation Zone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aerial</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of lot 214 Pioneer Highway</td>
<td>RURAL SECS 361A 361B PT SEC 361 PT LOT 1 DP 8529 BLK X KAIRANGA SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

234 Pioneer Highway
LOT 1 DP 80929 BLK X KAIRANGA SD
Engagement with Tanenuiarangi o Manawatū Incorporated to conduct a Cultural Impact Assessment which has identified key resource management issues significant to Rangitāne o Manawatū.

A planning assessment of the appropriate delivery mechanisms for achieving recommended outcomes in the Cultural Impact Assessment.

2.2 In summary feedback from parties has indicated that:

a) Rangitāne o Manawatū – Feedback from RoM is predominantly covered under the response to the Landscape Assessment and Cultural Impact Assessment in Part 2 of this report.

b) RACE Incorporated and Kamind Properties Ltd – Both parties with landowner interest in the site and their consultants have been consulted throughout the process and most of the Structure Plan decisions proposed have been communicated with these parties. It is expected that any further feedback can be accommodated in the submissions stage.

c) Horizons Regional Council - No substantial flood hazard risks have been raised. If further information becomes available at the time of notification then PC C will be able to address these through the response to submissions.

d) New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) – The main concerns raised by NZTA are:
   a. Limiting individual accesses onto Pioneer Highway
   b. The safe and efficient operation of the road network with respect to the junction of Te Wanaka Road and Pioneer Highway
   c. Noise sensitivity in the proximity of Pioneer Highway

Supporting evidence

2.3 In considering and preparing PC C the Council commissioned relevant technical reports and supporting documents. These included:

1. Landscape Assessment
2. Transportation Assessment
3. Stormwater Assessment
4. Water & Wastewater Assessment
5. Cultural Impact Assessment
6. Liquefaction Assessment
7. Noise Assessment
8. Soil Assessment

2.4 The key findings of these reports are outlined below.
Liquefaction Assessment, Tonkin and Taylor, December 2017

2.5 Council commissioned Tonkin and Taylor to complete a report assessing the liquefaction and lateral spread risk for the site. The Report is a high-level assessment, based on ten Cone Penetration Tests (CPTs) throughout the site.

2.6 The results of the CPTs identified that the majority of the site is at medium risk of liquefaction, with the easternmost points of the site at high risk of liquefaction. These areas are shown in Appendix A of the Tonkin and Taylor Report in Appendix 86. The Report acknowledges that categories shown in Appendix A are based on widely-spaced investigations. Additional testing was recommended at a more closely-spaced level to confirm the boundaries within the areas shown in Appendix A and for each lot within the high liquefaction category.

2.7 The Report also considered the risk of lateral spreading given the proximity of the Awapuni Lagoon/Mangaone Stream to the subject site. “A strip of land approximately 50 to 100m wide along the western limits of the existing watercourse site is potentially susceptible to lateral spreading during large earthquake events (e.g. 500-year level shaking). ... The area susceptible to lateral spreading is located within the areas assigned liquefaction categories of Medium and High.”

2.8 The Report identifies likely implications for housing development in the medium and high liquefaction categories where different development options are used. These development options are:

- a standard NZS 3604\textsuperscript{1} foundation with no ground improvement ($15,000 to $20,000 per lot)
- enhanced foundation with no ground improvement ($30,000 to $40,000 per lot)
- enhanced foundation with ground improvement beneath dwelling only ($65,000 to $85,000 per lot)
- enhanced foundation with area wide ground improvement ($110,000 to $140,000 per lot)

2.9 The report notes that a standard NZS 3604 foundation is unlikely to meet Building Code requirements. An enhanced foundation with no ground improvement is likely to meet Building Code requirements. Enhancements above this provide additional resilience beyond minimum building code requirements. Similar standard and enhanced foundation options also apply to the potential for lateral spread issues and likelihood of meeting Building Code requirements.

2.10 The report continues by noting that “If area-wide improvement is not undertaken..., then buried services and pavements outside the treated areas would be susceptible to liquefaction-induced damage. The resilience of infrastructure networks could be increased by:

- Undertaking localised ground improvement along infrastructure corridors, and /or
- Using flexible pipes, flexible connections, and pressurised (rather than gravity-driven) networks.”

Overall, based on the findings, the report considers site development. “Development of the site would be appropriate subject to the options provided. Site specific assessments required for design will provide greater clarity for foundation design and ground improvement requirements for individual lots.

\textsuperscript{1} NZS 3604:2011 Timber framed buildings
2.11 This assessment does not remove any requirements for site specific assessment for detailed design. All requirements for design as stated in NZS 3604 still apply.”

2.12 On that basis the rezoning of the site to Residential Zone is considered appropriate as long as the District Plan provides adequate controls for geotechnical assessment and mitigation measures at the time of development.

Acoustic Report, Acousafe, May 2018

2.13 Council’s Acoustic Expert, Mr Nigel Lloyd from Acousafe Consulting and Engineering Limited, has reviewed the proposal in relation to how the District Plan could adequately manage the actual and potential noise effects on new residential activities as the site is redeveloped, taking particular account of:

- the cross-boundary effects with neighbouring rural and race training activities, and
- the expectation that the area will have a speed limit that is consistent with a residential area.

2.14 A letter exchange between the Council and the New Zealand Transport Agency has been referenced confirming the future long-term outcome of the section of Pioneer Highway adjacent to the site as being a local residential road. Mr Lloyd has recommended that a 20 metre setback should be applied at the Pioneer Highway interface given these conditions, with soft landscaping utilised to increase the noise reduction properties of the surface.

2.15 To aid in the long-term land use being predominantly residential, the noise provisions of the Residential Zone have been recommended for this site.

Soils and Land Use Capability of the Kelvin Grove, Anders Road and Race Course Growth Options, Agresearch, July 2010

2.16 As part of the development of the former Residential Growth Strategy 2010, Agresearch were conducted to analyse the soil capability across various residential growth options, including the area referred to as the Kikiwhenua Residential Area.

2.17 Map 5 of the assessment in Appendix 8 shows a high proportion of the site being made up of Class 1 and 2 soils suitable for food production, however Maps 7 and 9 of the assessment show a lower proportion of soils with an actual value for food production when considering land use, the built environment, and parcel size.

2.18 A large area of class 1 soils located to the south-west of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area were specifically excluded from the proposed City West (Anders Road and Race course) Residential Growth Area. The final extent of the proposed City West Area is shown in Map 9.2 of the District Plan.
Alternative Two: Plan Change as proposed

Rezone the site bounded by Te Wanaka Road, Pioneer Highway, and the Mangaone Stream from Race Training Zone to Residential Zone. Include a structure plan to guide future residential development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The alternative zone aligns with the anticipated future use of the site.</td>
<td>• The costs of formulating and implementing new provisions for the Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realises one of Council’s preferred growth options to provide a variety of housing choice and needs in the City.</td>
<td>• The costs of rezoning and preparing a plan change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The structure planning process allows for more oversight into how development is coordinating with the Cityview Objective, Council’s Strategic Direction, generally logical and connected neighbourhoods.</td>
<td>• Costs associated with the enhanced foundation design to mitigate risk of liquefaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains a clear buffer between potentially incompatible uses either side of Te Wanaka Road in a staged manner.</td>
<td>• Costs associated with development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enables Council to better meet it’s obligations under Section 6 of the RMA.</td>
<td>• Costs associated with servicing the site for water, wastewater, roading, parks, and transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures a high quality urban environment is created that is sympathetic to the specific context of the site.</td>
<td>• Opportunity costs with respect to high class soils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiency:

The alternative Zone for this site allows for a more efficient use of land than the current undersubscribed race training land use. The site is one of the most efficient greenfield sites to service for growth infrastructure. This option proposes to inform the site’s development with an integrated structure plan, allowing for an efficient release of land for urban development.

The efficient use of high class soils would be lost through residential development, and it would be unlikely to provide for development that can be both an efficient use of land for residential use and retaining productive soils for future use.

The benefits of this option outweigh the costs with respect to efficiently meeting Council’s obligations under the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity.

Effectiveness:

The provisions of PC C are considered to be effective in enabling a change in land use for the site. Utilising the land for housing allows for the entire site to be put to use. The Structure Plan provides for the recognition and investment of Kikiwhenua to meet Council’s duties with respect to protecting and enhancing waahi tapu sites.

Opportunities for Economic Growth and Employment:

This option encourages residential development at this site. There are added spillover benefits to the local construction sector and increased commercial viability for Awapuni. Revenue from
the site is likely to enable further investment into Awapuni Racecourse to realise their position as one of four Nationally Strategic Racecourses under the New Zealand Thoroughbred Racing Strategic Plan. Releasing this stage for development will create infrastructure improvements that will move further stages of Kakatangiata closer to being developable.

Risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information:

The risk of not acting is that future residential growth is limited from occurring in the west of the City. There are little existing options for the City to grow whilst maintaining a central core and contiguous urban form. Expansion of quality race training facilities at Kamada Park have reduced the dependency on Awapuni’s race training capacity to be serviced at this site, so continued use of the site would be limited. It is anticipated that RACE would not further develop race training facilities at this site due to its surplus requirement, so there is a risk that the site runs into disrepair.

Council has information, in the form of the Tonkin and Taylor Liquefaction Report, which states that development of the site is appropriate provided improvements are undertaken. In this case, to achieve protection in a 1 in 100 year earthquake event, the improvements required relate to enhanced foundation design above the Building Act Requirements. This is considered a small cost in relation to the overall land and house package values expected at the site.

Overall, there is sufficient information to support this change.

Appropriateness:

The rezoning and new provisions are considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and to fulfil Council’s statutory obligation to ensure that a District Plan sustainably manages the natural and physical resources of the City.

As detailed in the assessment above, there are a number of benefits to rezoning the site to residential. An important cost that needs to be weighed-up against the overall benefits of the rezoning proposal is the additional cost associated with liquefaction mitigation in the event of a significant earthquake. This is an issue the City is having to carefully consider with all new rezoning proposals. A desktop Liquefaction Report completed at the macro-scale in 2011 revealed large parts of the City located on the plains of the Manawatū River are subject to moderate to very-high liquefaction risk. A further report was commissioned in 2017 to conduct further liquefaction assessments specific to the Kikiwhenua Residential Area.

The costs and benefits of any rezoning proposal are unique and need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Section 32(2)(b) of the Act seeks, if practicable, for Council to quantify the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the provisions. In terms of PC C and the associated liquefaction risk, the rezoning and the additional cost of the provisions requiring pre-development geotechnical investigations can be quantified at a high-level based on the information contained within the Tonkin and Taylor Report in Appendix 8.

July median house prices in Palmerston North in July 2018 were $400,000\(^2\). Given section sizes are likely to be close to the average in Palmerston North, the median house prices can be used

\(^2\) REINZ Monthly Property Report, August 2018
as a proxy for Kikiwhenua house values. Based on this, the total capital value for approximately 220 lots could be $88,000,000.

Table 6.1 of the Liquefaction Report by Tonkin and Taylor in Appendix 7 summarises the development options and costs in medium and high liquefaction risk areas. The additional costs, over and above standard foundations, range from $15,000 to $112,000. Assuming development option 2 is used, the additional costs, over and above standard foundations, range from $26,000 to $32,000 for medium liquefaction risk areas. It is likely development option 2 will be required in medium liquefaction risk areas to which the entire plan change area comprises of. Liquefaction assessments at subdivision stage will provide further clarity about appropriate mitigation. It is estimated that across the 220 lots estimated for the development, mitigation costs will range between $5,720,000 and $7,040,000.

Local infrastructure such as the service roads, lanes and local water and wastewater connections will be required to be installed by the developer. Table 5.3 of the Liquefaction Report reveals the additional costs associated with mitigating the effects of liquefaction on local infrastructure to be minimal. Council already requires flexible pipes and connections at the time of subdivision. A pressurised system has been recommended in both the Liquefaction Report and Water/Wastewater Assessment, however we do not have enough information to determine the costs of a low-pressure system. We do know that a low-pressure system is of a lower cost than localised ground improvements, so will use the costs of localised ground improvements as a conservative proxy for infrastructure liquefaction mitigation. If services were placed in a 1.5m – 2.0m wide deep trench the additional cost would be $90-$120/m. The proposed structure plan contains approximately 2500 metres of service corridor / road which equates to $225,000 - $300,000 additional cost across the entire development.

The costs of developing tracks, securing the Kikiwhenua site, and developing roads, services and stormwater infrastructure have not been quantified as they are not expected to be prohibit the cost-efficiency of the development.

The overall benefits and additional liquefaction mitigation costs can be summarised as follows:

- Total capital value of completed residential development: $88,000,000.
- Additional costs, over and above standard foundations, for medium liquefaction risk areas: $5,720,000 - $7,040,000.
- Additional costs for local infrastructure mitigation: $225,000 - $300,000.
- Total additional liquefaction mitigation costs: $5,942,500 - $7,340,000.

Based on the assessment above, the additional costs associated with liquefaction mitigation anticipated for the PC C site are not considered significant.

This analysis is not intended to be a full quantified cost-benefit analysis of PC C. The purpose is to quantify the additional liquefaction mitigations costs relative to the total capital value of the completed residential development. The analysis has also not quantified mitigation costs associated with the high liquefaction risk areas on site or areas susceptible to lateral spreading, as these sites have been excluded from the structure plan.
With respect to the consideration of high class soils versus meeting demand for residential land, given the following reasons, it is considered appropriate to use this land for housing:

- the land is not being productively used or zoned for productive use at present
- the limited options for meeting residential land use needs across the City
- the requirements under the NPS for Urban Development Capacity
- the risk of uncoordinated and disconnected further stages of Kakatangiata if this site is not developed
- the recreation and environmental relationship between the stream and the development built through the plan change as proposed
- reserving the Kikiwhenua Meeting House site for commercial food production may be a culturally-inappropriate fit long-term for the site
7A. WHAKARONGO GREENFIELD RESIDENTIAL AREAS

7A.1 Introduction

Subdivision is a process to enable the separate ownership of land and the registration of interests in land. Subdivision of land is defined by the Resource Management Act 1991.

This section enables greenfield development within:
- The Whakarongo Residential Area (as shown on Map 7A.1)
- The Kikiwhenua Residential Area (Map 7A.2)

These areas were identified for residential growth in the Palmerston North City Residential Growth Strategy (2010)-Development Strategy 2017.

The provisions within this section require well designed, attractive and functional communities within the Whakarongo Greenfield Residential Areas. The Whakarongo Structure Plans (Map 7A.1) for each Greenfield Residential Area will direct subdivision and provides for a neighbourhood centre surrounded by residential development and including public open spaces. A mix of activities and densities are provided for which will assist with achieving a variety of living choices and a diverse community.

7A.2 Resource Management Issues

The following resource management issues were identified with regard to subdivision within the Whakarongo Greenfield Residential Area and apply in addition to the overarching issues identified in Section 7.2:

1. The need for subdivision to create a pleasant, attractive and safe residential neighbourhood.
2. The need to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are put in place to support residential development in areas affected by natural hazards.
3. The risk of uncoordinated residential development.
4. The need for connectivity between staged development and adjacent urban neighbourhoods.
5. The need to cater for an aging population and changing housing demand through a variety of housing forms and densities.
6. The importance for well-located and accessible local services and community facilities within the neighbourhood centre.
7. The need for high-quality and coordinated streetscapes and public open space.
8. The effects of residential development on sites of significance to Rangitāne.
Residential Area can be serviced for water without the need for a new bore and reservoir, it will be required to service the full residential subdivision of Kakatangiata.

To ensure both the efficient delivery of this new bore supply to the city water network and to meet the water supply LoS requirements for the wider Kakatangiata Growth Area Council has assessment the trunk network needs to provide for:

- A 300mm diameter pipe along Pioneer Highway connecting to the existing 300mm diameter pipeline at Maxwell Line intersection
- A 200mm diameter main in Te Wanaka Road from Pioneer Highway to Grand Oaks Drive

Council has made provision to fund the cost of upsizing the mains from the 200mm and 150mm mains required to service the Kikiwhenua Residential Area.

### 3.4 Funding

Council has approved programmes in the 2018-28 LTP for funding of new water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure in the Kakatangiata area in anticipation of re-zoning occurring within the period of the LTP. Programme 1170 – Urban Growth – Kakatangiata – Installation of Water Supply Systems has provided for the following levels of funding for wastewater water supply infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Programme 1170 – 2018-28 LTP Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The funding allocation was made with provision for servicing of the Kikiwhenua Residential Area with some initial funding in 2019/20 to funding mains upgrades in Pioneer Highway and Te Wanaka Road. The timing of funding requirements will be dependent on progress with any plan change. If required Council funding provisions may need to be brought forward.

### Summary

An assessment of both water and wastewater servicing requirements for the proposed Kikiwhenua Residential Area has been completed. This has included a detailed assessment by way of network modelling for both water supply and pressure sewer servicing. The assessment has confirmed:

- For both water supply and wastewater servicing cost efficient servicing options for the Kikiwhenua Residential Area are available which are consistent with longer term servicing of the Kakatangiata Growth Area
- The trunk infrastructure required to service the Kikiwhenua Residential Area has been identified. It is Council’s expectation that this infrastructure will be funded by the developer.
- Council has funding in confirmed LTP programmes within the next 2 to 3 years to fund the upsizing of both trunk water and wastewater services to provide for future growth.
Primary road connection to Pioneer Highway to be left-in/left-out turning only until the speed limit on the road reduces to 60km/hr or below.

Secondary road connection to Grand Oaks Drive subject to assessment via a Designation or PNCC Resource Consent and Horizons Regional Council Resource Consent.
APPENDIX 3: Rangitane Correspondence
Morena

See comments in caps below.

Tena korua Danielle, Jon,

Thank you for meeting with David, Michael and myself on Thursday to discuss the concerns raised by Commissioners regarding Proposed Plan Change C: Kikiwhenua Residential Area. As discussed, Commissioners have requested the following:

**Direction 3:** In relation to our request for further information on the identification, and protection if appropriate, of the three sites of significance to Rangitane, we direct the Council to discuss these issues with Rangitane, and with relevant land owners as necessary, and report to us on the way in which each site should be spatially identified, and on whether specific measures are required, as part of PC C, to preserve or protect any of the sites. This report should be sent by 31 October 2019.

In order to answer this request, we have had a hui together to go through the pros and cons of spatial definition of wahi tapu versus the current approach proposed in Plan Change C. Some notes made from our hui yesterday are below. Please read through these and make sure that this is an accurate account of what we had discussed, and whether you agree with the statements below.

- The risk of having strictly spatially-defined waahi tapu sites is that District Plan rules will only be able to apply to the site as defined in the Plan. If through archaeological assessment the developer finds that the site is larger than defined in the Plan, then there...
may be no mechanisms to protect the extent of waahi tapu that has not been identified. Likewise, if the archaeological assessment finds that the site is smaller than defined in the Plan, there are no mechanisms to negotiate any other use of the land not part of waahi tapu.

- Spatially defining the sites in a public document poses risks to the retention of wahi tapu prior to subdivision consents being applied for.

- Residential Zoning as an intermediary zone is the most flexible zone to realise Rangitane’s future aspirations for Kikiwhenua. For example, the Residential Zone provisions in Section 10 of the District Plan provide for community and leisure facilities, Papakainga and Marae development, health centres, and commercial activity. While the Recreation Zone provides for community and leisure activities, the zone does not provide for the breadth of opportunities that may want to be captured by Rangitane o Manawatu in the future. If the Residential Zone is not seen as the best zone in the near future, then the proposed plan change for the future stages of Kakatangiata can include a rezoning of Kikiwhenua. THIS IS BASED ON PNCC AS TO THE REZONING APPROACHES.

- Kikiwhenua is protected from residential development through rule 7A.5.2.3(c)(vi) the extent to which Kikwhenua, Awapuni Pa, an associated Urupa are retained and recognised within the subdivision, backed up by archaeological assessment and cultural monitoring requirements in rule 7A.5.2.3. Section 17 of the District Plan schedules Kikiwhenua and the Urupa for protection under rule 17.8.1 as sites of cultural heritage value to tangata whenua.

- The site which the Urupa is located is within land owned by Trustees of Rangitane o Manawatu Settlement Trust. Plan Change C and your agreement with RACE ensure controls are in place should further work identify part of the Urupa is located on land subject to Plan Change C. AGREE

- General accordance with the Kikiwhenua Structure Plan is strengthened through the requirement for an archaeological assessment, archaeological discover protocol, and a cultural monitoring plan. In order to assure an accurate extent of waahi tapu prior to the approval of a subdivision consent, Rangitane have recommended amending rule 7A.5.2.3(c)(i) as follows:

  Whether an archaeological assessment of the site has been undertaken by a suitably qualified archaeologist, including geophysical surveys to identify the extent of waahi tapu. THIS IS A LITTLE WEAK CAN WE SAY AN ARCH... WILL BE..... TO MAKE SURE IT DOES OCCURR.

- The current Structure Plan extent implies that Rangitane land adjacent to the Mangaone Stream is captured under the Kikiwhenua Residential Area. As the land is not subject to Residential Zone rezoning, the land is not captured by provisions in Plan Change C. To make this clearer, we propose to shift the boundary indicated in Map 7A.2 to exclude RoM land. Please see attached.

- It is not appropriate to spatially define Awapuni as it is the name of the general area /
former lagoon and it is not specifically located in the location shown in the Cultural Impact Assessment.

Kia ora rawa atu for your assistance in this part of the process.

Nga mihi,

KEEGAN APLIN-THANE  |  Kaiwhakamahere Kaupapa Here  |  Planner
Palmerston North City Council  |  Private Bag 11034  |  Palmerston North
P: +64 (6) 3568199  |  M: 021 731 887  |  Placemaking Palmerston North  |  Linkedin