

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 3 – HORIZONS ONE PLAN

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER Proposed Plan Change 3 ‘Urban Form and Development’ to the Consolidated Regional Policy Statement, Regional Plan and Regional Coastal Plan for the Manawatū-Whanganui Region (One Plan)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF REBECCA DAVIES ON BEHALF OF THE
NEW ZEALAND DEFENCE FORCE**

SUBMITTER S15 and FS1

1 February 2024

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Rebecca Davies and I am employed by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) within Defence Estate and Infrastructure, as a Principal Statutory Planner. I have been in that role since 2016. I manage and engage in Resource Management Act 1991 statutory processes on behalf of Army, Navy and Air Force throughout New Zealand in relation to on-base and off-site infrastructure and activities.
2. NZDF is a government department, an element of the Crown, and provides military capability as required by Government. NZDF is empowered and authorised in its activities by the Defence Act 1990 and by output agreements with Government. NZDF supports the nation's security, resilience and wellbeing, in fulfilment of national security objectives and the principles underpinning the Government's expectations of NZDF.
3. I am familiar with NZDF's submission and further submission on proposed Plan Change 3 (PC3) 'Urban Form and Development' to Horizon's One Plan, having directed consultants in the preparation of those. I confirm that I have the authority to provide evidence in relation to the matters set out below on behalf of NZDF.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

4. This statement of evidence focuses on several provisions of PC3 relating to the protection of regionally or nationally significant infrastructure from urban development. This includes recognition of NZDF facilities as 'nationally significant infrastructure' so that all relevant provisions of PC3 apply to NZDF facilities as anticipated by Chapter 3 of the existing Regional Policy Statement (RPS) provisions of the One Plan. NZDF was unable to attend pre-hearing conferencing on Topic 1: Regionally and Nationally Significant Infrastructure held in August 2023.

DEFENCE FACILITIES IN THE MANAWATŪ-WHANGANUI REGION

5. The Manawatū-Whanganui region is important strategically to NZDF, and NZDF is a significant stakeholder in the Manawatū-Whanganui region, with the Linton Military Camp, Raumai Weapons Range, Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF) Base Ohakea and Waiouru Military Camp and Training Area all located within it. A Statement of Intent between NZDF, Manawatū District Council and Palmerston North City Council acknowledges the enduring relationship between the three parties, cites

mutual benefits, and records the intention of these parties to work together in mutual areas of interest.

6. Defence infrastructure is designated in the relevant District Plans in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991. The Minister of Defence is the Requiring Authority for Defence designations. Defence facilities are regionally and nationally significant Defence infrastructure that are essential to national security and Defence operations both in the North Island and New Zealand more broadly.
7. The existing provisions of the Regional Policy Statement, specifically the provisions in Chapter 3: *Infrastructure, Energy, Waste, Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land* including Objective 3.1 and Policies 3.1 and 3.2, recognise the benefits of infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance and seek to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on this infrastructure.
- 8.
9. Proposed Plan Change 3: Urban Development (PC3) sets out objectives and policies to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). Specifically, PC3 seeks to enable sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand, and for the planning of well-functioning urban environments.
10. Palmerston North is an 'urban environment' as defined in the NPS-UD. The Linton Military Camp is located in close proximity to this urban environment. Linton Military Camp has been in its current location since the 1940s.
11. Over 2,000 personnel are based at the Linton Military Camp and it is extensively used for housing, training facilities including a rifle range, office accommodation and vehicle and equipment storage and maintenance. It is the largest Army base in New Zealand, covering an area of approximately 260 hectares, and is both regionally and nationally significant Defence infrastructure. As well as being essential for meeting Defence purposes under the Defence Act 1990¹, the Camp makes a significant

¹ Section 5 of the Defence Act 1990 provides for the raising and maintenance of armed forces for specified purposes. Those purposes include the defence of New Zealand, the protection of the interests of New Zealand, the provision of assistance to the civil power in times of emergency and the provision of any public service.

contribution to the economic and social well-being of Palmerston North as well as the wider Manawatū-Whanganui Region.

NZDF'S SUBMISSION

12. NZDF is highly conscious of:

- i. Policy direction in the Horizons One Plan Regional Policy Statement (RPS) that requires recognition of RNZAF Base Ohakea as infrastructure that is a physical resource of regional or national importance, and recognition of NZDF facilities as being physical assets of regional or national importance² (discussed below).
- ii. The need to preserve operational capabilities of Defence facilities and infrastructure so that they can continue to be used to meet Defence purposes under Section 5 of the Defence Act 1990.
- iii. The potential for development within Palmerston North to occur in proximity to the Linton Military Camp. An example of this is the Kākātangiata urban growth area which is located approximately 450m north of the Linton Military Camp. A future plan change would seek to change the zoning of this land from rural to mainly residential zoning.
- iv. Defence facilities are 'effects producing activities' which have effects extending outside the boundaries of the designation and physical site. Relevant to Linton Military Camp, this includes the lawful operation of a rifle range. New development, particularly noise-sensitive activities, in proximity to Defence facilities could result in reverse sensitivity effects, which could adversely affect NZDF's ability to operate its facilities and ultimately compromise Defence capability.

13. Palmerston North is an 'urban environment' as defined in the NPS-UD. Linton Military Camp is located in close proximity to this urban environment. NZDF acknowledges the need to provide for residential growth within Palmerston North City and to implement the NPS-UD. However, reverse sensitivity poses significant risks to the continued operation of NZDF facilities such as the Linton Military Camp. Noise-generating activities are particularly vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects. These

² One Plan RPS Policy 3.4.1.

effects can be exacerbated by the presence of new residential or other noise-sensitive activities in the vicinity of these noise generating activities.

14. As set out in its submission, the position of NZDF is that development must be appropriately located and designed in relation to established infrastructure, must not be incompatible with existing lawful landuses and activities, and needs to be managed in a way that avoids adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on regionally or nationally significant infrastructure, including Defence facilities.

RESPONSE TO SECTION 42A REPORT

15. For ease of comparison, the changes sought by NZDF and the changes recommended in the Section 42A Report, including the most recent changes recommended through rebuttal evidence prepared by the reporting planner (Ms Shirley, 24 January 2024), are set out in the table attached to this evidence (attachment 1). Further changes sought by NZDF are also set out in the table, and are explained below.
16. For the purpose of this evidence, I have focused on NZDF's submission points in relation to the definition of infrastructure. NZDF also made a number of further submission points supporting changes to the specific wording of Plan provisions by KiwiRail and Transpower. NZDF supports the changes set out in the evidence of Mr Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited and Mr Whitney on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited in relation to reverse sensitivity. Specifically, NZDF seeks that adverse reverse sensitivity effects are avoided in the first instance (UFD-03 and UFD-04), consistent with Chapter 3 of the RPS, rather than managed.
17. As set out in the S42A Report, it was agreed at the pre-hearing meeting (Topic 1: Regionally and Nationally Significant Infrastructure) to include the NPS-UD definition of Nationally Significant Infrastructure to support UFD-03 and UFD-P4. While NZDF understands the rationale for adopting that definition, NZDF is opposed to it because the definition does not include NZDF Defence facilities. This is despite the fact that Defence facilities are nationally and regionally important and are recognised as such elsewhere in the One Plan.
18. Specifically, One Plan RPS Policy 3.4.1 requires that Horizons Regional Council (and Territorial Authorities) must recognise RNZAF Base Ohakea as infrastructure that is a physical resource of regional or national importance. It also requires that New Zealand Defence Force facilities are recognised as being physical assets of regional

or national importance³. PC3 needs to be amended in order to be consistent with, and give effect to, this existing directive RPS policy. As noted above, requested amendments are set out in the table attached to this evidence (attachment 1).

19. While the NPS-UD defines nationally significant infrastructure, it does not preclude the inclusion and recognition of other nationally significant infrastructure within the One Plan to respond to a particular local or regional context and to ensure consistency across the existing RPS and PC3. The presence of significant Defence facilities within the region is an important part of the local and regional context. In addition, NZDF seeks consistency with the RPS.
20. At paragraph 86 of the Section 42A Report, the reporting planner notes that urban development that impacts NZDF facilities will be subject to the direction set out in Policies 3-2 and 3-3, and that effects on NZDF facilities from urban development are appropriately managed through these policies.
21. NZDF disagrees with this statement. Policy 3-2 is the only relevant policy that can be relied on, but does not set any expectations regarding urban development and encroachment but instead focuses on 'activities'. PC3 sets the direction for urban development in the region and how this is to occur. Considering the directive nature of the NPS-UD and associated PC3 provisions, it is reasonable to expect these will be given primacy over other provisions within the RPS.
22. Additionally, as a number of the PC3 provisions only apply to the NPS-UD definition of 'nationally significant infrastructure', greater weight will be given to the protection to infrastructure covered by this definition, which does not include NZDF facilities. By not addressing all nationally significant or important infrastructure as part of PC3, it suggests that urban development and intensification only needs to consider reverse sensitivity effects on some of this infrastructure.
23. NZDF supports the amendment to UFD-O3(1)(f) to include reference to 'regionally and nationally important' infrastructure as recommended at paragraph 97 of the S42A

³The distinction between the use of the word 'significant' in the NPS-UD and 'important' in Chapter 3 of the RPS is largely a semantic one only. The infrastructure and other physical resources of regional or national importance (e.g. the National Grid, Palmerston North and Whanganui airports, telecommunication and radio communication facilities, the Port of Whanganui etc, along with RNZAF Base Ohakea) are equally regionally or nationally significant infrastructure.

Report but considers that consistent terminology should be used, and that this needs to refer to '*infrastructure **and physical resources** of regional or national importance*' consistent with Policies 3.1 and 3.2.

24. The amendment to UFD-O3 (1)(f) should also apply to UFD-I3 and UFD-P4. In particular, the change to UFD-P4 is required to ensure internal consistency between the policy provisions and a logical policy cascade from the objective, through to the policy which implements the objective.

CONCLUSION

25. NZDF is a significant stakeholder in the Manawatu-Whanganui region, having several significant facilities located within it, and the region is important to NZDF strategically. Defence facilities comprise regionally and nationally significant infrastructure that is essential to national security and Defence operations both in the North Island and New Zealand more broadly.
26. NZDF acknowledges the need to provide for residential growth, however, NZDF seeks to ensure that its interests, which include the ongoing operation of Defence facilities, are protected now and into the future.
27. The inclusion of the NPS-UD definition of Nationally Significant Infrastructure does not preclude the inclusion and recognition of other nationally significant infrastructure (such as Defence facilities) within the One Plan to respond to a particular local or regional context and to ensure consistency across the existing RPS and PC3. The presence of significant Defence facilities within the region is an important part of the local and regional context, and NZDF seeks consistency with the One Plan.
28. Without this, Defence facilities such as Linton Military Camp and RNZAF Base Ohakea, which are recognised as nationally and regionally important within the One Plan, are at risk of reverse sensitivity effects through implementation of PC3 but are not protected by the reverse sensitivity provisions in PC3. NZDF's position is that this is not a consistent or reasonable approach.
29. NZDF requests amendments to PC3 in order to achieve protection of nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, and to be consistent with, and give effect to, the existing RPS policy direction. An amendment to policy UFD-P4 is required to ensure internal consistency between the policy provisions and a logical policy cascade from objective UFD-03, through to the policy which implements this objective.

30. Amendments sought by NZDF are set out in attachment 1. The amended provisions are appropriate and necessary to protect the ongoing operation of NZDF facilities.

Rebecca Davies

1 February 2024

Attachment 1

Provision	NZDF Submission	Section 42A Report and Rebuttal Evidence	NZDF suggested amendments based on evidence
<p>UFD-I3: Demand for housing, business land*, infrastructure^ and community services*</p>	<p>A growing population increases demand for housing, business land*, infrastructure^ and community services*. Growth needs to be provided for in a way that contributes to well-functioning urban environments*, is integrated with infrastructure^ planning and funding decisions,</p> <p>manages effects* on the urban and natural environment and on infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance,</p> <p>and improves resilience to the effects* of climate change^.</p>	<p>A growing population increases demand for housing, business land*, infrastructure^ and community services*. Growth in <u>urban environments*</u> needs to be provided for in a way that contributes to well-functioning urban environments*, is integrated with infrastructure^ planning and funding decisions,</p> <p><u>avoids the creation of reverse sensitivity effects on existing nationally significant infrastructure*, manages effects* on the urban and natural environment (including freshwater),</u></p> <p>and improves resilience to the effects* of climate change^. <u>Growth in smaller towns and communities that are not urban environments* should also be provided in a manner which contributes to well-functioning communities that achieve the principles of well-functioning urban environments*.</u></p>	<p>A growing population increases demand for housing, business land*, infrastructure^ and community services*. Growth in <u>urban environments*</u> needs to be provided for in a way that contributes to well-functioning urban environments*, is integrated with infrastructure^ planning and funding decisions,</p> <p><u>avoids the creation of reverse sensitivity effects on existing nationally significant infrastructure* including infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance, manages effects* on the urban and natural environment (including freshwater).</u></p>

Provision	NZDF Submission	Section 42A Report and Rebuttal Evidence	NZDF suggested amendments based on evidence
<p>UFD-03: Urban form and function</p>	<p>The intensification and expansion of urban environments*:</p> <p>(1) contributes to well-functioning urban environments* that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>(f) protects infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance and provides for its ongoing operation...</u></p>	<p>The intensification and expansion of urban environments*:</p> <p>(1) contributes to well-functioning urban environments* that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>(f) manage effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure, including infrastructure of regional or national importance, to ensure the infrastructure is not compromised..</u></p>	<p>The intensification and expansion of urban environments*:</p> <p>(1) contributes to well-functioning urban environments* that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>(f) manage avoid effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure, including infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance, to ensure the infrastructure is not compromised..</u></p>
<p>UFD-P4: Urban intensification and expansion</p>	<p>Intensification and expansion of urban environments* is provided for and enabled in district plans^ where: . . .</p> <p>e) it protects natural and physical resources that have been scheduled within the One Plan in relation to their significance or special character.</p>	<p>Intensification and expansion of urban environments* is provided for and enabled in district plans^ where:. . .</p> <p>e) it protects natural and physical resources that have been scheduled within the One Plan in relation to their significance or special character, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>f) the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure* is not compromised</u></p>	<p>Intensification and expansion of urban environments* is provided for and enabled in district plans^ where:. . .</p> <p>e) it protects natural and physical resources that have been scheduled within the One Plan in relation to their significance or special character, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>f) the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure*, including infrastructure and</u></p>

Provision	NZDF Submission	Section 42A Report and Rebuttal Evidence	NZDF suggested amendments based on evidence
	<p>2) In addition to meeting the criteria in (1) above, the expansion of urban environments* must only occur where it: ...</p> <p>(d) manages adverse reverse sensitivity effects* on land with existing incompatible activities adjacent to the urban environment* boundary, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(e) avoids adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on infrastructure and resources of regional or national importance.</u></p>	<p>2) In addition to meeting the criteria in (1) above, the expansion of urban environments* must only occur where it:.</p> <p>(d) manages adverse reverse sensitivity effects* on land with existing incompatible activities, <u>including</u> adjacent to the urban environment* boundary, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(e) does not compromise the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure</u></p>	<p><u>physical resources of regional or national importance, is not compromised</u></p> <p>2) In addition to meeting the criteria in (1) above, the expansion of urban environments* must only occur where it:.</p> <p>(d) manages <u>avoids</u> adverse reverse sensitivity effects* on land with existing incompatible activities, <u>including</u> adjacent to the urban environment* boundary, <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(e) does not compromise the operation, maintenance and upgrade of nationally significant infrastructure including infrastructure and physical resources of regional or national importance</u></p>