



SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Ordinary Council meeting

Tuesday, 22 July 2025

Date: Tuesday, 22 July 2025

Time: 3pm - 5pm

**Location: Tauranga City Council Chambers
L1, 90 Devonport Road
Tauranga**

Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed and the recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: www.tauranga.govt.nz.

**Marty Grenfell
Chief Executive**

Order of Business

4	Business	4
4.1	Amendment to Item 4.1 - Phase 2 submission to Resource Management Reforms - National Direction	4

4 BUSINESS

4.1 Amendment to Item 4.1 - Phase 2 submission to Resource Management Reforms - National Direction

ATTACHMENTS

1. Amendment to Attachment 1 & 2 - Phase 2 submissions to Resource Management Reforms - National Direction - A18537659 [↓](#) 

22 July 2025

Amendments to item 4.1: Submissions on Phase 2 of the Resource Management Reforms – National Direction

Following on from the release of the Council agenda, four submission points have been identified for addition or amendment. The amendments are to ensure alignment with similar points made in the SmartGrowth submission.

Package 1: National Policy Statement for Infrastructure (Attachment 1)

1. **New** submission point added for the definition on 'Additional infrastructure' this is to provide alignment with the SmartGrowth submission.

	Provision	Position	Discussion/Issue	Relief Sought
6.1.1A	D1 Additional infrastructure	Support in part	The proposed definition is supported as it recognises the broad range of infrastructure that supports the wellbeing of people and communities and their health and safety, however community infrastructure (as defined in the Local Government Act 2002) should also be included. This would then cover community infrastructure such as parks and reserves, and public facilities like pools, sports and community centres.	Amend the proposed definition as follows (or similar wording with the same intent): <u>(h) community facilities as defined in the Local Government Act 2002.</u>

2. The TCC submission point originally sought the retention of Policy 5 with no further amendments. Since the drafting of the TCC submission point we have become aware of the SmartGrowth draft submission on this policy which has been informed by input from the Tu Pakari advisors and it is agreed as a relevant point to raise in the TCC submission. The following submission point has been **amended** as follows:

	Provision	Position	Discussion/Issue	Relief Sought
6.1.11	P5 Recognising and providing for Māori rights and interests	Support in part	TCC request stronger, clearer language to ensure genuine and consistent consideration of Māori rights and interests. This includes stronger wording for protecting wāhi tapū or other sites of significance. TCC seek the revision of the phrase (and its intent) "in appropriate circumstances...", as this is seen as limiting and conditional rather than ensuring full and consistent participation by tāngata whenua. Using terms like "opportunities" and "appropriate circumstances" may mean tāngata whenua involvement is only considered when it suits the decision-makers, rather than being a guaranteed right or requirement with regards to engagement and participation. The references to section 58L of the RMA is unclear given that these provisions only relate to Mana Whakahaere a Rohe. Iwi participation should be in line with relevant legislation, policy and any existing agreements.	Amend Policy 5(1)(c) to read as follows: (c) providing opportunities in appropriate circumstances for tāngata whenua involvement in relation to sites of significance to Māori and issues of cultural significance; and OR Amend to specifically list the circumstances where it would not be appropriate for tāngata whenua to be involved in relation to sites of cultural significance. AND Amend Policy 5(1)(d) to read as follows: (d) operating in a way that is consistent with <u>relevant legislation, policy and agreements</u> that provides for iwi participation <u>(as defined in section 58L of the RMA)</u> .

22 July 2025

Package 2: National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (Attachment 2)

3. The following submission point has been **amended** following discussions with Smartgrowth. The proposed provisions utilise the term *urban development*, which is undefined, however the NPS-HPL includes a definition for *future urban development*. TCC recommends amending the relief sought to ensure any amendments to the NPS-HPL to rezone LUC 3 land is linked to the definition of *future urban development*. Smartgrowth will include this relief sought in their submission.

Q #	Question	Position	Discussion/Issue	Relief Sought
26.	If the proposal was to exempt LUC 3 land from NPS-HPL restrictions for urban development only, would it be better for it to be for local authorities led urban rezoning only, or should restrictions also be removed for private plan changes to rezone LUC 3 land for urban development?	Private plan changes as well as local authority led plan changes	<p>TCC supports the flexibility in allowing private plan changes. Recently, two plan changes to the Tauranga City Plan rezoned rural land to Industrial and Medium Density Residential. These plan changes were in line with the identified growth areas in the Future Development Strategy (FDS) and were progressed by way of a private plan change. TCC would not wish to prevent private plan changes that align with the FDS.</p> <p>However, there needs to be careful consideration on enabling a private plan <u>change</u> on LUC 3 land that does not align with an identified growth area. It is often the case that private plan changes do not align with the FDS or spatial plan and are, therefore, out of sequence of councils' infrastructure delivery and Long Term Plan funding.</p> <p>Therefore, if private plan changes are to be provided for on LUC 3 land, a higher threshold is required for councils to accept the plan change to ensure that the rezoning is for urban development (not low density residential or rural lifestyle) and aligns with strategic direction for growth.</p> <p>There is no definition for 'urban development' however we consider the intent was to refer to 'future urban development' which we consider is appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend to enable LUC 3 land to be rezoned for urban development by private plan changes as well as local authority led plan changes where criteria must be met.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the NPS-HPL to ensure that plan changes to rezone LUC 3 land is for 'future urban development' as defined in the NPS-HPL.</p>

4. The following submission point has been **deleted** to avoid misalignment with the SmartGrowth submission. Both submission points sought for national consistency, but TCC suggested achieving this through a process led by central government, while Smartgrowth suggested a process led by local government with support from national guidance and direction or an outcome-based framework. It is unlikely that TCC would be affected by special agricultural areas (SAAs) and therefore recommends any submission on this is led by the Regional Council and WBOPDC who are more likely to have areas that would be subject to SAAs.

Q #	Question	Position	Discussion/Issue	Relief Sought
30.	What is appropriate process for identifying special agricultural areas should be? Should this process be led by local government or central government?	Led by central government	To ensure that there is national consistency in identifying special agriculture areas, the process should be led by central government with local government engagement.	Provide for central government to lead the process for identifying special agricultural areas.