



Notice of Meeting

A meeting of the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, 26 Gordon Street, Dannevirke on **Wednesday 24 April 2024** commencing at **9:30am**.

Bryan Nicholson
Chief Executive

Agenda

1. Welcome and Meeting Opening

2. Apologies

3. Public Forum

A period of up to 30 minutes shall be set aside for a public forum. Each speaker during the public forum section of a meeting may speak for up to five minutes.

Standing Orders may be suspended on a vote of three-quarters of those present to extend the period of public participation or the period any speaker is allowed to speak.

With the permission of the Chairperson, members may ask questions of speakers during the period reserved for public forum. If permitted by the Chairperson, questions by members are to be confined to obtaining information or clarification on matters raised by the speaker.

4. Notification of Items Not on the Agenda

Major items not on the agenda may be dealt with at this meeting if so resolved by the Council and the chairperson explains at the meeting at a time when it is open to the public the reason why the item was not listed on the agenda and the reason why discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

Minor matters not on the agenda relating to the general business of the Council may be discussed if the Chairperson explains at the beginning of the meeting, at

a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at that meeting, but no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer it to a subsequent meeting.

- 5. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest in Relation to this Meeting's Items of Business**
- 6. Confirmation of Minutes 3**

Recommendation

That the minutes of the Strategy Growth and Planning Committee meeting held on 13 February 2024 (as circulated) be confirmed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.
- 7. Reports**
 - 7.1 Draft Urban Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback and Documentation Amendments 9**
 - 7.2 Policy and Bylaw Update 17**
 - 7.3 Submissions Update 19**
- 8. Items not on the Agenda Accepted in Accordance with the Procedure Outlined as per Agenda Item 4**
- 9. Closure**



Minutes of a meeting of the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, 26 Gordon Street, Dannevirke on Tuesday 13 February 2024 commencing at 9:30am.

1. Present

Councillor S M Wards (Chairperson), Her Worship the Mayor - Mrs T H Collis, Crs E L Peeti-Webber (Deputy Mayor), N L Chase, A K Franklin, S M Gilmore, P A Johns, M F Long, K A Sutherland, and S A Wallace

In Attendance

Mr D Batley	- Evergreen Consulting
Ms J Avery	- Riverstone Law
Mr B Nicholson	- Chief Executive
Mrs A Small	- Group Manager – Strategy and Community Wellbeing
Mr H Featonby	- Group Manager - Infrastructure
Ms G Nock	- Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager
Ms A Charmley	- Team Leader Planning Services
Ms A Rule	- Policy and Planning Advisor
Mrs A Dunn	- Manager – Democracy Services

2. Welcome and Meeting Opening

The Chairperson opened the meeting with reflection to set the scene for the meeting, reading a quote from a Japanese philosopher.

3. Apologies

That an apology for lateness from Her Worship the Mayor be accepted.

Gilmore/Franklin

Carried

4. Public Forum

There were no requests for public forum time.

5. Notification of Items Not on the Agenda

Nil

6. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest in Relation to this Meeting's Items of Business

Nil

7. Confirmation of Minutes

That the minutes of the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee meeting held on 7 November 2023 (as circulated) be confirmed as true and accurate record of the meeting.

Johns/Sutherland

Carried

8. Reports

8.1 Policy and Bylaw Update

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 30 January 2024 that provided an update on the programme of work on policies and bylaws. A larger copy of the tables published within the agenda was circulated to members.

That the report from the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 30 January 2024 concerning the Policy and Bylaw Update be received.

Chase/Johns

Carried

8.2 2024 Consultation Items

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 31 January 2024 that provided an update on upcoming engagement and consultation items across Council and Tararua Alliance projects. A larger copy of the tables published within the agenda was circulated to members.

That the report from the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 31 January 2024 concerning the 2024 Consultation Items be received.

Wallace/Franklin

Carried

8.3 Management Report

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Group Manager – Strategy and Community Wellbeing dated 15 January 2024 that

provided an update on key activities and items of interest since the last meeting.

That the report from the Group Manager - Strategy & Community Wellbeing dated 15 January 2024 concerning the Management Report be received.

Peeti-Webber/Chase

Carried

8.4 Draft Urban Growth Strategy

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Team Leader Planning Services dated 5 February 2024 that provided information on the draft Urban Growth Strategy on which public feedback was currently being sought.

That the report from the Team Leader Planning Services dated 05 February 2024 concerning the Draft Urban Growth Strategy be received.

Gilmore/Sutherland

Carried

8.5 District Plan Review Update

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Team Leader Planning Services dated 2 February 2024 that provided an update on the District Plan Review.

That the report from the Team Leader Planning Services dated 02 February 2024 concerning the District Plan Review Update be received.

Long/Peeti-Webber

Carried

8.6 Draft Bylaws Review and Consultation - Keeping of Animals Bylaw 2024, Alcohol Bylaw 2024, Public Places Bylaw 2024 and Cemeteries Bylaw 2024.

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Regulatory Services Manager dated 26 January 2024 that presented proposed Bylaws and Statements of Proposal for adoption for public consultation.

Her Worship the Mayor joined the meeting at 10:27am.

The committee went through each proposed bylaw to understand the changes made.

Concern was expressed about the proposed definition of micro-mobility devices and whether that included mobility scooters, with the feeling that there should not be any restrictions of the use of such mobility aids for users visiting shops. It was agreed that the definition be clarified to ensure mobility scooters were not captured.

Definition of events, which had been proposed to ensure limitation of nuisance to others. Concern was expressed about any impact on events such as Dannevirke Day, and sports events. Agreed to add to definition “including sports events”.

Keeping of Animals Bylaw – discussed the proposed rule for the number of cats, and whether a clause could be included so that people already keeping more than three cats would not be affected.

That the report from the Regulatory Services Manager dated 26 January 2024 concerning the Draft Bylaws Review and Consultation - Keeping of Animals Bylaw 2024, Alcohol Bylaw 2024, Public Places Bylaw 2024 and Cemeteries Bylaw 2024. be received.

That the Committee determines, pursuant to s155(1) of the Local Government Act 2002, that a bylaw is the most appropriate way of addressing perceived problems identified for the keeping of animals in Tararua district, alcohol compliance, issues in public places and in Tararua District Council cemeteries.

Long/Sutherland

Carried

That the Committee approves the combined Statement of Proposal and the Tararua District Council’s draft Keeping of Animals Bylaw 2024, for public consultation in accordance with s83 and s86 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Franklin/Collis

Carried

That the Committee approves the combined Statement of Proposal and the Tararua District Council’s draft Alcohol Bylaw 2024, for public consultation in accordance with s83 and s86 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Johns/Gilmore

Carried

That the Committee approves the combined Statement of Proposal and the Tararua District Council’s draft Public Places Bylaw 2024, for public consultation in accordance with s83 and s86 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Wallace/Peeti-Webber

Carried

That the Committee approves the combined Statement of Proposal and the Tararua District Council’s draft Cemeteries Bylaw 2024, for public consultation in accordance with s83 and s86 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Chase/Wallace

Carried

That the Committee agrees that the Chief Executive be delegated the power to approve any minor amendments to the draft bylaws or statements of proposal that he considers appropriate, prior to consultation starting.

Johns/Long

Carried

8.7 District Strategy alignment to Council activities

The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee considered the report of the Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager dated 31 January 2024 that provided the context and rationale for a strategic alignment across Council activities, and a proposed method for achieving this.

That the report from the Strategy and Corporate Planning Manager dated 31 January 2024 concerning the District Strategy alignment to Council activities be received.

That the proposed reporting method be received.

Wallace/Chase

Carried

9. Items not on the Agenda

Nil

There being no further business the Chairperson thanked those present for their attendance and contributions, and declared the meeting closed at 11:59am.

Chairperson



Report

Date : 18 April 2024

To : Chairperson and Committee Members
Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee

From : Aimee Charmley
Team Leader Planning Services

Subject : **Draft Urban Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback and Documentation Amendments**

Item No : **7.1**

1. Recommendation

- 1.1 *That the report from the Team Leader Planning Services dated 16 April 2024 concerning the Draft Urban Growth Strategy - Consultation Feedback and Documentation Amendments be received.*
- 1.2 *That the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee agree to the changes made to the Growth Strategy detailed in the Review of Community Feedback arising from the submissions received on the consultation.*

2. Reason for the Report

- 2.1 This report is to update the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee on submissions and consultation feedback received and subsequent amendments to the document post consultation.
- 2.2 The aim of this report is to take the Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee through a summary of the submissions received and to seek feedback and support for the proposed amendments to the document and maps.
- 2.3 It is our intention to have the documentation finalised and ready for adoption at the next Council meeting in May.

3. Public Consultation and feedback

- 3.1 Public Consultation and feedback on the on draft urban growth strategy was undertaken from 5th February 2024 to 5th March 2024. Late feedback forms were accepted until 11 March 2024.
- 3.2 900 letters were sent out to affected landowner's a week ahead of the public consultation. These letters were sent out because the growth strategy included a proposed recommendation relating to rezoning their property for future growth. This letter also notified them of the upcoming community consultation on the draft strategy.
- 3.3 We hosted four public drop-in sessions from 5-7pm at Dannevirke Library on 15th February 2024; Eketāhuna Library on 20th February 2024; Pahiatua Service Centre on 21st February 2024, Tararua isite Visitor Information Centre on 22nd February 2024.
- 3.4 The public drop in sessions were well attended, we have over 140 people attend the four sessions and we received a lot of valuable verbal feedback. In addition, we received nearly 75 feedback forms. We also received and responded to over 65 phone calls and/or email enquiries.
- 3.5 We hosted two follow up meetings on the growth strategy feedback with our Iwi partners. Our Iwi partners were very supportive of the Māori Multi-Purpose Zone recommendations.
- 3.6 We also attended a meeting with Horizons Regional Council to discuss the Draft Urban Growth Strategy 2024-2054 Feedback on 20th March 2024.
- 3.7 Shannon Bray has drafted a summary of changes in direct response to the written and oral public feedback received. Refer to Urban Growth Strategy – Summary of Changes.

Attachments

- 1 [↓](#). Urban Growth Strategy - Summary of Changes

MEMO

To: Aimee Charmley, Dan Batley
From: Shannon Bray
Project: Tararua Urban Growth Strategy
Subject: Review of Community Feedback
Date: 16 April 2024

This memo sets out the changes that have been made to the Growth Strategy document (including the maps) following the public consultation process.

Changes to Document:

Page	Changes Made	Reason
Title	Updated the date.	
3	Updated Tracy's blurb to include public consultation and feedback.	
8	Updated table of contents to reflect changes in the document.	
12 Para 9	Changed reference to Design Guidelines to be "development policy recommendations".	Agreed not to prepare a Design Guidelines document but rather a set of recommendations for policy within DP so that outcomes are embedded rather than referenced.
14 Para 5	Added the word "primary" before "focus" and added a note to say community feedback is incorporated.	To reflect that some changes to the document have occurred because of community and individual feedback.
14 Para 7	Added a sentence referencing that rezoning may impact rates.	This was brought up by many people in the community, so it's important to acknowledge in the document.
14	Added a paragraph that more clearly outlines the link between the Growth Strategy and the District Plan.	Discussion with the team that this wasn't as clear as it could be.
15 Para 5	Added paragraph about the consultation process and how feedback is integrated. Have suggested that the feedback be contained in a separate document (this memo) which can be circulated as requested, rather than setting out a whole new page.	



16	Various updates to terminology.	
20/21	Significant updates to legislation, introducing Fast Track Legislation and reducing descriptions of NBA and SPA.	Changes being made by National Government. The Fast Track Bill is relevant because it relates directly to housing and development growth.
23	Added definition about urban environment as defined by NPSUD and added reference to Plan Change 3.	Requested by Horizons.
22/23	Pages Removed.	Legislation changes mean this page spread was no longer required.
<i>NOTE: BELOW THIS LINE PAGES ARE REFERRED TO AS THEY NOW APPEAR IN THE REVISED DOCUMENT</i>		
24	Changed reference to Horizons preparing LUC maps to NZLRI.	Requested by Horizons.
24	Added paragraph to indicate current Government intentions to remove LUC 3.	Promoted under current National Government policy.
25	Changes to Freshwater Management to indicate will be considered under DP review.	Requested by Horizons.
25	Changes to NPS ET.	Requested by Transpower.
26	Changes to text around the One Plan.	Requested by Horizons.
31	Removed reference to Water Services Act and changed to tracking changes.	Act has been repealed.
40	Updated net migration figures to 126,000.	New information released by StatsNZ.
48	Added paragraph on Mixed Use zones to introduce this concept earlier in the document.	The concept of Mixed Use was widely talked about during consultation and the project team agreed it would be a useful zone for each of the towns.
52	Corrected reference to the Ruahine Ranges not the Tararua Ranges west of Dannevirke.	
56	Changed reference to Horizons as authors of LUC maps to NZLRI.	As requested by Horizons.
56	Changed reference to LUC 3.	National Party policy is widely published now to indicated LUC 3 will be removed from the HPL restrictions.
60	Added surface water takes to description of water supply and noted supply is already at allocation levels.	Requested by Horizons.
60	Changed last paragraph to reflect changes to water services.	Government has repealed Water Services Act.
62	Changed last paragraph to reflect changes to water services.	Government has repealed Water Services Act.
66/67	Introduced two new pages (a double-page spread) that covers existing zoning under the existing District Plan.	There were comments from the community about why we were proposing areas which they thought



		were already zoned for certain activities. In addition, we have determined to proceed with a Mixed Use zone and need a place in the document to clearly discuss this.
<i>NOTE: BELOW THIS LINE PAGES ARE REFERRED TO AS THEY NOW APPEAR IN THE REVISED DOCUMENT</i>		
72/73	Various changes where there are references to Design Guidelines to change this to Development Policy.	No longer preparing Design Guidelines.
72	Changed last para under land ownership to reflect that consultation has been done.	
73	Added "National Grid" to site constraints	Requested by Transpower.
76	Changed wording to reflect development policy rather than design guidelines.	No longer preparing Design Guidelines.
76	Discuss Mixed Use zone concept under design for resilience – change the focus to overall resilience rather than just climate change.	
80	Various changes where there are references to Design Guidelines to change this to Development Policy, including deleting section on District Plan as this is incorporated into the Development Policy section.	No longer preparing Design Guidelines.
80	Expanded on the Mixed Use concept to indicate how this will be applied.	
82 Para 4	Changes to reflect the consultation that has been undertaken.	
82 Para 4	Discuss Mixed Use zone	
82 Bullets	Added reference to National Grid	Requested by Transpower.
84	Various changes where there are references to Design Guidelines to change this to Development Policy., including deleting section referencing District Plan.	
84	Outlining Mixed Use zone.	
86	Removed reference to Fonterra as satellite because this is now going to be rezoned as Industrial.	Fonterra submission and also community concerns about industrial in Pahiatua. Will change the maps to rezone Dairy Plant as industrial (see below).
86	Noted impending changes to LUC.	Government is progressing changes detailed in policy.
87	Removed reference to District Plan, design guidelines and NPSHPL as these are now covered in the overview.	Rewording.



88	Changed references to Papakaiainga.	Discussed that we will no longer have Papakaiainga Guidelines, but rather embed the details of this within the DP.
89	Removed reference to Papakaiainga guidelines as these will become embedded in DP policy.	Covered in the overview.
92	Changes to reflect introduction of Mixed Use Zoning, and identifying that we don't have data for all Maori land parcels. Have also made changes to reflect that feedback has already been obtained, and that there remains a process for opposing the changes. And signalled we understand there will be implications on rates.	
94	Added text to recognise issues and opportunities around the waterways within the residential zoning area.	Community comments (written and verbal) concerned about the development of this area.
94	Significant changes to the text under Industrial and Commercial to combine these and set up the Mixed Use Zoning.	
95	Removed Industrial area to the south of town.	Community opposition to the recommendation for industrial activity in this location.
97	Maps to be updated – see below.	
98	Added a note under residential about the racecourse.	Community opposition to including the racecourse as an opportunity so have changed text.
98	Significant changes to the text under Industrial and Commercial to combine these and set up the Mixed Use Zoning.	
98	Added more commentary around the Industrial Hub concept indicating this needs to be confirmed through the District Plan Review.	Land owner submission from the original site indicated it would not be suitable, but alternative sites could be. Further work is needed to determine whether this is suitable for rezoning.
99	Removed reference to Racecourse	Community opposition to including the racecourse as an opportunity.
101	Maps to be updated – see below.	
102	Significant changes to the text under Industrial and Commercial to combine these and set up the Mixed Use Zoning.	
103	Removed reference to industrial area in town and added dairy plant option.	
105	Maps to be updated – see below.	
108	Changes to reflect no design guidelines.	



111	Changed to Revision E	
-----	-----------------------	--

Changes to Maps:

The below table provides an overview of the submission requests and what has been carried through to the final revision of the document.

Location	Changes sought	Why	Recommendation
Eketahuna	Investigate more residential along SH1 and golf course.	Tom & Tamara Williams submission	Have reviewed this request and do not think the change is appropriate to adopt due to other locations being more suited. This submitter can still use the satellite development route if they wish to undertake more intensive development than zoned. No changes made.
Eketahuna	Consider more residential zoning near Alfredton Road and school	Linda Osborne	Small area with minimal effects and had previously been considered appropriate. Have added this zoning to meet the submitter requirements.
Dannevirke	Review residential by the stream, concerns of flooding.	Samantha McIntosh	Reviewed area and increased the size of residential rezoning to allow future development to have adequate buffers around the streams. Have also strengthened wording in report (Page 94).
Woodville	Show National Grid.	Transpower	The maps now show the national grid.
Pahiatua	Remove industrial zoning in town, consider rural residential extension.	Various submitters	Changed proposed industrial zoning to rural residential to meet residents concerns and requirements. Rezoned Fonterra Dairy Plant and surrounding land as industrial. Also changes



			made to document wording in this regard (Page 102).
Woodville	Remove industrial satellite hub.	Zoning not sought by landowner – Fern Renewables.	Have altered size of industrial zoning in this area and indicated that it is subject to further investigation.
Dannevirke	Remove industrial south of town.	Rangitane and others	Removed as requested.
Pahiatua	Change dairy plant to industrial.	Fonterra	Added industrial to Dairy Plant and small area adjacent.
Norsewood	Remove sheed paddock from Mixed Use.	Verbal request	Small change made to correct an error.
All towns	Consider areas for Mixed Use zone	Various	Have changed all commercial areas to Mixed Use.
Pahiatua	Check boundaries on residential area as small mistake picked up on boundary.	Verbal submission	Small change to ensure zoning is aligned with boundaries.
Dannevirke	Check boundaries on stream as small mistakes picked up	Noticed in discussion	Small change to ensure zoning is aligned with boundaries.
Pahiatua	Stormwater/Flood Modelling needs updating	Horizons	Have increased the zoning area to allow for future buffer around water. Can be addressed through DP and future development.
All towns	Check fault zones are showing correctly, appears they may not be	Horizons	Updated as required.
New Maps	Prepare new maps showing existing zoning.	Noticed in review – will help support Mixed Use zoning.	Updated as required.
Woodville	Change zoning opposite rail station to Mixed Use.	Verbal discussion with landowners in this location.	Updated as required.
All Maps	Update Area Tables	Consequential changes.	The area tables in all maps have been updated to reflect new areas and now also include area of existing zoning.



Report

Date : 18 April 2024

To : Chairperson and Committee Members
Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee

From : Angela Rule
Policy and Planning Advisor

Subject : **Policy and Bylaw Update**

Item No : **7.2**

1. Recommendation

- 1.1 *That the report from the Policy and Planning Advisor dated 10 April 2024 concerning the Policy and Bylaw Update be received.*

2. Reason for the Report

- 2.1 Regular update on programme of work on policies and bylaws.

3. Background

- 3.1 This committee has oversight of the whole policy and bylaw work programme.
- 3.2 The terms of reference for committees determines which policies and bylaws will be reviewed through each committee.
- 3.3 The attached schedule shows when policy and bylaw reviews will be brought to the respective committee meetings.

4. Status of Policies and Bylaws Reported to this Committee

Policy Name	Commenced date	Review frequency	Status at time of reporting
Class 4 Gambling and Racing Board Venue Policy	29/06/2022	3 yearly	Current
Dangerous and Insanitary Buildings Policy	30/08/2017	5 yearly	Scheduled in bylaws review programme
Enforcement	March 2022	3 yearly	Current
CCTV	Draft		In development
Dog Control Policy	25/05/2022	5 yearly	Current
Litter Infringement Policy	30/03/2022	5 yearly	Current
Alcohol Bylaw	17/12/2018	5 yrs	Consultation scheduled for August 2024
Cemeteries Bylaw	5/11/2018	5 yrs	Consultation scheduled for August 2024
Dog Control Bylaw	1/05/2022	10 yrs	Current
Public Places Bylaw	5/11/2018	5 yrs	Consultation scheduled for August 2024
The Keeping of Animals, Cats, Poultry and Bees Bylaw	5/11/2018	5 yrs	Consultation scheduled for August 2024
Administration Bylaw	5/11/2018	5yrs	Being replaced by bylaws in review programme

5. Status of Policies and Bylaws Reported to other Committees

- 5.1 A draft Security Policy and Procurement Policy may be presented to the Audit and Risk Committee in July.

6. First Tranche of Bylaws

- 6.1 Alcohol, Cemeteries, Public Places, and The Keeping of Animals, Cats, Poultry and Bees bylaws are in the first tranche of the bylaw reviews with the aim to consult in August 2024.

Attachments

Nil.



Report

Date : 19 April 2024

To : Chairperson and Committee Members
Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee

From : Peter Wimsett
Three Waters Transition Manager

Subject : **Submissions Update**

Item No : **7.3**

1. Recommendation

- 1.1 *That the report from the Three Waters Transition Manager dated 19 April 2024 concerning the Submissions Update be received.*

2. Reason for the Report

- 2.1 This Committee's terms of reference include a key responsibility to approve submissions to government, local authorities and other organisations.
- 2.2 The new Government's 100-day plan continues to unfold into changes in legislation, regulation and ministerial decisions, with wide reaching impacts for local government. This is likely to result in a fast pace of change and consultation that is likely to result in timelines that do not align to this Committee's work plan, with legislative changes usually having 30 days for consultation.
- 2.3 The Strategy, Growth and Planning Committee is therefore able to invoke its process to enable our Council's quick response to external requests for consultation.
- 2.4 These are for matters that potentially significantly affect Council that we can and need to influence.
- 2.5 The process is for the Chairperson to call on a subcommittee of members of the Council committee to provide feedback and authorise draft submissions prepared

by Council staff, experts and local government representative groups, including Local Government New Zealand and Taituarā.

3. Submission on Fast Track Approval Bill

3.1 This process has just been necessary to invoke for the Fast Track Approvals Bill. The approved submission is attached for Council's information. We received confirmation of our submission to Parliament on the Fast Track Approvals Bill on 19 April 2024. We have advised that we wish to speak to our submission to the Select Committee.

3.1.1 Summary of Submission

In the online submission, we also had the opportunity to draw the Select Committee's attention to particular matters in summary form under two headings and will be able to expand on these during the hearings. These were made as follows:

We wish to make the following comments.

Some Key Extracts from our attached Submission:

We agree that it is a powerful Bill and very important to local government.

Tararua District Council also acknowledge that the current system settings and alignments are not right – yet. Therefore, we welcome the purpose and concept of having an alternative tool to streamline infrastructure planning processes.

We support improved decision-making timeframes, particularly for nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and think that a one-stop shop approach works in the right situation however, we are concerned with the scope of the proposed bill and the wide-reaching scale and types of projects that can be accepted.

We support and endorse Taituarā's/LGNZ submission.

We wish to make the following recommendations.

Highlighted Matters to Consider (as referenced to our submission item numbers):

- 3 Limit the scope of the bill to nationally and regional significant infrastructure projects only and give the bill some time to embed and to see the outcomes of these projects before we expand the scope too quickly and too wide.
- 4 The scope and range of projects that can be accepted under Fast Track needs to be sufficiently narrow, clear and defined.
- 7 The bill needs to give an opportunity to ensure affected communities are appropriately heard.

- 13 The community needs to be taken along the journey from the beginning of pre lodgement consultation conversations through to the decision end of the process. We believe that some projects such as wind farms are better suited to the RMA process and should not be accepted as Fast Track applications.
- 14 The private developer should pay for all actual and reasonable costs to process their applications it is unfair to burden the local Council and their community.
- 16 Add an option for Council to make a general submission alongside a technical one, providing an opportunity to convey community context. This will provide a safeguard when projects are not publicly notified.
- 19 Provide more time for inputs from communities and their representative organisations as these generally add value to a project. (Comments on impact items 20 - 24)
- 27 Understand the financial costs of fast-tracking infrastructure and development projects in hazard areas including areas subject to climate change and who those costs will fall to – including future generations.
- 30-33 Vesting assets in councils of developed assets needs to remain optional to councils.
- 34 - 38 Reserves - considerations: The applicant & council could engage with interested parties identified as part of the Pre-application Consultation in regard to any impact on reserves.
- 39 - 41 Absence of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Clause - reconsider this matter for a number of important reasons, as identified.

4. Horizons Regional Council Submission

- 4.1 Presently we are considering the Horizons Regional Council Long-Term Plan submission which is due by 5pm, Monday 22 April 2024.
- 4.2 This submission has not yet been completed. However, the Horizons Regional Council's submission form is attached for your information.

5. Other Upcoming Submission Matters

- 5.1 Other matters we may wish to submit on are:
 - 5.1.1 The Report of the Controller and Auditor-General, Making infrastructure investment decisions quickly

This is due on 11.59pm Wednesday, 08 May 2024.

It covers the process of infrastructure investment by Government, including funding that may occur to local government. The Office of the Auditor General

recommends changes to how monitoring occurs with such funding and that the Treasury:

- establish regular public reporting on the progress of the full New Zealand Upgrade Programme and periodically report on the performance of all significant investments that have had or that require Cabinet-level consideration.
- seek feedback from relevant agencies on how useful they find the Treasury's guidance on expediting decision-making and review that guidance regularly to ensure that it remains fit for purpose; and
- consider whether the Investment Management System should include minimum requirements and guidance for setting up and running contestable funding processes.

5.1.2 Major policy positions affecting local government are expected to be advised by Government over the coming months. These might include matters on:

- Freshwater
- Three Waters
- Natural Landscapes
- Māori Wards

5.2 We will be actively monitoring for new matters where it will be appropriate for Council to make submissions and raising these to this Committee.

Attachments

1 [↓](#). Tararua District Council - Fast-track Approvals Bill 2024 - Submission 19 April 2024

2 [↓](#). LTP_2024-34__Submission_Form_FINAL



SUBMISSION TO THE ENVIRONMENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FAST-TRACK CONSENTING BILL

Tararua District Council thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Fast-track Approvals Bill (FTA).

We support and endorse Taituarā's/LGNZ submission.

We agree that it is a powerful Bill and very important to local government. Local government is a critical partner in the delivery of the resource management system. Most obviously the FTA affects its roles and responsibilities for consenting and planning under the RMA, as well as its monitoring, compliance, and enforcement functions. It will also affect its democratic role and the services, infrastructure and assets councils provide and own on behalf of communities. And it will likely affect future investment priorities.

Tararua District Council also acknowledge that the current system settings and alignments are not right – yet. Therefore, we welcome the purpose and concept of having an alternative tool to streamline infrastructure planning processes.

Local government and communities stand to benefit from expedited decision making, and the delivery of nationally and regionally significant projects that have positive net benefits. We therefore want to ensure the proposed arrangements, as a potential building block for the future system, work for the long-term benefit of the people and communities central and local government both serve.

Given the timeframes involved and the complexity of the Bill we have not provided a clause by clause analysis and again we reiterate that we support and endorse the submission made by Taituarā/LGNZ.

We will now focus our submission and will raise specific points that are important to our community and situation, including partnerships with community and Māori groups with rights and interests.

Scope of Bill and priority of economic over environmental sustainability

1. We support improved decision-making timeframes, particularly for nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and think that a one-stop shop approach works in the right situation however, we are concerned with the scope of the proposed bill and the wide-reaching scale and types of projects that can be accepted.
2. The bill enables a wide range of projects, from projects to support mitigating climate changes to mining and petroleum development activities. It specifically provides for projects that will deliver significant economic benefits. It also provides for non-complying and prohibited activities that may not comply with the policies and objectives of the District and Regional Plans. Our concern is that economic value is being prioritised over environmental sustainability. We therefore recommend that the Bill aligns with the sustainable management approach in the RMA.
3. We are also concerned that given the wide-reaching scope of the bill that this may have unintended consequences. We think that there may be huge uptake of this Fast Track pathway over the RMA process if the scope of the bill is too wide and the number and types of projects that can be accepted is too large. We believe that uptake will create potential resourcing issues for the EPA and in effect create a downstream bottle neck. Given that this Bill is new we think it would be wiser to limit the scope of the bill to nationally and regional significant infrastructure projects only and give the bill some time to embed and to see the outcomes of these projects before we expand the scope too quickly and too wide.
4. The decisions and outcomes of Fast Track projects are permanent and will impact on our communities forever and we need to ensure that the decision-making process is robust, considered and enduring. We are also concerned that if the scope of the bill is too wide too early that we could suppress and minimise the voice of our local community in this decision-making process. We also think the scope and range of projects that can be accepted under Fast Track needs to be sufficiently narrow, clear and defined to ensure that the Fast Track process truly

works in practice and does not create another bottle neck at the EPA or later on down the path through implementation.

Voice of our community, democratic rights and natural justice

5. Our Council is concerned that the Fast Track process eliminates the voice of our community, and this naturally creates angst within that community when a project of significance such as a wind farm enters through the Fast Track process.
6. The Council is left holding the can in these situations. Council is left in a powerless position carrying the burden of their community's fear and anger without the resource or power to influence any change or provide them with any guarantees that their voices can and will be heard.
7. We have firsthand experience of this as the Yinson Renewables Wind Farm application has now opted to take the Fast Track (NBA) option and the community is rightfully fearful that they will not be heard, and they likely will not be identified as a party to submit on this project. The community is angry and is looking to Council for answers and yet Council has been removed from the process. This new bill needs to give an opportunity to ensure affected communities are appropriately heard.
8. Under a Fast Track application, the community have no certainty that they will be involved in this process, and this has elevated their levels of stress unnecessarily. Council gets treated with suspicion and mistrust because this is effectively not our process, and we cannot provide them with the certainty that they desire. From a community perspective it appears that the Fast Track process is not transparent, and it is not democratic.
9. Council is mindful that alternative energy projects such as wind and solar farms whilst important infrastructure projects are being Fast Tracked unnecessarily when they can be processed successfully under the RMA system. We have processed a limited notified solar farm application through a Council hearing.
10. Direct referrals that are managed through the Environment Court work well with wind farm applications and our Council is testament to this as we have multiple wind farms that have been approved over the years. Through public notification process submitters have the opportunity and choice to participate and have their voice be heard, to share the social and economic impact of the proposal on their

lives and to understand the complex nature of these proposals in terms of positive, negative and cumulative environmental effects.

11. Public notification also provides the opportunity to engage 'friends of the submitters' to walk and guide the public through the submission and environment court process. This process supports clarity, certainty and transparency and ensures that the voice of the community no matter how small or large has the opportunity to be heard.
12. Alternatively in our experience Fast Track narrows the scope for affected parties creating fear and uncertainty amongst the affected community because they feel that it is undemocratic, and they may not get the opportunity to voice their concerns or be a part of the process.
13. Conversely, we feel that the Environment Court process supports the principles of natural justice and ensures democratic process as the community voice is heard and the transparency of the process creates understanding of the complexity of these significant projects. The community needs to be taken along the journey from the beginning of pre lodgment consultation conversations through to the decision end of the process. We believe that some projects such as wind farms are better suited to the RMA process and should not be accepted as Fast Track applications.

Actual and Reasonable Cost recovery

14. We are also concerned that when Council is asked to submit on Fast Track proposals, we cannot effectively cost recover our actual and reasonable costs. The private developer should pay for all actual and reasonable costs to process their applications it is unfair to burden the local Council and their community.
15. In our experience with Te Rere Hau Repowering Fast Track application our planning and technical staff were involved in multiple meetings and workshops through the Fast Track application, and we were only able to cost recover approximately 25% of their time invested in this which equated to \$20,000 of which we could claim back \$5,000. It disproportionately impacts Councils with a smaller ratepayer base - is this fair to our ratepayers? This exposes us to greater risk as we may not be able to engage the necessary expertise. We were not able to cost recover any of their time invested in preparing the submission and engaging the experts that peer reviewed the proposal with respect to key effects

to input into this submission. This cost burden was borne by the ratepayers, and we consider this to be unacceptable.

16. Add an option for Council to make a general submission alongside a technical one, providing an opportunity to convey community context. This will provide a safeguard when projects are not publicly notified.

Timeframe for providing comments on Referred Projects

17. The time frame urgency that these proposals create puts unnecessary and additional resourcing pressure on staff that are already under resourced and time poor.
18. Tararua District is a small Council and our location and size mean that it is often difficult for us to find and secure the right 'local' experts to review the complex material and provide informed and robust comments in the 10-working day timeframe allowed.
19. We reiterate Taituarā's/LGNZ comments that decision makers need to recognise the huge value that carefully thought through inputs from communities and their representative organisations add to a project. Local communities and local authorities hold important information about their communities and environment that is not always obvious or available to remote experts. Neither are communities always willing to part with the cultural knowledge they hold on the terms or in the timeframes provided to them by the applicants and their agents. More time to provide these comments would be appreciated and we think that this is necessary as these comments are important to inform and shape the final decision and outcome.

Fast is not always best – Quality over Quantity

20. We support improved decision-making timeframes, however we think there is too much emphasis on fast processing which risks and potentially undermines quality decision making. We reiterate Taituarā's/LGNZ submission on this point.
21. Processing timeframes are impacted by the complexity of an application, the quality of information provided with it, the willingness of an applicant to provide further information, the resources - including expertise - available to assess the

information, the existing body of knowledge around specific activities, particularly if they are novel or – currently – prohibited, suitable conditions, rights of objection, review, and appeal, and engagement commitments.

22. We think that simply legislating for faster decisions is unlikely on its own to result in decisions that are robust, or in development proceeding at pace. A concern around unintended consequences and a need for some form of robust risk analysis is recommended.
23. Projects of scale and significance are likely to be complex. Multi-approvals for these activities – given this is novel territory – done too quickly increases the risk of poor decisions and delay at later points in the development process.
24. Timeframes will also be affected by the number of applications that are being dealt with at any one time – by a local authority and across the system. Clear eligibility, acceptance, and approval criteria are therefore critical to a streamlined approach.

Infrastructure and Assets

25. Infrastructure such as three waters or major road networks are needed to support most development projects. Councils currently plan for known or planned growth through LTP. New fast-tracked projects are likely to necessitate new water allocation and discharge consents to function. They may also necessitate transport – including roads, intersections, pavements, wharves – upgrades.
26. Councils are already in compromised financial positions trying to upgrade and future proof their existing three waters infrastructure, we do not require additional financial burdens in this space.
27. The Select Committee needs to understand the financial costs of fast-tracking infrastructure and development projects in hazard areas including areas subject to climate change and who those costs will fall to – including future generations.
28. If infrastructure subject to service level agreements under the Local Government Act is built or increased in areas subject to sea level rise or weather-related changes in hydrology, then it is important the infrastructure is resilient to projected changes over the next 100 years, and financial implications for infrastructure providers is factored into the assessment process.

29. We are also concerned that inappropriate new development, development that doesn't have a functional need to be there, will occur in areas that should be avoided due to natural hazard risks, locking society into long term costs.

Vesting

30. Consents often contain conditions that relate to the vesting of infrastructure in councils. We are concerned there will be a burden on local government resulting from the handover of assets associated with ill-conceived housing or other developments that have not been the subject of usual local government quality control exercised at the RMA section 224 subdivision stage.
31. Local government needs to be satisfied that assets vested with them are fit for purpose, meet whole of lifecycle sustainability criteria, enable councils to deliver ancillary services (such as waste collection on roads that are vested), do not place an undue cost burden on current or future generations (for their maintenance, renewal, and eventual replacement), and have been appropriately certified.
32. The cost to LG associated with managing and maintaining received assets will be higher where the quality, including the resilience, of the asset is lower. We are concerned the focus on speed in the FTA might be at the expense of quality outcomes in the future.
33. There is no obligation on a local authority to take on third party infrastructure it does not want, and this must remain.

Reserves

34. Councils administer numerous parcels of land that are subject to the Reserves Act. Reserves are held for a variety of purposes – ecological, recreational, scenic, future road, on behalf of the community. It isn't clear whether Council reserves are included in Schedule 5.
35. Some reserve land is more appropriate than other reserve land for the granting of easements, leases, licences and permits, access, encroachments etc. Some



activities are more compatible than others – floodable areas in parks, pipes in the road corridor etc. Some activities are temporary, and others are permanent.

36. Reserve land may be covered by a Reserve Management Plan. Councils must work with their communities to develop these Plans and consult them on changes – publicly notify changes. There may also be obligations to tangata whenua.
37. There is real concern that conservation values will be undermined, and incompatible / exclusionary use will occur without public engagement and therefore there would be no social licence for change. This would be exacerbated if there was no opportunity for the community to participate in the approval of a designation or consents through the Fast-track process. To some extent engagement could be done up-front by the applicant / council with interested parties identified as part of the Pre-application Consultation.
38. If Local Government reserves are intended to be included, the protections and compensation for these be clearly included, particularly if there is an option for land swaps or compensation in land.

Absence of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Clause


39. Taituarā and LGNZ and TDC strongly recommend that the Committee works with Māori groups who hold rights and interests on the shape of the final legislation and a general effect clause. We reiterate the submission made by Taituarā/LGNZ on this matter.
40. There is concern that the absence of a Treaty clause in this Bill could undermine existing council relationships. From what we've heard from those that have a genuine relationship this seems unlikely as the desire to work closely is strong. Many local authorities have long established working relationships with Māori groups including iwi and hapū, in plan development, consenting and monitoring and value the expert local and regional knowledge those groups (often at their own expense) bring to the table. This was strongly evidenced in the Tararua District during the recovery and repair post Cyclone Gabrielle.
41. There are other relationships with Māori groups, both statutory and non-statutory, linked to and beyond the RMA plan development and consenting realm – for example for council decision-making, long term planning, including infrastructure development, spatial planning, economic development, and delivering housing.

And local government itself has responsibilities under Settlement legislation, which need to be upheld.



Puka whiriwhiri o te Mahere Roa 2024-34 2024-34 Long-term Plan consultation document

Puka tono Submission form



Puka tono Submission form



Have your say! Our consultation document highlights specific areas of our business that we are seeking community feedback on. We also welcome feedback on any other areas of our business and have left space on page 7 for additional comments. The information that supports the consultation document is available at haveyoursay.horizons.govt.nz, our service centres and local libraries.

An electronic version of this form can be found at haveyoursay.horizons.govt.nz.

Please include your name, main contact phone number, full address, postcode, and email address on the last page of this form, and indicate whether you would like to speak to your submission (in either English, Māori or New Zealand Sign Language) at a Council Hearing between 29 April 2024 and 2 May 2024.

Note: submissions are public information and will be published in the resulting Council report which may be made available to media and the general public. Contact details will be kept confidential.

1

Te anga rautaki Strategic Framework

Our strategic framework outlines our vision, four strategic priorities and six community outcomes which will help us keep our eye on the big picture, especially when planning for the ten years ahead. We welcome your feedback on our strategic framework which has been shared in detail on page 6 of the consultation document.

Summarised comments/sentiment:



For the following items, please tick the box that best suits your preference.

2

Issue 1: Responding to legislative requirements – level of service for highly productive land

For more information on this topic, refer to page 26 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1

Targeted mapping focussing on acute urban growth pressure areas only.

☐

Option 2 - Council's preferred option

Targeted mapping focussing on areas where there is urban growth pressure and/or demand for rural lifestyle subdivision.



PREFERRED
OPTION

☐

Option 3

Targeted mapping focussing on land surrounding all existing urban areas (cities, towns, villages).

Summarised comments/sentiment:

3

Issue 2: Planning for the future

For more information on this topic, refer to page 29 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Fund work programme for integrated catchment management.



PREFERRED
OPTION

☐

Option 2

Do not fund work programme for integrated catchment management.

Summarised comments/sentiment:



For the following items, please tick the box that best suits your preference.

4

Issue 3a: Updates to our operational areas – increase to river management insurances

For more information on this topic, refer to page 32 and 33 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Include baseline inflation, revaluations, claim up to \$200 million per event by Horizons and up to \$500 million alongside other councils.



PREFERRED
OPTION

☐

Option 2

Claim up to \$200 million per event by Horizons.

☐

Option 3

Claim up to \$500 million per event alongside other councils.

☐

Option 4

No change in insurance level cover, covers inflation and revaluations only.

Summarised comments/sentiment:

5

Issue 3b: Updates to our operational areas – reduced levels of service for freshwater activity

For more information on this topic, refer to page 34 and 35 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Return to pre-Jobs for Nature funding levels of service and budget 30 kilometres of fencing and 70,000 plants.



PREFERRED
OPTION

☐

Option 2

A target of 80 kilometres of fencing and 160,000 plants plus one staff member.

☐

Option 3

A target of 110 kilometres of fencing and 240,000 plants plus two staff members.

Summarised comments/sentiment:



For the following items, please tick the box that best suits your preference.

6

Issue 3c: Updates to our operational areas – increased levels of service for public transport – Whanganui improvements

For more information on this topic, refer to page 36 and 37 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Whanganui public transport improvements running by the end of 2025-26.



**PREFERRED
OPTION**

☐

Option 2

Whanganui public transport improvements staged, full implementation by 2028-29.

☐

Option 3

Remain with current service levels.

Summarised comments/sentiment:

7

New services for Horowhenua

For more information on this topic, refer to page 38 and 39 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Wider Horowhenua district.



**PREFERRED
OPTION**

☐

Option 2

Levin only public transport services.

Summarised comments/sentiment:



For the following items, please tick the box that best suits your preference.

8

New and improved regional services

For more information on this topic, refer to page 40 and 41 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

New and improved regional services.

☐

Option 2

New and improved regional services (smaller scale).



**PREFERRED
OPTION**

Summarised comments/sentiment:

9

Issue 4: Changing fee structure for water meters

For more information on this topic, refer to page 42 and 43 of the consultation document.

☐

Option 1 - Council's preferred option

Changing fee structure for water meters to 100% user pays.

☐

Option 2

Continue to fund water meters from the Science budget.



**PREFERRED
OPTION**

Summarised comments/sentiment:



For the following items, please tick the box that best suits your preference.

10

Revenue and Financing Policy

Council is proposing some changes to the way it funds some of its activities and to how it uses revenue from its investment activity. Examples of this include changes to the Uniform Annual General Charge (UAGC) and the funding model for Horizons' 11 river and drainage schemes. Please share your thoughts with us on our changes to the Revenue and Financing Policy.

For more information on this issue, refer to page 47 and 48 of this document and page 247 of the Supporting Information.

Summarised comments/sentiment:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and extend across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Additional comments:

Along with the issues we have listed above, we welcome your feedback on all areas of our business.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no text or other markings on the paper.

- Our preferred option is for submissions to be made online at **haveyoursay.horizons.govt.nz**
- Or, by emailing your submission to **haveyoursay@horizons.govt.nz**
Please note that email attachments must be under 25 MB total to be received by our server. Submissions will be confirmed by an email auto reply.
- Or, by using this form, or writing us a letter, and posting it to:
**Freepost 247615, Horizons Regional Council
Private Bag 11025, Manawātū Mail Centre, Palmerston North**
- Or, by dropping it off to one of our service centres in Whanganui, Woodville, Marton and Palmerston North

HAVE
YOUR SAY

Have your say
and let us know if
we have got it right
by completing this
submission form and
returning it back to us
by **5pm, 22 April
2024.**

Ngā pitopito matawhaiaro Contact details

Name:

Organisation:

Address: Postcode:

Email: Phone:

Signature: Date:

☐ I would like to speak to my submission at a Council Hearing
between **29 April 2024 and 2 May 2024.**

Tick preferred speaking session. We will be in touch to confirm your time.

☐ Whanganui - 29 April - morning (9:30am - 12:30pm, in person only)

☐ Whanganui - 29 April - afternoon (1:15pm - 3:15pm, in person only)

☐ Palmerston North - 1 May (1:00pm - 8:00pm) ☐ speak to my submission in-person ☐ by Zoom

☐ Palmerston North - 2 May (9:30am - 12:30pm) ☐ speak to my submission in-person ☐ by Zoom

☐ Palmerston North - 2 May (1:15pm - 5:00pm) ☐ speak to my submission in-person ☐ by Zoom

I will speak in:

☐ English ☐ Māori ☐ New Zealand Sign Language

Signature:

Reply Paid Authority 247615



Horizons Regional Council
Private Bag 11025
Manawatu Mail Centre
Palmerston North 4442



----- Fold here -----

----- Fold here -----