Decisions on Submissions – Private Plan Change – Rongotea South

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
SO1/00 1	Rhonda Maurice	Whole Plan Change	Oppose	Three Waters: The infrastructure will not cope. Roading: Worried about traffic congestion. Local Character: The quiet community will have its population nearly doubled and the building process will cause ongoing disruption. Is also worried that the rezoning will devalue surrounding properties and alter the outlook of the area.	MDC opposes the rezoning application.	Reject for the reasons set out in the decision.
SO2/00 1	Chantelle Miles	Whole Plan Change	Oppose	Local Character: Purchased a section in the area due to the quiet rural area and did not anticipate being surrounding by residential properties. Owns a lifestyle property and wants the area to maintain its current character. Is also worried about the impact on the local school role.	Refuse the proposal.	Reject for the reasons set out in the decision.

No.	Submitte	Provisio	Support/	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
	r Name	n of Plan	Oppose			
FSO1/0 01	WB & CM Miles Family Trust – Warren Bernard Miles and Carolyn Maria Miles	Supports S				As above
SO3/00 1	Marti Hodgins	Whole Plan Change	Unstated	Three Waters: Currently a lot of flooding during wet/heavy rain periods. A lot of pre-work needs to occur on the land before it can be developed. The subject site sits higher than surrounding properties where a large amount of water runoff occurs into properties along Severn Street. A sufficient drainage system needs to be established to ensure stormwater effects are prevented on adjoining properties.	Ensure adequate drainage is in place between the subject site and Severn Street.	Accept in part for the reasons set out in the decision.
SO4/00 1	Andrew Mercer	Potential Walkway	Does not oppose	Recreation: Seeks that the developer be required to construct and form the	Require the developers to construct the walkway as part of the Plan Change.	Accept in part for the reasons set out in the decision.

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				"potential walkway" for the benefit of the wider community.		
SO5/00 1	Wayne Page	Whole plan change	Oppose	Local Character: Purchased a section in the area due to the quiet rural area and did not anticipate being surrounding by residential properties. Wants quiet country living without close neighbours. Only anticipated similar style development to theirs within the surrounding area. Amenity: Worried about additional foot traffic in the area, additional noise, loss of privacy and damage to the private road.	Refuse the proposal.	Reject for the reasons set out in the decision.
SO6/00 1	Guy & Sue Pinckney	Whole Plan Change	Support	General : Sees this as a great asset to the Rongotea Area and as neighbours, only see positive for the district.	Approve the proposal.	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
SO7/00 1	Rongotea & District Lions Club	Wetland Develop ment	Support	Wetland: Supports the redevelopment of the wetland within the subject site as the Club supports any project they see as benefiting the wider community. The development will also provide an educational environment for the 7 schools within the Te Kawau cluster.	Approve the proposal.	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision
SO8/00 1	Dean Arnott	Whole Plan Change	Support	Soil: Has been in the area for a prolonged period of time and has leased the subject site for rural purposes. The site has been difficult to farm due to the soil conditions being heavy and difficult to drain away excess moisture. General: No power or stock water supply to the site and close proximity to residential neighbours reduces the productive rural options for the site. The township of Rongotea is well suited to expansion with other developments that have	Approve the proposal.	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				occurred creating opportunities for local businesses and the community alike. Development is a positive addition to the community.		
SO9/00 1	Rob & Jan Griffin	Whole Plan Change	Support	General: Recent developments have improved the entry to Rongotea along Banks Road. The redevelopment of the subject site will energise the village and provide recreational opportunities to current and future generations. The village is very self-sufficient and takes care of one another.	Approve the proposal.	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision
				Three Waters: The infrastructure is ready with the new community water scheme and the newly installed wastewater to Kawakawa Road.		
				Community Facilities: There is a community recreation facility and community swimming pool. Local businesses are present to serve the needs of the community. The township is well		

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				placed to support sustainable growth. Recreation: The concept of a new recreational space will provide a safe and welcoming environment for all of the residents in the vicinity of the village.		
SO10/0 01	Walter Lockyer	Propose d Structur e Plan	Does not state	Roading: Including a new linking road will mean the new area is more in keeping with the village structure.	Structure Plan be amended to include a connecting road to Witham Street.	Reject for the reasons set out in the decision
SO11/0 01	Manawat u District Council	Whole Plan Change	Unstated	Population Growth: Current Population of Rongotea 640 (2018 census), Estimated to be 710 based on 1.8% population increase between 2018 and 2022(2022) Three Waters: Potable Water: Current Consent: 107252 800m3/day Expires 1 July 2029. Currently not all of the dwellings in Rongotea are connected to the potable water scheme. Based on the 2022 data the water use is characterised as follows: Average use 82m3 per day Peak use	Provision be made in the Plan Change and Structure Plan to include flexibility around size and ownership options of the greenspace area. That comment be sought from recognised mana whenua.	Submission withdrawn – no decision required

No.	Submitte	Provisio	Support/	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
	r Name	n of Plan	Oppose			
				312m3 per day 95th percentile		
				138m3/day Reasonable Water		
				Use Calculation based on		
				everyone being connected and 7		
				year growth at 2% (Consent		
				expiry date). Current 335m3/day,		
				Plan Change 219m3/day, Total		
				554m3/day.		
				, ,		
				Even if every property in		
				Rongotea connected to the		
				potable water scheme and all		
				160 properties were inhabited		
				before 1 July 2029 (current		
				consent expires) there would be		
				sufficient water to support the		
				scheme.		
				Wastewater, Council are in the		
				process of centralising the		
				Rongotea WWTP, as part of this		
				work the Trent Street		
				pumpstation and rising main is		
				being upgraded. If wastewater is		
				pumped to the Trent Street		
				pumpstation, money associated		
				with the development		
				contributions should go towards		

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				ensuring there is sufficient		
				capacity both in terms of pump		
				capacity, and pipe size. Storage		
				at the new pump station should		
				be provided to prevent an		
				unintentional discharge to a		
				surface waterway. Any		
				connection to Trent Street		
				should occur after the Trent		
				Street Pump Station is upgraded		
				as it currently is experiencing		
				capacity issues. In addition to		
				this, the Rongotea WWTP is at		
				design capacity and therefore		
				additional connections should		
				not occur until the centralisation		
				project has been completed.		
				Stormwater, The reserve concept		
				for stormwater management		
				should be encouraged.		
				Consideration to putting an		
				easement over the two		
				additional overland flow paths		
				should be given to ensure these		
				flow paths are maintained.		

No.	Submitte	Provisio	Support/	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
	r Name	n of Plan	Oppose			
				Roading: Roading have not		
				identified any concerns with the		
				proposed roading configuration.		
				Recreation: Council currently has		
				no plans to expand the		
				greenspace or recreational space		
				in Rongotea Village. The addition		
				of 140-180 houses will require		
				additional greenspace and the		
				inclusion of this is supported in		
				the Draft Structure Plan. At this		
				point in time there is no budget		
				in place to support the		
				development and maintenance		
				of a greenspace in this area and		
				as such this will need to be a		
				consideration as part of Council's		
				Long Term Plan decision process.		
				Given the expanse of area		
				shown, Council wishes to		
				highlight that the cost and level		
				of service commitment required		
				to maintain the greenspace will		
				have financial implications for		
				Rongotea Village and Council and		
				as such it is requested that		
				provision be made in the Plan		
				Change and Structure Plan to		

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				include flexibility around size and ownership options of the greenspace area, noting that the size of this area will be influenced by final design requirements (including possible stormwater treatment options). Cultural Impact Assessment: MDC notes that a Cultural Impact Assessment has been prepared by Rangitāne in support of the Private Plan Change. MDC notes that other iwi/hapū are also formally recognised as having interest in this part of the Manawatū.		
\$011/0 02	Manawat u District Council	Propose d Structur e Plan	Unstated	Roading: Council supports provision of access connections through to Rongotea Village.	Structure Plan be amended to include a connecting road to Witham Street.	Submission withdrawn – no decision required
SO12/0 01	Waka Kotahi	Whole Plan Change	Neutral	Roading: Does not expect the proposal to adversely impact the safe operation of the surrounding state highway network or nearby freight connections as there is sufficient capacity within the state highway	Support provision for well- connected cycleways and walkways to be retained as part of the proposal to provide local residents with alternative transport	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				network to absorb the relatively small traffic generation.	options in the local environment.	
				Connectivity: Supports a multimodal approach to developments to promote a range of transport options and avoid increasing the current reliance on private vehicles for travel. The proposed development is well located in terms of its proximity to the local primary school and small retail/service areas of the village. The bulk of employment opportunities for future residents will generally be located beyond the Rongotea Township area.	Inclusion of walkway on the structure plan.	
				Acknowledges that the Manawatu-Whanganui Regional Council have signalled that investigation of a bus route between Palmerston North and Rongotea is a high priority with investigations anticipated to begin in 2023 according to the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The provision of a bus		

No.	Submitte	Provisio	Support/	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
	r Name	n of Plan	Oppose			
				route would provide an		
				additional alternative to private		
				vehicle use and thereby increase		
				travel options for local residents		
				to employment opportunities		
				outside of Rongotea. Currently,		
				there is no certainty regarding		
				whether the investigation or		
				potential establishment of this		
				bus route will go ahead. Waka		
				Kotahi would support a bus route		
				between Palmerston North and		
				Rongotea were it to go ahead in		
				future.		
				The proposed inclusion of		
				walkways, multimodal pathways,		
				and connections to the existing		
				footpaths in Rongotea is critical		
				to ensure safe and accessible		
				multi-modal travel options are		
				provided for future residents and		
				users of the development. Waka		
				Kotahi notes that there is a		
				'walkway opportunity' identified		
				on the proposed structure plan.		
				A walkway of this nature would		
				provide important through		
				connections from the proposed		

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				development to Witham Street. Waka Kotahi therefore supports the inclusion of this walkway within the structure plan.		
SO12/0 02	Waka Kotahi	Objectiv e DEV1 - 02	Unstated	Connectivity: The wording here suggests the benefits of cycling and walking within the village are restricted to recreational benefits. The sustainable benefits of multi-modal approaches to transport go beyond recreation however. Benefits also include reduced travel costs, safer roads through reduced vehicle traffic, reduced noise and reduced traffic pollution within the local context. It also encourages a reduction in Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT), albeit at a local level. Waka Kotahi requests consideration of a wording change to reflect the broader benefits provided by cycling and walking in the local context. This would provide future decision makers with an understanding of	The wording of Objective DEV1 – 02 be amended. Possible wording: Objectives DEV1 – O2 Subdivision in the Rongotea South Development Area creates a sustainable neighbourhood where: a. the development successfully integrates with the village character of Rongotea; b. natural site features are protected and incorporated into the development design; c. the recreational and multi-modal opportunities of the community are	Accept in part for the reasons set out in the decision

No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
				the value of well-connected walking and cycling infrastructure as critical elements to the community beyond just their recreational value.	enhanced through the provision of public open space and pedestrian and cycle linkages; and	
SO13/0 01	Graham Edwards	Whole plan change	Support	Three Waters: The subject site sits higher than surrounding properties where a large amount of water runoff occurs into properties along Severn Street. A sufficient drainage system needs to be established to ensure stormwater effects are prevented on adjoining properties. Needs to be some kind of swale drain between the subject site and the rear of the properties adjacent with a culvert connecting down towards Trent Street.	Ensure adequate drainage is in place between the subject site and Severn Street.	Accept for the reasons set out in the decision
SO14/0 01	Horizons Regional Council	Flooding and Stormwa ter Manage ment	Unstated	Three Waters: Discussion with Horizons Regional Council (Horizons) staff re-iterated concern regarding the location of the proposed Stormwater treatment and attenuation pond within 100m proximity of identified natural inland	Require the applicant to confirm how the conditions of regulation 55 of the NES-F 2020 will be met. Require the applicant to provide the geotechnical	Accept in part for the reasons set out in the decision

No.	Submitte	Provisio	Support/	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
	r Name	n of Plan	Oppose			
				wetlands. Regulation 54 of the	assessment requested	
				national Environmental Standard	during discussions with	
				for Freshwater (2020)	Horizons of the alternate	
				determines that the diversion or	storm water treatment	
				discharge of water within, or	and attenuation system	
				within a 100m setback from, a	proposed under Option B.	
				natural wetland is a non-	The application states that	
				complying activity. Horizons	Option b is the most	
				considers that the applicant	sensible location for the	
				Horizons considers that the	storm water treatment	
				applicant has not indicated how	and attenuation pond,	
				the Option A location of the	given the distance of	
				Stormwater treatment and	100m from the existing	
				attenuation pond will meet the	identified natural inland	
				requirements for the protection	wetlands, yet the	
				of the existing natural inland	application recommends	
				wetland. The applicant has not	Option A.	
				outlined how the requirements	Require the applicant to	
				of regulation 55 will be met,	confirm that Option A	
				particularly where activities must	provides the same level or	
				not result in the discharge of a	better protection from	
				contaminant if the receiving	potential contaminant	
				environment includes an natural	discharge into the existing	
				wetland (55(3)(a)) or alter the	natural wetland than	
				natural movement of waterinto	Option B and the grounds	
				any natural wetland waters	on which this	
				(55(3)(c) or could ensure that the	determination is based.	
				activity will not promote the		

discharge of water to any natural wetland (55(3)(d). The application discusses 'restoration of a wetland' as the manner is which storm water treatment and attenuation systems will be undertaken. Description of a water treatment and attenuation systems will be undertaken. Require the applicant to confirm how the proposed stormwater treatment and attenuation system in Option A meets the wetland restoration requirements, when apart from the identified natural inland wetland area outlined, no other wetland is available to be 'restored'. Require the applicant to confirm how the applicant to confirm how the 'restoration' will be undertaken on the existing natural inland wetland, which by it's definition has no	No.	Submitte r Name	Provisio n of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested	Panel Decision
requirement for restoration.					wetland (55(3)(d). The application discusses 'restoration of a wetland' as the manner is which storm water treatment and attenuation systems will be	confirm how the proposed stormwater treatment and attenuation system in Option A meets the wetland restoration requirements, when apart from the identified natural inland wetland area outlined, no other wetland is available to be 'restored'. Require the applicant to confirm how the 'restoration' will be undertaken on the existing natural inland wetland, which by it's definition has no requirement for	