

SECTION 32 OPTION EVALUATION TABLE

APPENDIX L

	Option 1 – Do Nothing	Option 2 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone	Option 3 – Large Lot Zone	Option 4 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone with Precinct	Option 5 – Mixed Housing Urban Zone with Precinct
Zone description and purpose	<p>This option would retain the Mixed Rural Zone on the land. It is a zone that provides for rural production, typically on smaller rural sites and with some provision for associated non-residential activities.</p> <p>The AUP identifies that any further subdivision of land in this zone is limited.</p>	<p>This option would rezone the PPC land from Mixed Rural zone to Mixed Housing Suburban zone.</p> <p>The MHS zone is the most widespread residential zone (in both the region and in Waiuku). Much of the existing development in the zone is characterised by one or two storey, mainly standalone buildings, set back from site boundaries with landscaped gardens.</p> <p>The purpose of the zone is to enable intensification, while retaining a suburban built character.</p>	<p>This option would rezone the PPC land from Mixed Rural zone to Large Lot zone.</p> <p>The Large Lot zone provides for large lot residential development on the periphery of urban areas. Larger lot sizes are used to manage potential effects that might arise due to an area's landscape qualities, absence of reticulated services, or physical limitations imposed by topography, ground conditions, instability or natural hazards.</p> <p>Subdivision in the Large Lot zone is enabled down to a minimum lot size of 4,000m².</p>	<p>This option would rezone the PPC land from Mixed Rural zone to Mixed Housing Suburban zone and apply a site-specific precinct. It is the same as Option 2 but with the addition of a precinct.</p> <p>This precinct would include or provide for indicative road and greenway circulation and connections, indicative open space, a methodology for addressing the urban rural interface, provisions for ensuring appropriate frontage to the existing recreation reserve, vehicle access restrictions to Constable Road, recognition of the gateway area, opportunities for mana whenua input, and provisions for affordable community housing and a community garden.</p>	<p>This option would rezone the PPC land from Mixed Rural zone to Mixed Housing Urban zone and apply a site-specific precinct. It is the same as Option 4 but with the use of a higher intensity zone.</p> <p>Option 5 is contemplated because of implications arising from the Government's recently enacted Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The RMA amendment introduces medium density residential standards (MDRS), in order to provide greater housing choice and facilitate intensification.</p> <p>The MDRS is most similar to the Mixed Housing Urban zone in terms of outcome, so consideration of Option 5 is necessary to ensure that the PPC is in step with potential rezoning of residential land throughout the rest of the urban areas of Waiuku and so that scope exists for any changes during the PPC process. Option 5 anticipates that the MDRS can be imposed if required during the process, and the option has been evaluated on the basis of a higher potential yield on the PPC land.</p> <p>As at March 2022, it is clear that the MDRS will apply in Waiuku unless the Council determine that qualifying matters apply that would make that outcome inappropriate.</p>
Appropriateness <i>(whether the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (s32(1)(a))</i>	<p>The proposal seeks to utilise the PPC land to provide for residential development capacity to an extent that is sufficient to support the continued growth of Waiuku. The continued use of the land for pastoral farming is inconsistent with that objective.</p>	<p>The objective of the PPC is to enable and facilitate the use of the land for residential purposes to support the growth of Waiuku. The objective therefore has two elements – provision of more development capacity, and locating that capacity specifically on the PPC land. Option 2 then adds a third element, being the delivery of the</p>	<p>The same questions posed in relation to Option 2 are of assistance in evaluating whether Option 3 is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. While the answers to the first two questions will be the same, it is useful to consider whether the Large Lot zone will provide the most appropriate</p>	<p>This option has the same broad objectives as Option 2, being the provision of more development capacity, and locating that capacity specifically on the PPC land. The option also provides for the delivery of the additional development capacity at a level enabled by the MHS zone.</p>	<p>This option has the same broad objectives as options 2 and 4, being the provision of more development capacity, and locating that capacity specifically on the PPC land. However, Option 5 provides for the delivery of the additional development capacity at a level greater than that enabled by the MHS zone.</p>

	Option 1 – Do Nothing	Option 2 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone	Option 3 – Large Lot Zone	Option 4 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone with Precinct	Option 5 – Mixed Housing Urban Zone with Precinct
	<p>It is considered that the provision of additional development capacity is pivotal for the future of Waiuku as a well-functioning urban environment. Without that capacity, the economic, social and cultural wellbeing of Waiuku residents will be undermined and the purpose of the RMA is not achieved.</p> <p>While the land that is required for continued urban growth could be located elsewhere around the town, the proposed location on the PPC land is considered to be the option that best supports the wellbeing of residents with the fewest and least significant adverse effects.</p>	<p>additional development capacity at a level enabled by the MHS zone.</p> <p>When evaluating whether the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, three questions arise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the delivery of additional development capacity to Waiuku achieve the purpose of the RMA?</i> • <i>If so, is the PPC land the most appropriate location for that additional development capacity? and</i> • <i>Will the MHS zone provide the most appropriate outcomes for the land, in terms of urban form and development capacity?</i> <p>It is considered that the answer to the first two of these questions is 'yes'. The MHS zone will provide an appropriate outcome for the land, but possibly not the <i>most</i> appropriate outcome in the context of the likely requirement to implement the MDRS in Waiuku.</p> <p>In relation to the first question, the PPC will enable the Waiuku community to provide for its social, economic, and cultural well-being. In particular, the additional development capacity will assist in enabling the town to meet the needs of its future generations. At the same time, the PPC will have no significant adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>It is also considered that the PPC land provides the most appropriate location to accommodate that growth. This is because the PPC land is located close to the town centre and existing community services and facilities, is relatively easy to develop, and is comprised of soils that are predominantly classified as types other than 'elite' or 'prime'. Alternative</p>	<p>outcomes for the PPC land, in terms of urban form and development capacity.</p> <p>The Large Lot zone will provide an appropriate form of residential development within the context of a rural town. It currently makes up a significant proportion of the urban area of Waiuku, predominantly in the eastern part of the town but also at its southern, north-western and north-eastern edges.</p> <p>However, the allocation of the Large Lot zone to the PPC land would only provide a small contribution to the additional housing capacity that is required to accommodate growth in a way that ensures a competitive market. It will be insufficient to address the deficit in residential land capacity or meet obligations under the RPS and the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Based on the minimum permitted lot size in the Large Lot zone, and taking account of land lost to access and unavailable land within the school boundary, it is considered that the PPC land could yield a maximum of around 70 sites. Each of those would accommodate one new dwelling. That number of additional houses is around one tenth of that available under Option 2. In addition, the larger land curtilage inherent in these sites would result in higher values that do not address housing affordability issues.</p> <p>As a result of minimal additional development capacity and higher house prices, Option 3 would not be the most appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>	<p>However, Option 4 is able to deliver on the more detailed objectives of the proposal through the inclusion of a precinct plan and related precinct provisions. The precinct objectives seek several positive outcomes that may not be available without the mechanisms that would apply through the rules and standards of the precinct.</p> <p>Those rules and standards will give effect to both the precinct objectives and the objectives of the proposal. The outcome will achieve the purpose of the RMA because the MHS zone and precinct, in tandem, would enable the Waiuku community to provide for its social, economic, and cultural well-being. In particular, the additional development capacity will assist in enabling the town to meet the needs of its future generations.</p> <p>At the same time, the PPC will have no significant adverse effects on the environment. The precinct provisions will provide for some additional positive outcomes, particularly with regard to amenity.</p> <p>It is also considered that the PPC land provides the most appropriate location to accommodate that growth. This is because the PPC land is located close to the town centre and existing community services and facilities, is relatively easy to develop, and is comprised of soils that are predominantly classified as types other than 'elite' or 'prime'. Alternative locations are situated further from the town centre, and would utilise land that is more fragmented and subject to greater natural hazards, or would be on highly productive soils.</p> <p>For these reasons, Option 4 provides an appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the RMA. It is more appropriate than Option 2 because the</p>	<p>Option 5 shares the advantages of a precinct, as set out for Option 4.</p> <p>There is a question as to whether the use of MHU zone, with its level of enabled residential intensity, would be wholly appropriate for the site in terms of the purpose of the RMA. However, that question has been answered by the recently enacted Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, assuming that the MDRS is applied to Waiuku. It is noted that there are already some areas of MHU zone in Waiuku, located immediately south and east of the town centre. While the PPC land is not as close to the town centre, it is still within a comfortable walking distance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the potential for MDRS to be applied to the PPC land, the PPC's economic consultant has suggested that MHU zone in Waiuku is unlikely to result in substantially different development outcomes from the MHS due to land values and the relative remoteness from the Auckland metropolitan area. For this reason, Option 5 is likely to rank generally the same as Option 4 in terms of appropriateness.</p>

	Option 1 – Do Nothing	Option 2 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone	Option 3 – Large Lot Zone	Option 4 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone with Precinct	Option 5 – Mixed Housing Urban Zone with Precinct
		<p>locations are situated further from the town centre, and would utilise land that is more fragmented and subject to greater natural hazards, or would be on highly productive soils.</p> <p>Development outcomes under the MHS zone represent an appropriate balance between the provision of greater dwelling numbers and the maintenance of the existing character of a rural town, but are unlikely to be entirely consistent with outcomes required under the MDRS.</p> <p>For these reasons, Option 2 provides an appropriate means of achieving the purpose of the RMA, but not the most appropriate means.</p>		precinct provides opportunities to enhance amenity and further mitigate any potential for adverse effects.	
Efficiency and effectiveness <i>(whether the provisions are the most efficient and effective means of achieving the objectives of the proposal (s32(1)(b))</i>	<p>The proposal has a single objective, being to enable and facilitate the use of the land for residential purposes to support the growth of Waiuku.</p> <p>Option 1 would not enable the use of the land for urban residential purposes, as dwellings are only enabled in the Mixed Rural zone at a ratio of one per site or one dwelling per 40 hectares of land.</p> <p>In this regard, Option 1 would not be efficient or effective in achieving the objective of the proposal. The continued zoning of the PPC land as Mixed Rural would deliver few (if any) additional dwellings and, as a consequence, would do little to improve development capacity and the ability of the town to provide for its future growth.</p>	<p>Option 2 would provide for development of the PPC land for urban purposes and at a density that could contribute around 700 new dwellings to the housing stock of Waiuku.</p> <p>This option would be effective in that it would make a significant contribution to development capacity, and it would be efficient insofar as its location is considered to be optimum for reasons outlined above.</p> <p>The MHS zone would increase development capacity while still maintaining the existing town form and character, but is not considered to be the most efficient and effective zoning option available for achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>	<p>Option 3 would not achieve the objectives of the proposal in that it would deliver only around 70 additional homes. As such, it would not be an effective mechanism.</p> <p>It is also noted that Option 3 would use the PPC land inefficiently, given that it is centrally located within Waiuku and is not subject to any particular physical constraints that would suggest that lower residential densities are appropriate. If easily developable land is to be removed from rural production it should be used efficiently.</p> <p>Option 3 is therefore neither efficient or effective.</p>	<p>Option 4 would provide for development of the PPC land for urban purposes and at a density that could contribute around 700 new dwellings to the housing stock of Waiuku.</p> <p>This option would be effective in that it would make a significant contribution to development capacity, and it would be efficient insofar as its location is considered to be optimum for reasons outlined above.</p> <p>The MHS zone would provide for significant development capacity while still maintaining the existing town form and character, so is an efficient and effective zoning option available for achieving the purpose of the RMA. It would be more effective than Option 2 as a result of the precinct and the improved management of effects that would arise under those provisions.</p>	<p>Option 5 would provide for development of the PPC land for urban purposes and at a density that could potentially contribute more new dwellings to the housing stock of Waiuku than any of the other options. The estimated yield for the site under a MHU zone and MDRS is approximately 910 dwellings.</p> <p>For this reason, Option 5 is likely to be the most efficient option for achieving the objectives of the proposal that seek to increase development capacity in Waiuku.</p>
Benefits <i>Assessment of benefits of the anticipated environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects of</i>	Option 1 would maintain the land in rural use. That provides for a level of ongoing rural production and associated economic and employment benefits.	Option 2 provides for approximately 700 new houses in Waiuku, located within walking distance of the town centre.	Option 3 would provide for approximately 70 new houses in Waiuku, located within walking distance of the town centre.	Option 4 provides for approximately 700 new houses in Waiuku, located within walking distance of the town centre.	Option 5 provides for approximately 910 new houses in Waiuku, located within walking distance of the town centre.

	Option 1 – Do Nothing	Option 2 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone	Option 3 – Large Lot Zone	Option 4 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone with Precinct	Option 5 – Mixed Housing Urban Zone with Precinct
<i>the provisions, including economic growth and employment (s32(2)(a) and (b)).</i>	<p>A rural production assessment for the PPC land suggests that it is only likely to be utilised for pastoral grazing. The ECBA report estimates that its continued use for farming would provide one FTE job, and a value add to the local economy of \$58,950 per annum or a present value over 30 years of \$0.9 million.</p> <p>The use of the land for farming does not bring with it any particular benefits arising in respect of environmental, social or cultural effects.</p>	<p>That level of housing provision will accommodate demand for residential growth in Waiuku over the short to medium term and the increased supply will dampen rising house prices. These benefits are further augmented through the ability of the large landholding to provide for establishment of a retirement village, in order to address a missing sector of the town’s current accommodation offering. All of these outcomes will result in associated economic, social and community wellbeing benefits for Waiuku.</p> <p>Direct benefits to the local economy from applying a MHS zoning to the PPC land are estimated at a net present value of around \$369 million over a 30-year period. Option 2 would likely create approximately 33 FTE jobs per annum and 125 FTE jobs over the course of the build out for the PPC land.</p>	<p>While that would make a small contribution to addressing the development capacity shortfall in Waiuku, it would be insufficient to address the required capacity in even the short term.</p> <p>In terms of economic development and employment, the rezoning enabled under Option 3 would provide perhaps 10% of the benefit to the local economy and 10% of the FTE jobs arising under Option 2.</p>	<p>In terms of economic growth and employment, provision of residential capacity, and suppression of house prices through supply, Option 4 has the same benefits as Option 2.</p> <p>However, Option 4 has some additional benefits through the application of the proposed precinct provisions. These include ensuring appropriate provision of open space and the enhancement of existing open space through frontage controls, management of the transition from urban land to rural land, and supply of community housing to assist people into home ownership.</p>	<p>The greater intensity of Option 5 would extend to more economic growth and employment, and an increased contribution to the costs of providing necessary infrastructure. This latter point is addressed in section 18 of the Economic Cost-Benefit Assessment, which demonstrates that there are substantial economic benefits that would arise in terms of infrastructure funding.</p> <p>All the additional benefits of the precinct proposed under Option 4 would also arise under Option 5.</p>
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>	<p>Retention of the existing rural zone on the land would preclude the opportunity to provide for residential development capacity, required to enable the growth of Waiuku.</p> <p>While that development capacity might be provided elsewhere around the town, there are no alternative locations that are as central to the town centre. The use of alternative land would therefore require longer and more frequent motor vehicle trips for households to meet their needs with regard to shopping, employment, secondary education, and many social and community services. Those trips contribute to congestion on the local roading network, exacerbate air and water pollution, and give rise to unproductive time spent in unnecessary vehicle trips.</p> <p>Increased separation from community, commercial and social facilities can create social and physical isolation,</p>	<p>The costs of Option 2 are costs associated with the loss of the land from rural production. These costs are set out as benefits under Option 1. The costs of rezoning the PPC land as MHS zone are overwhelmingly offset by the benefits of the rezoning proposal.</p>	<p>The direct costs arising under Option 3 would be the costs associated with the loss of land from rural production.</p> <p>However, those costs are not sufficiently offset by the benefits that arise due to the limited number of additional houses that would be delivered to the local market. There are also opportunity costs associated with the inefficient use of the PPC land, as it would otherwise have the potential to effectively address the supply and social issues associated with lack of housing and escalating property prices.</p>	<p>The costs of Option 4 are costs associated with the loss of the land from rural production. These costs are set out as benefits under Option 1. The costs of rezoning the PPC land as MHS zone are overwhelmingly offset by the benefits of the rezoning proposal.</p> <p>The other costs are primarily financial costs to the landowner through development, comprising some small loss of capacity through the more spacious site layout at the rural interface of the land and the costs of providing some community housing.</p>	<p>The costs of Option 5 are costs associated with the loss of the land from rural production. These costs are set out as benefits under Option 1. The costs of rezoning the PPC land as MHU zone are overwhelmingly offset by the benefits of the rezoning proposal.</p> <p>The other costs are primarily financial costs to the landowner through development, comprising some small loss of capacity through the more spacious site layout at the rural interface of the land and the costs of providing some community housing.</p>

	Option 1 – Do Nothing	Option 2 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone	Option 3 – Large Lot Zone	Option 4 – Mixed Housing Suburban Zone with Precinct	Option 5 – Mixed Housing Urban Zone with Precinct
	<p>particularly for the elderly or those with less mobility.</p> <p>It is noted that the costs of retaining the PPC land in rural production have been evaluated on the basis that development capacity would be provided somewhere else in Waiuku. If that were not the case, lack of sufficient development capacity to accommodate projected growth would have significant and unacceptable economic and social costs for the town.</p>				
<p>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></p>	<p>There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the proposal to rezone the PPC land from rural to residential use, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.</p>	<p>There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the proposal to rezone the PPC land from rural to residential use, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.</p>	<p>There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the proposal to rezone the PPC land from rural to residential use, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.</p>	<p>There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the proposal to rezone the PPC land from rural to residential use, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.</p>	<p>There is no uncertain information or insufficiency of information about the proposal to rezone the PPC land from rural to residential use, and no identified risks arise as a consequence.</p> <p>The only undetermined matter in relation to Option 5 is the question of whether the MDRS will be applied to Waiuku. However, that is unlikely to make any material difference because the development outcomes under a purely MHU zone or a MHU zone with the MDRS are likely to be substantially similar.</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<p>While the retention of the PPC land in rural production would make a negligible contribution to the local economy and housing, it would preclude the use of the most suitable land in Waiuku for the accommodation of projected residential growth.</p> <p>That outcome would result in an alternative solution to development capacity provision that would be less efficient and effective. It would increase frequency of vehicle trips on the local road network, with consequential environmental and social impacts. Option 1 is not the preferred option for these reasons.</p>	<p>Option 2 would have few costs and extensive benefits, in terms of economic, environmental, social and cultural matters. It provides an effective and efficient means of achieving the objective of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Option 2 is a suitable option for these reasons, but is not favoured over other options with additional benefits.</p>	<p>Option 3 would provide for insufficient benefits to justify removing the land from rural productive purposes. It would be neither effective nor efficient, and is not the preferred option for these reasons.</p>	<p>Option 4 would have few costs and significant benefits, in terms of economic, environmental, social and cultural matters. It provides an effective and efficient means of achieving the objective of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Option 4 is a suitable option for these reasons, but not favoured over other options (Option 5) that have additional benefits.</p>	<p>Option 5 would have few costs and extensive benefits, in terms of economic, environmental, social and cultural matters. It provides the most effective and efficient means of achieving the objective of the proposal and the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p>Option 5 is the preferred option for these reasons. It is the most consistent option with the introduction of the MDRS in Waiuku, which is the result of the enactment of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.</p>