

APPENDIX 13: SECTION 32 EVALUATION OF PROPOSED RULES AND METHODS (S32(2))

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban Growth and Form 	<p>Option 1: Status quo – retain Future Urban zone (FUZ) and the Countryside Living Rural Zone (CLZ) for the plan change as currently shown</p>	<p>Future Urban Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitional zone where land may be used for a range of general rural activities (under the Rural – Rural Production Zone provisions of the AUP) but cannot be used for urban activities until the site is rezoned for urban purposes. No more than one dwelling is permitted on any site (based on current site size). Subdivision in the zone for open spaces, reserves or road alignment is discretionary, all other subdivision is non-complying. <p>Countryside Living Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural zone for lifestyle living in areas closer to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current situation retained with minimal change in site use, meaning that adverse effects pertaining to urban development (visual, increase in stormwater runoff etc.) are avoided. Removes the cost of initiating/ progressing through the plan change process. No notable benefit to having the small southern areas, or the area proposed to be replaced with SHZ to the north-east (in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will not allow for urban development of the land. Limited activities can occur on the land. Less certainty and potential significant delays until land is rezoned for urban development. Assessments prove that the site can be developed now in terms of services and infrastructure. Delaying live zoning and development may change this current level of suitability – such as other developments taking up available servicing capacity. Delays can significantly adversely affect or even completely preclude reasonable development of land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The uses that can currently occur on the land are very limited and are not an effective or efficient use of the land to meet needs and demands of the community. The uncertainty around timing for a Council-initiated plan-change is also inefficient, noting that the Applicant has already undertaken specific assessment to demonstrate the appropriateness of the PPC. Retaining the current CLZ areas in the locations proposed to be amended to SHZ is inefficient in that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> these areas cannot provide additional lots as they are too 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Auckland Council’s FDS seeks to preclude live zoning of the site until 2035+ due to the prerequisites of wastewater and water supply, however, these are set out in the AEE as being services available to the site currently. Retaining the FUZ due to the FDS timeframes creates significant unnecessary delays and associated risks – potentially stopping reasonable and timely provision of much needed housing in this location immediately. The outcome of not providing for reasonable and practicable zoning and development immediately is not in accordance with the NPS-UD seeking additional housing supply to assist with affordability. Retaining these areas as CLZ areas introduces risk of

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>urban Auckland or rural coastal towns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to be provided for ecological enhancement. • Avoidance of vegetation removal and minimising earthworks is encouraged. • Reverse sensitivity between urban and rural land uses to be managed. • Acknowledgment of rural character of the location to be considered. • Subdivision minimum lot size of 2ha or 1ha average under Transferable Rural Site Subdivision. 	<p>vicinity of Mahi Road of CLZ on the site.</p>	<p>that could occur as of now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CLZ land is not the best use of the land where these small areas of CLZ to the south are surrounded by FUZ land, or where the CLZ land adjoining Mahi Road to the north-east adjoins SHZ to the north. The small areas to the south are too small to be subdivided, and subdividing the northern CLZ area near Mahi Road would add potential for reverse sensitivity effects to be increased in this predominantly urban location. • The locations of the small CLZ land areas to the south surrounded by FUZ land and to the north-east near Mahi 	<p>small to subdivide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no ecological benefits attributable to these CLZ areas with no significant practical ecological enhancement options available. 	<p>increased reverse sensitivity effects as urban development adjacent increases.</p>

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
				Road offer no ecological protection and enhancement options as there are no ecologically significant areas located within them.		
	Option 2: Lower intensity Residential zone (Residential – Large Lot Zone)	<p>Large Lot Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the Zone is to maintain and enhance the amenity values of established residential neighbourhoods on the periphery of urban areas, where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It reflects the areas landscape qualities. Land is not suited to conventional residential subdivision due to lack of reticulated services. There may be physical limitations such 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows for residential development which will provide additional housing and associated job creation in the construction industry. Lower intensity development is likely to be more easily managed in terms of resolving hazard risks Lower intensity development and more restrictive bulk/ location standards can more readily protect existing surrounding amenities and natural environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is not anticipated under the FDS future “Development Ready” zoning, and the Helensville South Structure Plan Medium Density Residential Zoning as indicated in the legacy Rodney District Plan 2000. Does not make the most efficient use of land and is inconsistent with RPS objectives, NPS-UD and purpose of the zone (no special/ neighbourhood character amenity values to be protected) due to the existing SHZ character already 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited in terms of density and typologies. Not efficient and effective in terms of aligning with RPS and NPS-UD. Not efficient in enabling the long signalled medium density development of the site under the Helensville South Structure Plan – which has carried through to the FULSS and the FDS in terms of the site identification for development ready zoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater risk of not meeting the growth enabled by the FDS on consideration of the timing not applicable due to the extent the ‘pre-requisites’ are already addressed. Affects housing and land market affordability as the highest and best use of the land is not enabled as set out in the Helensville Housing Market analysis included in <i>Appendix 4</i> by Insight Economics.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>as instability or natural hazards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amenity values of a neighbourhood may be based on spacious landscaped areas and larger lots – maintain the amenity of these is considered appropriate. Development is appropriate for the physical environmental attributes of the site (including ecological) and any infrastructure constraints. 		<p>established in this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not provide as great a range of options for housing typologies/ choice that the SHZ and Precinct Provisions can. Does not make most efficient use of infrastructure services. Will not assist with housing affordability as the highest and best use of the land is not enabled. 		
	<p>Option 3: Residential – Single House Zone on the periphery and Mixed Housing Suburban Zoning internally to enable variations of lot sizes in the urban zoned areas and for protection of significant ecological areas in</p>	<p>Single House Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on lots with a minimum size of 600m² located at the periphery. To manage edge effects from more intensive urban development. Typically, two storey dwellings in a variety of sizes and forms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SHZ and MHUZ areas are consistent with the Helensville South Structure Plan residential zoning for the area, which had informed the FULSS and FDS identification of the site for development ready land. Consistent with government and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for higher degree of change on landscape associated with residential use and development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoning and provisions that enable more dwellings that align with the typology demand for the area (refer to the Insight Economics Helensville Housing Market Analysis). Meeting housing demand demographics is important to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to cost – there is a risk that the higher degree of change from a higher density from the internal MHSZ may be perceived as out of character with the location. This is considered very low risk in that the Urban Design Assessment in <i>Appendix 10</i> and the Landscape Visual Assessment in <i>Appendix 12</i> both consider the

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
	<p>the balance Countryside Living Zone areas of the site.</p>	<p>Mixed Housing Suburban Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on lots with minimum size of 400m² or greater if subject to land use led subdivision for four or more dwellings on a site followed by subdivision around an approved land use consent. • Typically two storey dwellings in a variety of sizes and forms located internally within the site area. <p>Countryside Living Zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural zone for lifestyle living in areas closer to urban Auckland or rural coastal towns. • Opportunities to be provided for ecological enhancement. • Avoidance of vegetation removal and minimising 	<p>community expectations under the NPS-UD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a greater level of residential intensification in a location that is above flood plain locations and also outside of areas subject to geotechnical instability, noting these constraints are significant in the Helensville/Parakai area. • Accommodates a high range of housing typologies/ choice, aligning with the market demand assessment for Helensville as set out in the Housing Market assessment of Insight Economics included in <i>Appendix 4</i>. • Can be serviced by reticulated wastewater and on-site (roof) water supply, with suitable access and 		<p>overall success and sale rates for a development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a high return on infrastructure investments increasing their efficiency. • Provides a higher density of residential housing stock located outside of flood plains and areas of geotechnical instability, noting these constraints are significant in limiting housing supply options in the Helensville/Parakai location. • Strikes a good balance between providing efficient housing supply and complementing the existing and emerging residential character of the location. • Rationalises zoning better by relocating CLZ land away from 	<p>proposed density and likely housing typologies will complement the character of the location, with less than minor effects once established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the PPC has been thoroughly assessed and designed to achieve the optimal outcomes for this site, there are no other significant risks associated with this Option.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>earthworks is encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverse sensitivity between urban and rural land uses to be managed. • Acknowledgment of rural character of the location to be considered. • Subdivision minimum lot size of 2ha or 1ha average under Transferable Rural Site Subdivision. 	<p>other services available - making the most efficient use of these services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates an outcome that recognises the importance of the subject site for residential growth in Helensville, noting in general few areas of FUZ land suitable for development in Helensville and Parakai. • The proposed changes to the CLZ areas has the following benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The replacement of the northern CLZ area in the vicinity of Mahi Road makes an appropriate link for SHZ land to the north and the proposed SHZ. - The proposed CLZ areas rationalises the zonings in these locations such that potential reverse sensitivity 		<p>areas of potential reverse sensitivity and into the more ecologically sensitive south-western location containing Stream 1 and the ecological VS3 bush areas as set out in the Ecological Assessment in <i>Appendix 6</i>.</p>	

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
			<p>issues are reduced and not increased as a result of increased urban intensification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The location of the new CLZ area to the south-west aligns with the location of Stream 1 and the areas of significant vegetation identified as VS3 – manuka/kanuka scrub land as set out in the ecological assessment in <i>Appendix 6</i>. The CLZ in this location better recognises and provides for the protection and enhancement of this location under the associated relevant objectives and policies. 			
	<p>Option 4: Medium to high intensity Residential zone (i.e., Terrace</p>	<p>THAB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for terrace housing and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the area to be developed for high density residential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with the anticipated development density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand and development investment for five 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not directly adjacent to metropolitan, town and local centres and

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
	<p>Housing and Apartment Building)</p>	<p>apartments typically up to five storeys in height.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The zone is predominantly located around metropolitan, town and local centres and the public transport network to support the highest levels of intensification. • All new dwelling activity and building in the Zone requires resource consent • The purpose of the zone is to make efficient use of land and infrastructure, increase the capacity of housing and ensure that residents have convenient access to services, employment, education facilities, retail and entertainment opportunities, public open space and public transport. 	<p>development to make more efficient use of land and deliver more housing supply.</p>	<p>and form for the location, and also the density and form signalled in the Helensville South Structure Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for greater impervious coverage/ lesser setbacks – more potential to impact on environmental qualities, the existing landscape and future residential amenity. • There is no ‘permitted’ residential development that could occur within this zone as any new dwelling requires resource consent. There are economic costs associated with this. 	<p>storey terraces and/ or apartments in the area is low. As such, the zoning will not be effective and efficient in enabling development aligned with the SHZ and MHSZ purpose, or could even deter development that may be of greater demand in the area.</p>	<p>the public transport network, therefore the density expected by the zone will not be properly supported by necessary amenities and facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without being supported by the necessary services, there is a risk that the THAB zone could become underutilised, and development may be economically unviable. • Without demand for THAB zone typologies in this location, economic viability for development may fail, and the land may never be developed for residential housing supply. • With density associated with THABZ dwelling typologies, there may be more uncertainty as to whether planned infrastructure will meet the capacity demanded by the THAB zone.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
	<p>Option 5: SHZ with precinct plan and provisions to retain SHZ but enable intensification for smaller lots internally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SHZ with precinct provisions relating to a precinct plan providing for intensification internally to manage edge effects and to complement the existing urban character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains the SHZ over this location and avoids additional MHSZ not common in Helensville or present in this location. Enables bespoke provisions to manage effects of intensification to provide for the range of housing typologies fitting demand as set out in the Residential Market Analysis included in Appendix 4. Identifies core development infrastructure aspects of access and stormwater drainage, and other key aspects for consideration including streams and riparian margins and other ecological areas such as significant bush – including the area of VS3 bush set out in the ecological assessment in Appendix 6. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May result in a complex planning framework that ultimately results in applications being declined on technical grounds in terms of interpretations of conflicts with SHZ preferred outcomes. May result in the 20m riparian yard being reduced to the width of the CLZ area only. Good proposals may not eventuate due to the above, or may be subjected to onerous and costly planning processes, including appeals to the Environment Court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A precinct could be effective in directing appropriate densities to certain locations, and ensuring infrastructure and access is provided in the most practical locations. Precinct provisions can be effective in ensuring prescribed outcomes are achieved in subsequent resource consent applications – such as prescribing single level dwellings to the north and west to maintain views. However, the Council has also indicated concern around complexity of precinct provisions conflicting with the current zoning provisions of the AUP – including the MHSZ and also the extent to which the SHZ provisions might make 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The complexity of the provisions may lead to inconsistent interpretation/assessments from Council and some applications may not be supported on technicalities – such as perceived tensions between the SHZ and Precinct with the SHZ provisions being undermined.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
					<p>assessments of applications difficult. This may result in applications being declined on technical grounds, resulting in lost development potential.</p>	
<p>Explanation/ Summary</p>	<p>The option of rezoning to SHZ on the periphery and MHSZ internally aligns with the long anticipated residential development for this FUZ land as set out in the Helensville South Structure Plan which had identified the FUZ land for medium density zoning as far back as the legacy Rodney District Plan 2000. It is clear that there was a desire to make the most efficient use of this site for additional residential development then, and on consideration of the constraints applicable to Helensville and Parakai regarding flooding and geotechnical stability, there is a demonstrable need to provide the most efficient supply of land for housing in suitable locations. Now that the wastewater treatment plant and the local water network have sufficient capacity (or accepted alternatives) for the proposed density under the PPC provisions, the above assessments demonstrate that the PPC SHZ, MHSZ, and CLZ provisions and areas are entirely appropriate as the best option for future development of the FUZ area, and that this should occur now instead of the FDS timeframe of 2035+.</p> <p>The Helensville Housing Market analysis of Insight Economics in <i>Appendix 4</i> demonstrates the appropriateness of the proposed density and possible lot sizes and likely housing typologies for the Helensville market, with appropriate demand and associated economic viability resulting from this PPC approach.</p> <p>The extent to which the PPC SHZ and MHSZ provisions for higher density can complement the character of the location is demonstrated in the Urban Design Assessment in <i>Appendix 10</i> and the Landscape Visual Assessment in <i>Appendix 12</i>.</p> <p>The proposal strikes the best balance of provision of appropriate residential density and effects on the character of the location, while also providing the most efficient use of the land for residential supply noting the significant natural hazards elsewhere in this location. This highly aligns with the NPS-UD while appropriately acknowledging the character of Helensville.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the areas of CLZ address potential future increases in reverse sensitivity between the SHZ, MHSZ, and CLZ areas by moving the boundaries further from the existing and proposed urban areas. There are also ecological benefits from moving the CLZ to the south-western location where the stream and bush in this location have been assessed as having significant ecological values, and the CLZ better responds to these features with the associated objectives and policies seeking to protect and enhance ecological features.</p> <p>The above positive outcomes could also possibly be achieved under Option 5 of providing a Precinct over the SHZ areas, with bespoke provisions to enable additional density internally, so that the SHZ remains the dominant residential zoning in this location, but the character of the location (which includes smaller lots in the SHZ of in</p>					

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
	<p>the order of 200m² to 250m²) is maintained. However, through the course of discussions with the Council, it was indicated the preference was to keep the proposal simple by pursuing a zoning only approach of SHZ, MHUZ and CLZ. This was indicated by the Council as desirable to avoid complex assessments and interpretive complications at resource consent application stage, and also to avoid any potential undermining of the SHZ objectives and policies and purpose. We had considered this and have decided this is acceptable for the PPC application, but to include the MHSZ instead to better align with the SHZ outcomes in terms of heights and effects.</p> <p>Based on the above assessments, it is clear that Option 3 above is the best and most appropriate option as set out in this PPC.</p>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural Hazards Infrastructure Mana Whenua 	<p>Option 1: Do nothing.</p>	<p>Auckland-wide</p> <p><u>E36 Natural Hazards and Flooding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E36.4.1 addresses activities in the 1% AEP floodplain, and in overland flow paths. <p><u>Subdivision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E38.4.1(A11) requires an application for a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision within the 1% AEP floodplain. E38.6.2 – Access and entrance strips requires all sites to be provided with legal and physical access to a road. E38.6.3 – Services, requires that all land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional residential activity is proposed that could be potentially affected by any flood plains – noting these would only relate to the watercourse margins as the site is generally above the 1% AEP flood plain. No impacts are presented to the current overland flow paths on the site. No additional residential activity and associated amenity and traffic effects result. No additional capacity is added to the current services infrastructure for water supply and wastewater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not improved in terms of managing the effects of flooding characteristics over the site and to the surrounding catchment, noting this would mainly relate to riparian margins and planting where required. Any associated services upgrades are not realised. There is a significant lost opportunity through not realising development contributions and later rates payments to contribute to infrastructure upgrades and enhancements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not considered effective and efficient to not realise the services capacities and capabilities of this site and location. For example, in the order of \$17m was invested in the upgrading of the Helensville Wastewater Treatment Plant so that it can cater for additional future growth such as proposed here. To not realise this capability is a highly inefficient outcome. Related to the above is the inefficient use of the land for residential development capable of being established immediately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not developing this land results in the costs identified being realised – i.e. there is a significant risk in not making the most efficient use of the land for residential development capable of being serviced and accessed. There is some potential risk in that some areas of the VS3 area of ecological significance and Stream 1 (such as the south-western location) may not be protected by CLZ provisions which is considered an adverse effect on the values of mana whenua. Not providing additional housing in this location precludes the use of one of very few suitable locations for development outside of any flood plains or areas

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>proposed for subdivision have provision for all wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, and power and telcoms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.6.5 – Overland flow paths requires that all subdivision be designed to incorporate overland flow paths. It is also required that stormwater exit the site in a location that does not increase the risk of hazards to downstream properties. • E38.6.1 – requires a site shape factor for vacant site residential subdivision to be outside of yard setback requirements of the zone including riparian yards. • E38.12.1 sets out the restricted discretionary activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further potential effects on natural features of value to mana whenua. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed protection through avoiding works within the ecological VS3 terrestrial feature on the site may not be realised, which is considered of value to mana whenua. • Housing demand in this location is not realised, with adverse outcomes in housing supply and affordability. 		<p>of geotechnical instability. The risk is that supply for suitable housing in Helensville and Parakai is not realised, removing opportunity for those wishing to locate into the area, and also having an adverse effect on affordability through limiting housing supply in this area.</p>

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		matters of discretion including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) subdivision of a site in the 1% AEP floodplain, - (7) all other restricted discretionary subdivision activity subdivisions, including consideration of the effects of flooding, stormwater and wastewater discharges. 				
	Option 2: Rezone the site from FUZ to lower intensity residential zone (Large Lot Residential).	<u>Natural Hazards and Flooding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E36.4.1 addresses activities in the 1% AEP floodplain, and in overland flow paths. <u>Subdivision</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.4.1(A11) requires an application for a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision within 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be lesser areas of impervious surfaces if the site is zoned LLR. • Less impervious areas and associated runoff may be considered favourable outcomes for mana whenua. • There could be less demand on services such as wastewater and water supply 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main cost from this Option relates to lesser residential yields not making the most efficient use of this valuable land outside of flood plains, and that is geotechnically suitable – noting there are few such areas in Helensville and Parakai. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesser density means there is less efficient use by fewer people of provided infrastructure for the development. • Again – less revenue is generated through development contributions and rates, being less efficient in terms of maintenance and upgrades of services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is lost opportunity through not realising the most efficient use of infrastructure servicing the site, and though not appreciating the higher financial opportunities for larger development contributions and rates payments on an on-going basis. • There is a risk of precluding opportunity for affordable housing options, resulting

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>the 1% AEP floodplain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.6.2 – Access and entrance strips requires all sites to be provided with legal and physical access to a road. • E38.6.3 – Services, requires that all land proposed for subdivision have provision for all wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, and power and telcoms. • E38.6.5 – Overland flow paths requires that all subdivision be designed to incorporate overland flow paths. It is also required that stormwater exit the site in a location that does not increase the risk of hazards to downstream properties. 	<p>providing additional capacity to other sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be less effects on the road network due to lesser trip generation. • There may be less adverse residential amenity effects to surrounding properties in terms of light and noise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesser yields also have corresponding lesser financial contributions toward infrastructure upgrades through development contributions and rates. • Lower density and larger sites do not provide affordable housing options, noting the Helensville Housing Market analysis of Insight Economics identifies a demand for smaller more affordable lots and housing options in Helensville. 	<p>and roading requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesser yields do not make the most efficient use of the land – noting again that there are few suitable areas for development in Helensville and Parakai located outside of flood plains and that are geotechnically stable. 	<p>in people being forced to look to live elsewhere.</p>

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.6.1 – requires a site shape factor for vacant site residential subdivision to be outside of yard setback requirements of the zone including riparian yards. • E38.12.1 sets out the restricted discretionary activity matters of discretion including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (1) subdivision of a site in the 1% AEP floodplain, – (7) all other restricted discretionary subdivision activity subdivisions, including consideration of the effects of flooding, stormwater and wastewater discharges. 				

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
	<p>Option 3: Rezone from FUZ to SHZ and MHSZ, and amend some areas of CLZ.</p>	<p><u>Natural Hazards and Flooding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E36.4.1 addresses activities in the 1% AEP floodplain, and in overland flow paths. <p><u>Subdivision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E38.4.1(A11) requires an application for a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision within the 1% AEP floodplain. E38.6.2 – Access and entrance strips requires all sites to be provided with legal and physical access to a road. E38.6.3 – Services, requires that all land proposed for subdivision have provision for all wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, and power and telcoms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site can be developed to manage and improve the flooding characteristics associated with the site and its surrounds – noting this relates mainly to the riparian margins as the site is above the 1% AEP flood plain. The subdivision and development can utilise the existing services infrastructure efficiently, providing upgrades where necessary. There is an appropriate mix of housing options to provide opportunity for affordable living and also for a range of residential amenity options to suit a wider housing market. This has been assessed as suitable for the Helensville housing market as set out in the analysis of Insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for higher areas of impervious surfaces and higher stormwater runoff if not managed properly. Additional demands on services infrastructure and additional traffic generation with associated impacts on the road network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be the most effective and efficient option in that an appropriate residential density and occupation numbers will make efficient use of the proposed services and roading infrastructure. Higher yields provided under the Precinct provisions makes the most efficient use of the land – noting again that there are few suitable areas for development in Helensville and Parakai located outside of flood plains and that are geotechnically stable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the appropriate level at which the proposed SHZ and MHSZ can be accommodated to manage all infrastructure requirements, there are no physical risks resulting from the proposed rezoning. There is significant risk from not providing the proposed PPC provisions through lost opportunity for affordable and safe housing options – noting the sparse availability of suitable land outside of flood plains and on stable land.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.6.5 – Overland flow paths requires that all subdivision be designed to incorporate overland flow paths. It is also required that stormwater exit the site in a location that does not increase the risk of hazards to downstream properties. • E38.6.1 – requires a site shape factor for vacant site residential subdivision to be outside of yard setback requirements of the zone including riparian yards. • E38.12.1 sets out the restricted discretionary activity matters of discretion including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (1) subdivision of a site in the 1% AEP floodplain, – (7) all other restricted discretionary 	<p>Economics in <i>Appendix 4</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SHZ and MHSZ provisions for more density provides a suitable higher yield and housing options that might otherwise not be realised elsewhere in Helensville or Parakai where only the standard SHZ or LLZ may apply. • The protection of the VS3 ecological area under the CLZ provisions will protect terrestrial habitats, aquatic habitats, and the habitats of skinks and bats. This is a positive outcome ecologically, and also for the values of mana whenua. 			

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>subdivision activity subdivisions, including consideration of the effects of flooding, stormwater and wastewater discharges</p>				
	<p>Option 4: Rezone to medium to high intensity residential development (i.e. Residential Terrace Housing and Apartments Zone).</p>	<p><u>Natural Hazards and Flooding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E36.4.1 addresses activities in the 1% AEP floodplain, and in overland flow paths. <p><u>Subdivision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E38.4.1(A11) requires an application for a restricted discretionary activity for subdivision within the 1% AEP floodplain. E38.6.2 – Access and entrance strips requires all sites to be provided with legal and physical access to a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision and development could utilise the existing services infrastructure efficiently if capacity was available and providing upgrades where necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for higher areas of impervious surfaces and higher stormwater runoff if not managed properly. Potential for wastewater overflows if not able to be properly managed. Additional demands on services infrastructure and additional traffic generation with associated impacts on the road network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This could be an effective and efficient option in that high residential density and occupation numbers could make efficient use of proposed services and roading infrastructure. Higher yield results in higher development contributions and rates payments supporting infrastructure maintenance and growth. Higher yields in this location would make efficient use of the limited available land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There may be higher levels of risk from downstream flooding and unmanaged stormwater effects to the stormwater infrastructure such that overloading adversely affects the water quality of the downstream natural receiving watercourses and catchments. This is also a potential adverse effect on the values of mana whenua. Higher wastewater demands may also potentially add risk of wastewater overflows to the downstream natural water catchments -also a potential adverse effect on

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.6.3 – Services, requires that all land proposed for subdivision have provision for all wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, and power and telcoms. • E38.6.5 – Overland flow paths requires that all subdivision be designed to incorporate overland flow paths. It is also required that stormwater exit the site in a location that does not increase the risk of hazards to downstream properties. • E38.6.1 –requires a site shape factor for vacant site residential subdivision to be outside of yard setback requirements of the zone including riparian yards. 			<p>outside of flood plains and on stable land in the Helensville and Parakai areas.</p>	<p>the values of mana whenua.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The higher levels of traffic generation could potentially adversely affect the safe and efficient operation of the transportation network. • The THABZ typologies in this location away from public transport corridors and rail access may not be marketable and could place the completion of development at risk leaving unfinished infrastructure with associated adverse effects from flooding and uncontrolled discharges.

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E38.12.1 sets out the restricted discretionary activity matters of discretion including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (1) subdivision of a site in the 1% AEP floodplain, – (7) all other restricted discretionary subdivision activity subdivisions, including consideration of the effects of flooding, stormwater and wastewater discharges 				
	<p>Option 5: SHZ with precinct plan and provisions to retain SHZ but enable intensification for smaller lots internally.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHZ with precinct provisions relating to a precinct plan providing for intensification internally to manage edge effects and to complement the existing urban character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructural aspects can be identified on the precinct plan and provisions provided to ensure these are implemented in the assessed locations – such as roading and stormwater. • Areas of instability or flooding can also be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no identifiable costs associated with this Option regarding natural hazards, infrastructure, or mana whenua. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure (including roads and stormwater and flooding management) and areas of natural hazards are identified and referred in precinct provisions ensuring these are identified and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk in that the complexity of the precinct plan and provisions might result in proposals not being approved. This would not be making the most efficient use of road and public infrastructure such as the wastewater treatment plant and water supply infrastructure, and

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
			<p>identified and largely avoided to the extent that subsequent resource consent applications are required to comply with related provisions.</p>		<p>considered under later resource consent applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good management of infrastructure and natural hazards can assist to avoid adverse effects on water and land resources of value to mana whenua. • If the complexity of the provisions results in proposals being declined by the Council, the resulting lack of use of public infrastructure (wastewater, water, and roading) is not an efficient outcome and a lost opportunity for the most efficient utilisation of these services. 	<p>roading network established to enable growth in this location.</p>
	<p>Explanation/ Summary</p>	<p>Higher density has the potential to result in higher efficiencies in terms of the provision and use of infrastructure (services and roading). However, also with higher intensity comes higher demands on infrastructure and potential increased risk through failure, resulting in adverse effects of potential flooding and/or stormwater and wastewater discharges. These outcomes are potentially negative with regard to the values of mana whenua.</p> <p>While this may be considered a relatively low level of risk, these effects of intensity must be considered in the context of the location including natural features, geotechnical stability, and effects of discharges to the environment. In this regard, the combined SHZ, MHSZ and CLZ has been</p>				

RPS Topic	Options	Zoning and Rules	Benefit	Cost	Effectiveness and efficiency	Risk
		<p>demonstrated under the assessments provided to achieve an appropriate intensity while also recognising and providing for the protection of the surrounding character and environment, and also avoiding any potential adverse effects to the site and surrounds in terms of natural hazards or infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Regarding further intensification under the option of a THABZ, when this is considered against the likely unresponsive market for THABZ housing typologies in this location, the risk of completion of such a project may leave the site in an uncompleted state, with the associated infrastructure not coping with the associated impacts. Compared to the medium intensity level proposed of the PPC SHZ and MHSZ provisions in this location, it is clear that the PPC development is able to be serviced and accessed with less risk of failure, and also that full implementation of this is also highly likely without the uncertainty pertaining to any THABZ typologies.</p> <p>Precinct provisions could potentially assist to identify and manage infrastructure and natural hazards, however, as indicated by the Council under assessments of a precinct proposal for this land, it was considered this could possibly lead to decline of proposals on technical grounds, and this is not considered an efficient outcome and creates risk in that public services and roading in the location cannot be fully utilised to enable growth and use in the manner intended under recent improvements – i.e. the Helensville/Parakai Wastewater Treatment Plant and Water Supply network.</p> <p>The proposed Option 3 ensures more acceptable effects on the natural environment in terms of mana whenua values, including potential adverse effects on the water quality and mauri of downstream watercourses and catchments, and achieves the best balance of residential intensity and avoidance of adverse effects in relation to natural hazards and infrastructure. Further, it best promotes the likely use of infrastructure to enable the most efficient use of those referred resources.</p>				