

SECTION 32 OPTION EVALUATION TABLE

APPENDIX F

	Option 1 – Do Nothing/ Status Quo	Option 2 – Rezone the land to one/two residential zones only	Option 3 – Apply a mix of zonings and uses to the land that reflects the approved subdivision/resource consent	Option 4 – rezone as a Precinct that utilises AUP(OP) zonings and establishes specific place- based provisions and introduces MDRS as required to the relevant residential zones (except where qualifying matters apply)
Zone description and purpose	<p>This option would retain the Future Urban Zoning on the land and all or any development would have to take place in accordance with the granted resource consent.</p> <p>The Future Urban zone (FUZ) is applied to land that has been identified as suitable for urbanisation and is a transitional zone. Land can be used for a range of general rural activities and objectives and policies seek to ensure that it cannot be used for urban activities until the site is rezoned for urban purposes, or in this case has an approved resource consent.</p> <p>In accordance with the approved resource consent the site could be subdivided into a total of 575 lots at a range of sizes, including associated earthworks and stream reclamation. The consent is subject to a number of conditions including the provision of a private water supply and wastewater treatment and a piped stormwater network that would discharge into the existing stream network. The local road network would connect into Grand Drive and consist of a series of interconnected loops. The approved consent requires that all development be approved by a design panel and in accordance with a yet to be developed design guideline. The keeping of cats and dogs is restricted as a condition of consent. There are conditions in relating to weed clearance and management and replanting within the site. Approval in principle was given for a small commercial centre but the exact details of this would be subject to a further consent process.</p> <p>This is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>This option involves the rezoning of all the residential land on the site to one residential zone such as Mixed Housing Urban or to a maximum of two different but homogenous zones such as Mixed Housing Urban and Terraced Housing Zones. Though no precinct is included to allow for site specific responses.</p> <p>This is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>This option involves rezoning the land to the appropriate residential zone, based on the lot size and density outlined in the approved resource consent along with business and open space zonings. The existing provisions of the relevant zones as outlined in the AUP(OP) would apply to the site.</p> <p>This is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>This option involves including the land in a new precinct, based on the approved resource consent, take account of the NPS-UD (as amended) requirements and subsequent master planning. Precincts are an appropriate tool provided in the AUP(OP) that recognise the unique characteristics of the land and seek to establish, as necessary, specific place- based provisions for the land in order to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Resource consent for development was approved subject to a number of conditions that recognised and addressed the unique characteristics of the land and environs. The conditions would generally be able to be provided for as specific place-based provisions in the precinct provisions. Furthermore, this option allows for the consideration of any qualifying matters in terms of MDRS, those of relevance to the site include the ecological status of Nukumea Reserve and stability.</p> <p>Precincts are provided in the AUP(OP) to allow integrated planning and development of a discrete parcel of land within the context of the standard AUP methods and provisions but with the addition of specific place- based provisions where necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>The MDRS is incorporated as required by cl 25 (4A) of Schedule 1 of the RMA Amendment Act. Relevant qualifying matters have been utilised on parts of the site in terms of the ecological status of Nukumea Reserve and associated stability limitations along this interface.</p> <p>This is the preferred option.</p>

<p>Appropriateness (whether the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (s32(1)(a))</p>	<p>The objective or purpose of the proposed plan change is to enable the comprehensive and integrated development of a new residential community of up to 900 homes including a small neighbourhood centre within a unique landscape setting while protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>Option 1 would enable residential development on the site in a manner that is consistent with the approved resource consent i.e. a total of 575 dwellings and in line with the approved roading layout and the use of a private wastewater treatment system and water supply.</p> <p>Development of the site under Option 1 i.e. in accordance with the approved resource consent would provide additional housing which is an appropriate outcome in the constrained Auckland Housing market but additional consents would be required for a small neighbourhood centre in the area with FUZ zoning. Residential development in the location without access to community and commercial facilities would impact on the ability of the community to provide for its environmental, social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p> <p>The absence of a commercial centre to serve this community would also require the use of motor vehicles for the majority of convenience shopping trips, which would contribute to unnecessary use of fossil fuels and pollution.</p> <p>This option would not achieve the objectives of the proposal nor the purpose of the RMA. It would not allow the site to be developed to its fullest potential and provides for the subdivision to occur before connections to public infrastructure are available.</p> <p>The approved resource consent is an anomaly that will likely add considerable costs in the future, as well as result in sub-optimal development outcomes. Without appropriate zonings any redevelopment of the sites and dwellings would need to meet the rural standards imposed under the FUZ or require a resource consent.</p>	<p>The objective or purpose of the proposed plan change is to enable the comprehensive and integrated development of a new residential community of up to 900 homes including a small neighbourhood centre within a unique landscape setting while protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>Option 2 would enable residential development of the site that would provide additional housing which is an appropriate outcome in the constrained Auckland Housing market and allow for the efficient use of land and a well-functioning urban environment. It would align with the direction of the NPS-UD, MDRS and PC78.</p> <p>However, this option would preclude a planning approach that takes into account the unique characteristics of the site such as its location adjacent to a scenic reserve, undulating to steep topography, vegetation and the stream network and applies a “one size fits all” approach which would not necessarily provide the best overall outcome for the site or achieve the objective of a comprehensive and well planned development that protects and enhances the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the areas whilst realising the fullest development potential of the site.</p> <p>Further, some of the matters above are considered to be qualifying matters in respect stability and ecology so a bespoke approach would be supported.</p> <p>For example, if the Mixed Housing Urban zone was to be applied to the whole of the site then the relationship sought by the structure plan along the interface with Nukumea Scenic reserve would not be achieved by the application of the MHU controls and standards.</p> <p>By taking a multi- zonal approach that utilises the most appropriate zone in recognition of the site characteristics, the site will be able to be developed without more than minor adverse effects on the environment whilst at the same</p>	<p>The objective or purpose of the proposed plan change is to enable the comprehensive and integrated development of a new residential community of up to 900 homes including a small neighbourhood centre within a unique landscape setting while protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>The approved resource consent provides for a number of different residential densities and uses including the provision of a neighbourhood centre in principle i.e. not the final layout, size and design details of the centre are not approved and a further resource consent would be required.</p> <p>Option 3 would apply appropriate residential zonings to the site enabling residential development of the site that would provide additional housing which is an appropriate outcome in the constrained Auckland Housing market.</p> <p>However, whilst existing AUP(OP) zonings can be applied to the site that would generally reflect the intensity and type of development approved under the resource consent, the provisions of the zone must be applied to all development on that site. These provisions would not necessarily reflect the specific characteristics and qualities of the site that were provided for in the conditions of consent. These conditions were developed specifically to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of development in relation to the specific environmental conditions of the site.</p> <p>Development under the zoning provisions without recognition of the specific characteristics of the site would not adequately avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of development or enable the best outcomes for the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant has undertaken a thorough review of the approved resource consent and conditions, including undertaking new master planning and structure planning and has consulted further with the infrastructure providers which has resulted in amendments to elements of the consented road and block</p>	<p>The objective or purpose of the proposed plan change is to enable the comprehensive and integrated development of a new residential community of up to 900 homes including a small neighbourhood centre within a unique landscape setting while protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>This option uses an appropriate tool provided in the AUP(OP) that enables the recognition of the unique characteristics of the land and seeks to establish, as necessary specific place-based provisions for the land.</p> <p>Option 3 would enable residential development of the site that would provide additional housing which is an appropriate outcome in the constrained Auckland Housing market and allow for the efficient use of land and a well-functioning urban environment. It would align with the direction of the NPS-UD, MDRS and PC78.</p> <p>Precincts are provided in the AUP(OP) to allow integrated planning and development of a discrete parcel of land within the context of the standard AUP methods and provisions but with the addition of specific place-based provisions where necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>This approach would ensure that the standard AUP(OP) provisions are utilised along with specific provisions to address the unique characteristics of the land as identified in the approved resource consent and subsequent master-planning.</p> <p>Specific provisions to address particular characteristics within the proposed precinct include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of the ecological and amenity attributes of the precinct and the adjacent Nukumea Scenic Reserve through prohibiting the keeping of cats, mustelids or rodents in the precinct and the establishment of development-free and planting buffers (10m/20m) and minimum revegetation requirements
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>Activity and development standards in the FUZ are consistent with those allowed in the rural zone e.g. a 15m height limit and 10m front yards. These standards would not be suitable for any further development within the subdivision consequent to the development under the approved resource consent and there would be considerable cost involved for land owners who might seek to undertake additions and alterations to developments and dwellings that were approved under the resource consent but are on land that is zoned FUZ.</p> <p>This option would not be the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Further it would not deliver on the directions under NPS-UD, RMA Amendment Act and MDRS.</p> <p>It is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>time realising the full development potential of the land resource.</p> <p>This is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>It is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>layouts across the site. Overall it is concluded that there is opportunity for an increase in dwellings numbers on the site without compromising the natural environmental qualities of the site, subject to specific provisions for the site that do not just rely on the existing provisions of the AUP(OP).</p> <p>This option is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>It is not the preferred option.</p>	<p>adjoining the reserve boundary, provision of ecological corridors and additional revegetation requirements within this overlay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing for larger lot sizes along the Nukumea Reserve interface for both ecology reasons (i.e. achieve 60 % revegetation) and manage slope stability issues with the steep topography along this boundary. • Allowing commercial activities on the ground floor in certain areas of the THAB zone (Flexible Commercial Overlay) that adjoin the neighbourhood centre zone • Restricting the height of fencing in the front yard and having no fencing adjacent to open space. <p>The Amendment Act already identified that the use of qualifying matters for the application of MDRS are an appropriate tool. They are utilised in PC78 by Council. The qualifying matters proposed within this PPC relate to protection of the significant ecological areas within the Nukumea Scenic Reserve, sites subject to instability and the application of riparian yard setbacks.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA. It is the preferred option.</p>
<p>Efficiency and effectiveness (whether the provisions are the most efficient and effective means of achieving the objectives of the proposal (s32(1)(b))</p>	<p>Option 1 would not be efficient or effective in achieving the objectives of the proposed plan change and development of the site. (Whilst it would be able to rely on an existing consent for the subdivision layout that has been through a thorough and integrated consent process for development, any future development such as the dwellings and further additions and alterations would be subject to the provisions of the FUZ which refers to the development standards of the Rural Zone. which is a zone that does not provide a suitable suite of planning standards and controls for the intensity of development consented.</p> <p>Overall it would not allow the community to provide for its social and economic well-being</p>	<p>Option 2 would provide for residential development in the area but would not be efficient or effective as it would not be consistent with the approved resource consent and would establish homogenous zoning across the site regardless of the site's unique characteristics and proximity to Nukumea Scenic Reserve. This means that the site may not be able to be readily developed without significant additional cost such as engineering and earthworks or that the full development potential of the site is not realised which is an inefficient use of the land resource.</p>	<p>Option 3 would be more efficient and effective than Options 1 and 2 as it recognises that a multi-zonal approach that utilises the most appropriate zone in recognition of the site characteristics is an efficient enabler of development and means that the site will be able to be developed without more than minor adverse effects on the environment, whilst at the same time realising the full development potential of the land resource. However, the relevant zoning provisions will be the only development controls and no account is taken of the sites unique characteristics in particular the relationship to Nukumea Scenic Reserve that were provided for through the conditions of the resource consent but would not be part of the standard zone development controls of the AUP(OP).</p>	<p>Option 4 would provide for the scale and nature of development that is sought under the proposed plan change and would more accurately reflect the approved resource consent which was considered to be sustainable management of the site. It also takes into account the additional master-planning, structure planning and consultation with the infrastructure providers that has been undertaken since the consent was approved.</p> <p>The provisions of Option 4 which establishes site specific provisions where necessary but overall relies on existing provisions of the AUP(OP), whilst increasing the number of dwellings that could be constructed on the site would be the most effective and efficient way to achieve the</p>

	and could have the potential for significant adverse environmental effects as effective management of environmental effects would be solely as a result of the conditions of a resource consent that does not form part of a public statutory planning regime.		This option would not be the most efficient or effective way of achieving the objectives of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.	objectives of the proposal. It would enable the comprehensive development of the site to its fullest potential whilst overall protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.
Benefits <i>Assessment of benefits of the anticipated environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of the provisions, including economic growth and employment (s32(2)(a) and (b)).</i>	Option 1 provides for residential development on the land in accordance with the approved resource consent, thereby contributing to the supply of housing in a constrained market.	Option 2 would also enable residential development of the site that would be a positive feature in terms of additions to the housing market.	Option 3 would also enable residential development of the site that would be a positive feature in terms of additions to the housing market	Provision for a precinct on the land that utilises existing AUP(OP) provisions along with site specific provision would enable the comprehensive development of the site to its fullest potential whilst overall protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area. This is of considerable benefit.
Costs <i>Assessment of costs of the anticipated environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of the provisions, including economic growth and employment (s32(2)(a) and (b)).</i>	Option 1 means that full development potential of the site would not be realised given the consent does not allow for the construction of dwellings. There would be considerable future costs for residents as any future development would require resource consent, as well as potentially significant adverse environmental effects and outcomes as development is managed under a resource consent rather than a statutory document. The provision of a neighbourhood centre would require a further resource consent and should not be assumed. Overall costs to residents and the environment would in the long term be significant.	Under Option 2, serious costs, both economic and environmental could occur in order to make one zoning work across this site which has a number of unique characteristics. This option would have ecological and landscape impacts on native flora and fauna and would not result in a community of varied housing sizes and typologies leading to poor urban design outcomes. The lack of a neighbourhood centre would also mean there is not a focal point for the community and that they would have to travel outside the area for convenience goods, necessitating more car trips and use of fossil fuels,	Option 3 would likely result in significant environmental costs as a result of the unique characteristics of the site not being recognised or provided for through site-specific provisions. This would also be an economic cost as the lack of a neighbourhood centre means that additional travel and fuel costs are incurred to access facilities.	Whilst there may be some low scale costs associated with the processing of the private plan change, this is considered negligible in the context and necessary to ensure that the statutory planning regime on the site accurately reflects the development and future development of the site. Overall the cost associated with this option are negligible and outweighed by the benefits
Risk <i>Assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the provisions (s32(2)(c))</i>	There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the subject matter of the provisions, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.	There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the subject matter of the provisions, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.	There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the subject matter of the provisions, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.	There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the subject matter of the provisions, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.
Summary	Development of the site under the approved consent would enable the establishment of approximately 575 lots with no connections to public infrastructure. It would not require the provision of a small- scale centre to serve the surrounding residential community in terms of day to day convenience needs and to act as a focal centre. The absence of a suitable commercial centre on the land would increase frequency of vehicle trips on the local road	Option 2 would provide some of the outcomes that are sought by the proposal, but not to the extent that is required to optimise benefits to the community. Additional consents would be required to establish an appropriately scaled Neighbourhood Centre which is an inefficient way of giving effect to the objectives of the proposal. The homogenous nature of the development that would result from the imposition of only one zoning would not lead to	Option 3 would provide for a range of residential zonings and housing typologies that is consistent with the size of the residential catchment. However, a neighbourhood centre that will be focal point for the community would not be enabled and development would rely on the existing AUP(OP) provisions for the zone. These would not always be appropriate, taking in to account the unique characteristics of the land and potentially result in adverse environmental	Option 4 would provide for the scale and nature of development that is sought under the proposal and would more accurately reflect the approved resource consent which was considered to be sustainable management, as well as taking into account the additional master-planning, structure planning and consultation with the infrastructure providers that has been undertaken since the consent was approved.

	<p>network, resulting in environmental and social impacts. Subsequent development of the land would also require resource consent as it would not be consistent with the FUZ zoning provisions. The fact that the site has a FUZ zoning and an approved resource consent for significant development is an anomaly and needs to be rectified by establishing an appropriate zoning pattern that is within a statutory planning document and that is in line with development on the site.</p> <p>Option 1 is not the preferred option for these reasons.</p>	<p>the urban design outcomes that are expressed in the AUP(OP) and would also lead to adverse environmental outcomes in this unique landscape given the proximity of the site to Nukumea Scenic Reserve</p> <p>Option 2 is not the preferred option for these reasons.</p>	<p>outcomes given the proximity of the site to Nukumea Scenic Reserve.</p> <p>Option 3 is not the preferred option for these reasons</p>	<p>Option 4 provides for the provision of a precinct on the land that utilises existing AUP(OP) provisions along with site- specific provisions that would enable the comprehensive development of the site to its fullest potential whilst overall protecting and enhancing the ecological, landscape and amenity values of the area.</p> <p>The MDRS are incorporated as required and qualifying matters are utilised as relevant on the site.</p> <p>Option 4 is the preferred option for these reasons.</p>
--	--	--	--	--