

Summary of Submissions – Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
SO1/001	Rhonda Maurice	Whole Plan Change	Oppose	<p>Three Waters: The infrastructure will not cope.</p> <p>Roading: Worried about traffic congestion.</p> <p>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.</p>	MDC opposes the rezoning application.
SO2/001	Chantelle Miles	Whole Plan Change	Oppose	<p>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.</p>	Refuse the proposal.
SO3/001	Marti Hodgins	Whole Plan Change	Unstated	<p>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.</p>	Ensure adequate drainage is in place between the subject site and Severn Street.
SO4/001	Andrew Mercer	Potential Walkway	Does not oppose	<p>Recreation: Seeks that the developer be required to construct and form the “potential walkway” for the benefit of the wider community.</p>	Require the developers to construct the walkway as part of the Plan Change.
SO5/001	Wayne Page	Whole plan change	Oppose	<p>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</p>	Refuse the proposal.

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				<p>neighbours. Only anticipated similar style development to theirs within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Amenity: Worried about additional foot traffic in the area, additional noise, loss of privacy and damage to the private road.</p>	
SO6/001	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.
SO7/001	Rongotea & District Lions Club	Wetland Development	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.
SO8/001	Dean Arnott	Whole Plan Change	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>General: No power or stock water supply to the site and close proximity to residential neighbours reduces the productive rural options for the site.</p> <p>The township of Rongotea is well suited to expansion with other developments that have occurred creating opportunities for local businesses and the community alike. Development is a positive addition to the community.</p>	Approve the proposal.

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
SO9/001	Rob & Jan Griffin	Whole Plan Change	Support	<p>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.</p> <p>Three Waters: The infrastructure is ready with the new community water scheme and the newly installed wastewater to Kawakawa Road.</p> <p>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 placed to support sustainable growth.</p> <p>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.</p>	Approve the proposal.
SO10/001	Walter Lockyer	Proposed Structure Plan	Does not state	<p>Roading: Including a new linking road will mean the new area is more in keeping with the village structure.</p>	Structure Plan be amended to include a connecting road to Witham Street.
SO11/001	Manawatu District Council	Whole Plan Change	Unstated	<p>Population Growth: Current Population of Rongotea 640 (2018 census), Estimated to be 710 based on 1.8% population increase between 2018 and 2022(2022)</p> <p>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 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.</p>	<p>Provision be made in the Plan Change and Structure Plan to include flexibility around size and ownership options of the greenspace area.</p> <p>That comment be sought from recognised mana whenua.</p>

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				<p>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.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Roading: Rooding have not identified any concerns with the proposed roading configuration.</p> <p>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</p>	

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				<p>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 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).</p> <p>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.</p>	
SO11/002	Manawatu District Council	Proposed Structure 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.
SO12/001	Waka Kotahi	Whole Plan Change	Neutral	<p>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 network to absorb the relatively small traffic generation.</p> <p>Connectivity: Supports a multi-modal 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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Support provision for well-connected cycleways and walkways to be retained as part of the proposal to provide local residents with alternative transport options in the local environment.</p> <p>Inclusion of walkway on the structure plan.</p>

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				<p>Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). The provision of a bus 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.</p> <p>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 development to Witham Street. Waka Kotahi therefore supports the inclusion of this walkway within the structure plan.</p>	
SO12/002	Waka Kotahi	Objective DEV1 - 02	Unstated	<p>Connectivity: The wording here suggests the benefits of cycling and walking within the village are restricted to <i>recreational</i> 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 value of well-connected walking</p>	<p>The wording of Objective DEV1 – 02 be amended.</p> <p>Possible wording:</p> <p>Objectives <i>DEV1 – 02</i> <i>Subdivision in the Rongotea South Development Area creates a sustainable neighbourhood where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. the development successfully integrates with the village character of Rongotea;</i> <i>b. natural site features are protected and incorporated into the development design;</i>

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				and cycling infrastructure as critical elements to the community beyond just their recreational value.	<i>c. the recreational and multi-modal opportunities of the community are enhanced through the provision of public open space and pedestrian and cycle linkages; and...</i>
SO13/001	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.
SO14/001	Horizons Regional Council	Flooding and Stormwater Management	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 wetlands. Regulation 54 of the national Environmental Standard for Freshwater (2020) determines that the diversion or discharge of water within, or within a 100m setback from, a natural wetland is a non-complying activity. Horizons considers that the applicant Horizons considers that the applicant has not indicated how the Option A location of the Stormwater treatment and attenuation pond will meet the requirements for the protection of the existing natural inland wetland. The applicant has not outlined how the requirements of regulation 55 will be met, particularly where activities must not result in the discharge of a contaminant if the receiving environment includes a natural wetland (55(3)(a)) or alter the natural movement of water...into any natural wetland waters (55(3)(c) or could ensure that the activity will not promote the discharge of water to any natural wetland (55(3)(d). The application discusses 'restoration of a	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 assessment requested during discussions with Horizons of the alternate storm water treatment and attenuation system proposed under Option B. The application states that Option b is the most sensible location for the storm water treatment and attenuation pond, given the distance of 100m from the existing identified natural inland wetlands, yet the application recommends Option A. Require the applicant to confirm that Option A provides the same level or better protection from potential contaminant discharge into the existing natural wetland than Option B and the grounds on which this determination is based. Require the applicant to confirm how the proposed stormwater treatment and attenuation system in Option A meets the wetland restoration requirements, when apart

Summary of Submissions – Proposed Private Plan Change 1 – Rongotea South

No.	Submitter Name	Provision of Plan	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Decision Requested
				wetland' as the manner in which storm water treatment and attenuation systems will be undertaken.	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 its definition has no requirement for restoration.