

	Option One Status Quo ('do nothing') Retain R-MHS Zone and Māngere 1 Precinct	Option Two Maintain R-MHS Zone and remove Mangere 1 Precinct	Option Three Rezone to Residential Mixed Housing Urban and remove Precinct	Option Four Rezone to General Business /remove Precinct	Option Five Rezone to Business – Light Industry and remove Precinct
Zone description and purpose	R-MHS however the Māngere 1 precinct states that the objectives, polices and activity table in the precinct replaces the objectives, polices and activity table in the zone.  In light of this, no residential development is enabled on the site.  Only activities provided for by the Precinct are able to be	characterised by one or two storey, mainly stand- alone buildings, set back from site boundaries with landscaped gardens.  The zone enables intensification, while	high-intensity zone enabling a variety of the sizes and forms of residential development. The objectives of the zone support the increase in the capacity and choice of housing within neighbourhoods as well as promoting walkable communities.  The resource consent requirements enable the design and layout of the development to be assessed, recognising that the need to achieve a quality design is increasingly important as the scale	The Business – General Business Zone provides for business activities from light industrial to limited office, large format retail and trade suppliers. Large format retail is preferred in centres but it is recognised that this is not always possible, or practical.  These activities are appropriate in the Business – General Business Zone only when they do not adversely affect the function, role and amenity of the Business – City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone and Business – Town Centre Zone.  Although the application of the zone within Auckland is limited, it is an important part of this Plan's strategy to provide for growth in commercial activity and manage the effects of large format retail.  The establishment of small retail activities in the zone should be limited as the presence of these activities, in combination with large format retail, can effectively create an unplanned centre. Residential activity is also not envisaged due to the potential presence of light industrial activities and the need to preserve land for appropriate commercial activities.  The zone is located primarily in areas close to the Business – City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone and Business – Town Centre Zone or within identified growth corridors, where there is good transport access and exposure to customers.  New development within the zone requires assessment in order to ensure that it is designed to a good standard	The Business – Light Industry Zone anticipates industrial activities that do not generate objectionable odour, dust or noise. This includes manufacturing, production, logistics, storage, transport and distribution activities. The anticipated level of amenity is lower than the centres zones, Business – General Business Zone and Business – Mixed Use Zone. Due to the industrial nature of the zone, activities sensitive to air discharges are generally not provided for.



	Option One Status Quo ('do nothing') Retain R-MHS Zone and Māngere 1 Precinct	Option Two Maintain R-MHS Zone and remove Mangere 1 Precinct	Option Three Rezone to Residential Mixed Housing Urban and remove Precinct	Option Four Rezone to General Business /remove Precinct	Option Five Rezone to Business – Light Industry and remove Precinct
Effectiveness and efficiency	Not rezoning the land now would mean that any future development which was not animal welfare related would likely require a complex and costly planning process and delay the development of the land that could be efficiently developed for light industry sooner if zoned correctly.  The "do nothing" option does not address the identified issue/objective (developing the land for Light industry activities). Under this option, the PC area would not achieve the efficient development of the land.  This option is not efficient or effective given that not changing the zoning (in some manner) will not be consistent with the RPS and Part 2 of the RMA once the SPCA leaves as little to no development would likely proceed.	underlying zoning and is consistent with the immediately adjacent properties to the north-west.  Maintaining the zoning consistent with surrounding properties and removal of the precinct would allow the land to be efficiently developed for residential activities and would achieve a consistent character and environmental outcome for the area. The zone seeks to achieve high quality on-site living environments while managing the effects of visual amenity, privacy and access to daylight, resulting in a suburban character.  This would be efficient as it uses established residential zone provisions which have already been assessed and are consistent with the RPS / RMA.  In light of the objective of the plan change being to enable light industrial development this option does not make the most efficient and effective use of the land resource when	the proposed zoning would be an existing residential zone which is (now) applied to the majority of residential areas in Auckland and likely consistent with the zoning that would be proposed if/when a variation to PC78 is notified for the Light Rail Corridor. The land would be used efficiently, and it may be market attractive for intensive development.  This option would effectively achieve the RPS objectives in terms of residential intensification as well making the most of the locational characteristics of the land.  It would not allow the land to contribute to the supply of large	The General Business zone would be an effective way to provide for light industrial activities on the land however the allowance for large format retail has the potential to adversely affect the vitality of nearby centre zones resulting in inefficiency due to reduced demand in those areas.  It is also noted that the plan change land is not close to the Business — City Centre Zone, Business — Metropolitan Centre Zone and Business — Town Centre Zone or within an identified growth corridors so doesn't match with the locational strategy of the AUP.	This option is the most effective and efficient way to achieve the objective of the plan change which is to develop the land for light industrial purposes.  The planning framework is already existing and fit for purpose with resolved and settled provisions which are effective in providing for light industrial development whilst also efficiently protecting the amenity of surrounding land.
Cost	bespoke planning framework which was specifically tailored for the SPCA use on the site, it would have the benefit of	nature of built form enabled so a less complex plan change process would be	there is only limited change to the scale and nature of built form	There are high monetary costs from this option due to the complexity of the necessary plan change request processes and specialist reporting required.  Rezoning for general business would prevent the development of the site for residential intensification (outside those areas with the MANA and EMA) so would not meet RPS Residential intensification provisions.	Costs of this in terms of the plan change process are the same as for Option 4 – high due to the complexity and nature of the change.  Rezoning for B-LIZ would prevent the development of the site for residential intensification (especially outside those areas with the MANA and EMA) so would not meet RPS Residential intensification provisions.



Status Quo ('do nothing')	Option Two Maintain R-MHS Zone and remove Mangere 1 Precinct	Option Three Rezone to Residential Mixed Housing Urban and remove Precinct	Option Four Rezone to General Business /remove Precinct	Option Five Rezone to Business – Light Industry and remove Precinct
The SPCA has however confirmed plans to leave the site and move to a new facility which is to be constructed nearby and so once they vacate the site it would be unlikely to be utilised for any other activity of this nature.  Redevelopment for light industrial activities would require a Discretionary Activity resource consent and would likely be inconsistent with the Precinct objectives and policies (which are noted to entirely replace the zone provision) so securing resource consent would be either unlikely or would require substantial time and monetary investment in a risky and uncertain planning process.  Other costs related to site development and infrastructure provision would be incurred and dependant on future development typology.	dependant on future development typology but would be higher for more intensive uses.  Would enable residential development on a site which is within the E29 Emergency Management Area Control associated with the high-pressure petroleum pipeline which runs from Marsden Refinery to Wiri (Channel Terminal Services Limited Designation 6501, Petroleum Pipeline - Urban Section). The pipeline is located approximately 7m from the southern boundary of the plan change land with the Emergency Management Area Control applying a 34m buffer from the line. The EMA controls provisions seek that the risk to activities sensitive to hazardous facilities and infrastructure is considered. Enabling residential activities would result in increased risk of harm in the event of any pipeline ruptures.  Residential development of the site has the potential to create both adverse amenity effects on future residents as well as reverse sensitivity effects as the plan change land is affected by the D24 Aircraft Noise Overlay - Moderate aircraft noise area (MANA) and Aircraft noise notification area (ANNA), Auckland Airport - aircraft noise notification area. The MANA limits residential intensification across a large part of the site to a density of one unit per 400m².  Potential reduction in amenity for north and east neighbouring properties due to reduced yard requirements enabling buildings closer to site boundaries.	(risk of harm to future residents / loss of amenity ) associated with residential development of land which is affected by the fuel pipeline EMA control.  As with Option 2 there are potential costs around amenity for future residents and reverse sensitivity to the Airport from enabling residential intensification of land within the MANA / ANNA. This is exacerbated by the higher densities and intensity of use enabled within the R-MHU under this option vs the R-MHS under Option 2.  This option would result in a zoning pattern that is slightly different to the surrounding established residential area however this may change with	Would represents a spot zone and be inconsistent with the AUP locational strategy in terms of where the General Business zone is to be located.  Potential reduction in amenity for north and east neighbouring properties due to reduced yard requirements enabling buildings closer to site boundaries.  Additional height enabled for this Option (16.5m) vs Option 1, 2 and 3 however interface controls are standard zone provisions and would result in a reasonable and acceptable level of amenity.	Potential reduction in amenity for north and east neighbouring properties due to reduced yard requirements enabling buildings closer to site boundaries however better outcome for the northern neighbour compared to Option 4 as the General Business zone has no yard requirement to the school zone and a 6m+45 degree HIRTB.  Additional building height is enabled for this Option (20m) vs Option 1-4 so potential cost of reduced amenity for neighbours (visual amenity, building dominance, shading) however Urban Design Assessment report confirms that zone provisions around landscaped/planted yards and height to boundary are sufficient to address / mitigate these costs and provide an acceptable level of amenity.



	Option One	Ontion Two	Option Three	Option Four	Option Five
	Status Quo ('do nothing')	Option Two Maintain R-MHS Zone and remove Mangere	Rezone to Residential Mixed	Rezone to General Business /remove Precinct	Rezone to Business – Light Industry and
	Retain R-MHS Zone and	1 Precinct	Housing Urban and remove	Rezone to deneral business / Temove Precinct	remove Precinct
	Mängere 1 Precinct	Trecinct	Precinct		Temove Fredinct
Benefit	Wangere 1 Heemet		Treemee		
Bellejie	Would provide certainty for	Relatively straight forward plan change to	Same as Option 2 but would take	Will fully meet plan change objective and	Will fully meet plan change objective and
	neighbours as to the scale and	remove the Precinct based on it no longer	advantage of the site's location	provide a full suite of suitable plan provisions to	provide a full suite of suitable plan provisions to
	nature of future development	being required as specific occupier no longer	and size to provide a more	allow the land to be developed for light industrial	allow the land to be developed for light
	on the site.	needs it.	intensive development than	activities.	industrial activities.
			Option 2.		
	No costs to change planning	Increases housing capacity, choice and		Consideration given to neighbour amenity and	Increases land available for light industrial
	framework.	intensity.	Likely to be in line with PC78	quality of the built form via zone provisions	activities adjacent to an established light
			if/when varied to capture light rail		industrial area and transport options.
		Increased land available for housing adjacent	corridor.	Would enable the land to be developed for light	
		to an established residential area and		industrial purposes as sought, in an accessible	Consideration given to protection of neighbours
		transport options.		location, with ability to be serviced with existing infrastructure and where the adverse effects on	amenity via settled and effective bulk and
		Consideration given to on-site amenity and		the environment can be appropriately mitigated.	location controls which, as assessed in the Urban Design report, can maintain suitable and
		quality of the built form via zone provisions.		the environment can be appropriately mitigated.	reasonable amenity for neighbours
		quanty of the same form the zone provisions.		Avoids potential reverse sensitivity effects of	reasonable afficility for fielghboars
		Would enable the land to be developed for		residential activity establishing on the plan	Avoids potential reverse sensitivity effects of
		residential purposes, in an accessible		change land which is affected by the D24 Aircraft	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		location, with ability to be serviced with		Noise Overlay - Moderate aircraft noise area	change land which is affected by the D24
		infrastructure and where the adverse effects		(MANA) and Aircraft noise notification area	Aircraft Noise Overlay - Moderate aircraft noise
		on the environment can be appropriately		(ANNA), Auckland Airport - aircraft noise	area (MANA) and Aircraft noise notification area
		mitigated.		notification area.	(ANNA), Auckland Airport - aircraft noise
					notification area.
		Would provide a zoning pattern consistent		Would be broadly in line with strategic planning	
		with the surrounding area.		direction regarding providing for business and	Would enable the land to be developed for the
				commercial growth in suitable locations.	proposed light industrial purposes, in an
				Additional employment via new business	accessible location, with ability to be serviced
				development near residential areas.	with infrastructure and where the adverse
				development hear residential areas.	effects on the environment can be appropriately mitigated.
					appropriately mitigated.
					Would provide a zoning pattern consistent with
					the surrounding area to the south.
					Enables additional employment via new
					business development near residential areas.
Summary					
	The current zoning and	This option has the potential to achieve the	This is a similar conclusion as for	Overall, this option will provide an efficient and	Overall, this Option has similar costs, benefits as
	precinct on the site will, in the		Option 2 with potential to achieve	effective way to deliver the objective of light	Option 4 but is preferred and considered to best
	near future once SPCA vacate		the outcomes of the RPS /	industrial development on the land but the	meet the objectives of the plan change, RPS and
	the site, will no longer be fit for		AUP(OP) in terms of residential	potential adverse amenity effects on land to the	RMA as it fully meets the objective of enabling
	purpose as the precinct is a	able to deliver the objective of the plan	intensification, however, it is not	north combined with additional resource	



Option One	Option Two	Option Three	Option Four	Option Five
Status Quo ('do nothing')	Maintain R-MHS Zone and remove Mangere	Rezone to Residential Mixed	Rezone to General Business /remove Precinct	Rezone to Business – Light Industry and
Retain R-MHS Zone and	1 Precinct	Housing Urban and remove		remove Precinct
Mängere 1 Precinct		Precinct		
bespoke planning framework	change which is to enable light industrial	the most effective or efficient nor	consent process requirements (due to new	light industrial development and is the same as
for that particular occupant	development of the plan change land.	able to deliver the objective of the	buildings needing resource consent) make	the adjacent zoning.
and there are no others likely		plan change which is to enable	Option 5 a more efficient and effective way to	
to occupy the land and operate		light industrial development of	deliver light industrial development on the land	The respective zone provisions, together with
a similar activity.		the plan change land.	in line with the RPS.	the Auckland-wide rules of the AUP, will ensure
				environmental effects of future development
The land will be underutilised				proposal are avoided, minimised or mitigated in
and therefore will not be able				a more effective and efficient manner.
to be sustainably developed.				