

# Appendix C – Section 32 Assessment



## SECTION 32 EVALUATION ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS (S32(1)(b))

### Assessment of Options to Achieve Objectives

Table No. 1 – Overall Assessment of Alternatives

Section 32 – Alternatives, cost-benefit, efficiency and effectiveness, risk of not acting analysis (method to achieve objective)				
	Option 1 – Retain the status quo or do nothing	Option 2 – Retain and status quo and progress non-complying resource consent applications	Option 3 – Rezone the site to enable residential development	Option 4 – Wait for MPDP review
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – opportunity cost for restoration of features in conjunction with development.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – creation of jobs, support to existing business’ all lost. No contribution to meeting established demand and alleviating housing affordability. Critical mass of population opportunity for additional services for Morrinsville lost.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – opportunities for security of home availability/ownership diminished. Lost opportunity for growth in support base for existing community services/groups etc. Feasibility of social infrastructure in Stages 1-3 of Lockerbie development at risk.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - lost opportunity cost for restoration and enhancement of mauri of taonga (streams and wetland in particular) at the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – residential use on rural land, not in keeping with site and surrounding zone (made lead to reverse sensitivity effects), future challenge costs in terms of strict compliance with consents. Inefficient method owing to staggered regulatory processes (accompanying necessary staggering of development of this nature), results in uncertainty of effects over lifetime of development and may lead to inconsistent environmental outcomes and piecemeal development/delivery of infrastructure. Piecemeal development layouts will detract from the overall intention of a comprehensive approach sought via a Development Area Plan.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – risk of declined applications is high, representing high risk use of finance. Higher up-front costs associated with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – less certainty of precise effects than consenting, noting that consenting is still an outcome required with this option.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – costs to applicant of obtaining plan change, which are significant, that do not arise with option 1, and are likely to be less than option 2 too.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – would result in permanent, cemented loss of rural use, and associated amenity values, across part/all of the site if successful.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – no identifiable cultural costs.</li> </ul>	<p>Same costs as option three however increased opportunity costs in terms of duration and/or magnitude. Uncertainty in timing considering PC47 was made operative at the site in September 2017 and with RMA reform there is uncertainty around what future planning provisions will look like. To elaborate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – lost opportunity to expedite environmental enhancement of the site.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – significant land holding costs to wait until such time the District Plan provisions in respect of the site are reviewed.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – injection of housing supply and variety, addressing</li> </ul>

		<p>specificity required for consents now and the future (to meet range of market demand). Future regulatory changes may also result in materially different costs to consenting, which in turn would be reflected in higher dwelling prices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Social</b> – staggered nature of consents, timeframes for each increases risk of reverse sensitivity effects at neighbouring rural properties (considering range of permitted farming/rural activities).</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – one-stop opportunity for iwi to influence outcomes (consent phase). The scope of influence is greater via a plan change with embedded consenting framework.</li> </ul>		<p>affordability and suitability of housing, significantly delayed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – lost opportunity to expedite improvement to mauri of taonga across the site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Benefits</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – no change to current landscape character.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – no financial costs associated with plan change, resource consent processes, development. May reduce competition to established social infrastructure/services (childcare centres/café/medical centres) if these do not go ahead within Stages 1 -3 of Lockerbie as a result of doing nothing with the plan change site.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – amenity of existing site retained.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – no benefit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – high specificity and certainty of effects within each stage. Ecological restoration potential on a stage-by-stage basis.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – potential ease of financing based on staged consents and associated reduction of risk to lender to single stage only, provided consents are approved.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – more frequent opportunities to challenge consent applications and address specific amenity concerns as stages come in for consenting. If approved, the consents will deliver developable sections that will provide additional housing for Morrinsville.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – clear outcomes could be secured by way of consent conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – holistic and comprehensive consideration of the site, its ecosystems, with a high degree of certainty of effects. Ecological restoration potential considered and integrated across the site, spatially provided for within DAP.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – most expedient in terms of up-front costs, and flexible in terms of reducing future regulatory costs. Provides certain signal to the market of forthcoming dwellings in the area. Will result in quickest delivery to alleviate housing supply and affordability issues. Similarly, positive economic effects to existing service providers in</li> </ul>	<p>Similar benefits (in substance) to option 3 however overall level of benefit inherently reduced owing to time delay in realising such benefits. There are also the following additional benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> - would provide the opportunity to holistically consider the site and set objectives, policies, rules and design guidelines that guide future development alongside the other considerations of the review.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Rezoning will occur through Council</li> </ul>

			<p>Morrinsville, critical mass for new services in the area based on whole-of-site zoning and likely yield.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Social</b> – with most expedient delivery of houses, support to existing community services, groups and endeavours would commensurately be most quickly realised to improve the social welfare and capital of the community at large.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – most appropriate degree of influence in that a) the vision, framework and values are agreed to inform the plan provisions and DAP, b) engagement with Council through the plan change process and c) future engagement opportunities created by way of proposed consenting framework.</li> </ul>	<p>lead plan change and minimise the total costs of development on applicants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Social</b> – will provide additional housing supply for Morrinsville.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – no identified cultural benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/efficiency</b>	Nil – objective not achieved and fundamental issue giving rise to the plan change not addressed.	Effective if successful and will address the fundamental issue giving rise to the plan change. Ineffective in terms of piecemeal approach. Inefficient in terms of process and lack of certainty around outcome.	Will address the fundamental issue of the plan change, in a structured and certain manner, making it both effective and efficient.	Nil – objective not achieved and fundamental issue giving rise to the plan change not addressed.
<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.			
<b>Preferred option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 3 is the most efficient way of ensuring District Plan integrity, giving the community surety over intended environmental outcomes for the site and providing for the growth of Morrinsville.</li> </ul>			

Table No. 2 – Overall Assessment of Zoning Approach

Section 32 – Alternatives, cost-benefit, efficiency and effectiveness, risk of not acting analysis (zoning alternatives)			
	Option 1 – Adoption of existing zones in the MPDP	Option 2 – Mixed zoning (Residential and Medium Density Residential) and Precincts	Option 3 – Alternatives considered
<b>Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applying the Residential Zone to the site with no changes to the existing provisions.</li> <li>Introduction of a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of Residential Zone (with bespoke changes) around the perimeter of the site and a new MRZ in the core.</li> <li>New precinct identified within the MRZ</li> <li>Introduction of a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption of modified Residential Zone i.e. bespoke changes to some of the Residential Zone provisions to enable the increased density thru a more permissive consenting framework.</li> <li>Adoption of a MRZ across the whole site, or a higher density option.</li> </ul>
<b>Costs/Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environmental</b> – Limited costs or benefits. Some developers may prefer the existing residential zone provisions, however, this is not precluded with Option 2. Certainty over land use outcomes i.e. open space/infrastructure connections is enabled with the use of a DAP.</li> <li><b>Economic</b> – Does not achieve the density outcomes sought through the proposed objectives without using Council’s existing infill provisions which comes with increased consenting costs and time delays. Does achieve housing supply to assist with accommodating the growth of Morrinsville, albeit at a lesser density. Default standards for residential intensification are targeted at more infill development than greenfield sites.</li> <li><b>Social</b> – Certainty of outcomes for Council and the community through the use of a tested set of performance standards. Does not provide an easy consenting pathway for differing/denser housing typologies, which in turn can affect affordability, and gives rise to notification risks that seek to achieve such outcomes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environmental</b> – A drive to an increased density, requires further consideration of how off-site amenity is achieved i.e. greater open spaces/environmental enhancement arises from a concurrent master planning approach for the site and the adoption of a DAP. The use of a DAP enables the land use outcomes to be spatially defined. The use of the Residential Zone around the fringes of the site addresses reverse sensitivity and ensures a consistent external interface.</li> <li><b>Economic</b> – The mixed zoning approach will provide greater certainty to developers and the community as the expected outcomes across the site. Increased density, enabled by the MRZ, will provide variety of housing typologies which will help housing affordability. Will provide developer greater certainty to invest in and develop to increased densities. Maximises development and land efficiency and provides flexibility around a variety of housing options.</li> <li><b>Social</b> – The increased density, changing typologies will require a social change which in part is driven by housing affordability. The</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environmental</b> – The option of a modified Residential Zone would offer benefits over Option 1, but would require substantial alteration to the Residential Zone provisions and the use of MRZ or a higher density option does not address the reverse sensitivity or interface matters.</li> <li><b>Economic</b> – May provide greater certainty for developers and the community.</li> <li><b>Social</b> – Some benefits may accrued from adoption of a MRZ across the whole site or a higher density option, however, the community may not be ready to support a higher density than that enabled by the MRZ, particularly in Morrinsville and on its northern fringe.</li> <li><b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<p>planning framework provides certainty of outcomes for Council and the community around density expectations, over Option 1. The use of a DAP and definition of off-site amenity opportunities is important to provide future residents with certainty of their amenity opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	
<b>Effectiveness/efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing zoning provisions are considered to be inefficient and ineffective in achieving the objectives of the plan change, particularly around increasing density and housing choices, without going through cumbersome and risky consenting processes. They would result in an inefficient use of the land development potential (development density and variety).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of a MRZ and precinct mechanism are supported under the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>• The new zone and precinct mechanisms will provide a framework to establish new forms of residential activities (i.e. duplex's and terraces housing), as well as effects-based rules to enable and manage landuse activities.</li> <li>• The MRZ chapter provides for a consolidated set of objectives, polices and rule mechanism which will provide ease of administration and linkages between plan provisions.</li> <li>• Wholesale changes to the Residential Zone provisions are not required.</li> <li>• The new zone and precinct mechanisms can be adopted by MPDC to apply to other portions of the District, as they see fit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of MRZ across the whole site would not be effective in addressing reverse sensitivity or interface matters.</li> <li>• A complex set of amendments to the District Plan provisions would be required to achieve the objectives of the plan change, which in turn would by default create a bespoke zoning for the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		
<b>Preferred option</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 2 is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives of the plan change and the District Plan.</li> <li>• The adoption of a split zoning approach, with a supporting DAP, will clearly identify the nature and location of future activities on the site, including a range of housing typologies giving the community surety over intended environmental outcomes for the site.</li> </ul>		

## SECTION 32 EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES (S32(1)(a))

### Assessment of Objectives

Note: The objectives of the Residential Zone have been subject to a previous s32 analysis as required to become operative, and therefore are not revisited here. Furthermore, no changes to those objectives are being proposed. This assessment consequently focuses on the new Medium Density Residential Zone objectives.

**Table No. 3 – Assessment of Medium Density Objectives**

Section 32 – Proposed Medium Density Objectives		
Objective	Resource Management Act	Waikato Regional Policy Statement
	These objectives achieve the purpose of the RMA by:	These objectives give effect to the RPS sections, and specifically section 6 built environment (and its associated objectives 3.12) as well as the Schedule 6A criteria by:
MRZ O1	<p>To provide for residential activities and medium density housing, in comprehensively design greenfield areas, to provide a variety of lot sizes and housing typologies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective makes it clear that residential activities (i.e. housing provision) is central to the purpose of the zone, which addresses the fundamental issue sought to be addressed by the plan change.</li> <li>• It further makes it clear a range of densities and housing types are anticipated and expected, so as to be responsive to market demand terms of supply of dwellings, therefore promoting and enabling an efficient use of natural and physical resources.</li> <li>• While the land will no longer be retained for its rural amenity, the future amenity values and quality of the area are recognised in the DAP and zoning framework and will be enhanced through the implementation of development in accordance with both.</li> <li>• There are no specific “outstanding landscapes”, and the DAP provides for the retention, enhancement and public access to the identified watercourses and the one identified wetland.</li> <li>• The technical assessments that support the plan change confirm that the site is not subject to inappropriate natural hazard risks.</li> <li>• The relationship of Māori with their waahi tapu (and any customary activities) has been recognised (and obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi) and provided for through engagement undertaken with Ngāti Hauā. Implementation of this objective does not undermine this.</li> </ul>

MRZ O2	To ensure residential development produces good on-site amenity and good quality urban design that enhances our communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective addresses the quality and amenity of the expected to be achieved and signals that density is being enabled through good quality urban design and with the expected resulting residential amenity.</li> <li>• This objective also aligns with the use of a DAP which specifies the location of more intensive housing typologies that are supported by access to and proximity to open space.</li> <li>• The zoning and DAP has deliberately been devised to avoid, remedy and mitigate effects on the surrounding community as much as possible whilst addressing the fundamental issue of housing supply.</li> <li>• Adverse effects of urban activities will be avoided, remedied or mitigated through the proposed provisions for the site, so that good on-site amenity and urban design outcomes are achieved. These provisions are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for MRZ.</li> <li>• Integration with the surrounding townscape is enabled through a residential zoning on the perimeter of the plan change site and through the integration of pedestrian movements between the site and the existing environs are required by the DAP.</li> </ul>	<p>DAP), which will be linked to the wider network and that being developed by Lockerbie.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not giving rise in inappropriate effects on the state highway network nor regionally significant infrastructure.</li> <li>• Ensuring that infrastructure to service the site can be provided as required by Policy 6.3, albeit with the potential that additional water efficiency requirements may be required to address water allocation. The nod to energy efficiency supports policy 6.5.</li> </ul>
MRZ O3	A range of housing types and densities are available to meet the needs of all communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective build on MRZ O1 by reiterating that a mix of housing types and densities are expected. It further makes it clear a range of housing types and densities are anticipated and expected, so as to be responsive to market demand both in terms of pure supply of dwellings as well as quality of dwellings catering to all members of the community.</li> </ul>	
MRZ O4	To ensure that the design and appearance of buildings and sites provides good urban design, certainty for residents and integrates with the surrounding townscape.	The statements for MRZ O2 above are also relevant to these two objectives.	
MRZ O5	All activities are compatible with residential amenity.		
MRZ O6	Land-use, subdivision and infrastructure are planned in an integrated manner that does not	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective ensures development within MRZ's occurs in an integrated manner that respects the supply and capacity of public infrastructure, which is vital to ensuring the social and economic</li> </ul>	



	<p>compromise the supply and capacity of public services.</p>	<p>well-being of the wider community within which the plan change site is located.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth in this location helps, being a site signalled for urban development, relieves pressure for growth in other less appropriate parts of the Waikato region (i.e. such as productive land) thereby safeguarding the needs of future generations.</li> <li>• Triggers are provided for in the DAP to clearly differentiate what infrastructure is required when. Similarly, the DAP records that a Development Agreement may be required to address the funding of infrastructure that has a wider public benefit.</li> </ul>	
<p>MRZ 07</p>	<p>Residential buildings make efficient use of water and energy resources through access to sunlight and daylight.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective also signals a driver for development outcomes to be more efficient with water use to help reduce demand. This objective is driven by water availability and allocation pressures for Morrinsville, which is being resolved with MPDC and may result in additional provisions being provided for in the plan change.</li> <li>• The energy aspect of this objective seeks to encourage energy-efficient urban development, through promotion of energy-efficient urban form through access to good forms of sunlight and daylight and through the design of energy efficient buildings.</li> </ul>	

## SECTION 32 EVALUATION OF PROPOSED RULES AND METHODS (S32(2))

### PROPOSED PROVISIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

Table No. 4 – Activity Lists and Performance Standards

Section 32 – Objectives Assessment of Activity Status			
	Option 1 – Activity Lists and Performance Standard included	Option 2 – Effects based rules	Option 3 – Linkage to existing Activity List and Rules in District Plan
<b>Description</b>	Activity lists and associated performance standards are identified for the MRZ and the Precinct	Activities are assessed in terms of effects-based criteria and standards	Activity lists are utilised for existing District Plan provisions
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The spatial relationship between activities and the nature and type of activities which can be established without resource consent are clearly defined and can differ depending on location.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Certainty over plan provisions may enable more confidence in terms of building and development within the MRZ and Precinct.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Activity based rules are a simple and easy way to represent planning rules. They are also generally easier to understand and quantify.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Lack of certainty can lead to some inefficiencies and uncertainty for the community. Effects based rules often require a planning assessment before certainty is determined on whether an activity is permitted.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Lack of certainty may lead to additional assessment and compliance costs before a decision can be made to invest in or develop a property.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Can provide for more innovative approaches to land use, as activities can be assessed on their merits without being assessed against prescribed rules and definitions.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The performance standards within the District Plan may not translate well to the nature and character sought to be achieved in the MRZ, and the flexibility sought to enable a diversity of housing typologies.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Potential discrepancies between zone standards which would require significant time and investment to rectify i.e. wholesale changes to the District Plan.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Dependent on the precise rules which could be adopted and translated to our settlement areas</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The creation of a MRZ and an associated precinct with specific activity lists with associated performance standards allows for the provisions of new rules which reflect and can be tailored to the specific characteristics of the Lockerbie site and resulting MDR zoning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects based rules can be effective in focussing on the effects of activities without being tied to classes of activities and definitions apply across a wide range of different activities.</li> <li>• The disadvantage is that there is often inefficiency created with the assessment of permitted activities, and where</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option would be less efficient and effective as it would require modification and reframing of activity lists and rules to recognise and cater for differences between the Lockerbie site and other urban areas.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overlap with and need to modify other sections of the District Plan is minimised.</li> <li>• The creation of a new MRZ allows for the adoption of the National Planning Standards while work is progressed on the transition of the remainder of the District Plan.</li> <li>• The activity list approach is also adopted for other zones in the District Plan and there is efficiency in maintaining a consistent approach.</li> </ul>	<p>compliance with performance standards must be demonstrated in order to assess whether an activity require land use consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing advice and certainty to users of the District Plan is more difficult to achieve.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b></p>	<p>The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.</p>		
<p><b>Preferred option</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Settlement Zone and the District Plan.</li> <li>• The opportunity to establish activity lists and performance standards specific to the MRZ is the most effective and efficient mechanism as it allows the rules to be tailored to the nature and character envisaged for a MRZ.</li> <li>• This approach allows an early adoption of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>		

Table No. 5 – Performance Standards for the Medium Density Residential Zone

Section 32 – Objectives Assessment of Performance Standards			
MAXIMUM HEIGHT PROVISION			
	Option 1 – Utilise the Residential Zone standards	Option 2 – Apply A different standard for the MRZ	Option 3 – Alternatives Considered
<b>Description</b>	Adopt the 9m height limit for the MRZ that applies to the Residential Zone	Adopt a 10m height limit for the MRZ	No maximum height
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The 9m height provision is tried and tested in the MPDC as being a suitable height for a residential environment, giving rise to suitable amenity outcomes. Also minimises the visual impact of the development on the surrounding environment to a level that is reasonably anticipated.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance expected, so additional consenting costs are not expected.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the height provision aligns with that reasonably expected in a residential type environment.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – May provide the opportunity to increase roof pitch over and above that enabled by 9m i.e. more opportunity to maximum built form and urban design outcomes. Unlikely to be able to provide for three storey outcomes.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Again, compliance expected, so additional consenting costs are not expected where compliance is achieved.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No apparent visual difference between 9m and 10m, so no significant social issues or benefit/costs derived from increased height.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – No compliance costs, as no standards to consider/no consenting requirements.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No certainty of outcome for the community around the bulk of built form. Council has no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding residents.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	The existing 9m height provision is effective and efficient in that it enables double storey buildings, which is a reasonably anticipated outcome for Morrinsville and is consistent with the reasonably expected character.	There is limited difference between 9m and 10m, so it too would be effective and efficient.	Having no height standards would be effective and efficient in providing for increased density, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that is out of character for the receiving environment.
<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		

<b>Preferred option</b>	Option 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it retains the status quo for a residential environment and is consistent with the character and amenity reasonably expected.		
<b>HEIGHT RELATIVE TO SITE BOUNDARIES PROVISION</b>			
	<b>Option 1 – Utilise the Residential Zone standards</b>	<b>Option 2 – Apply a different standard for the MRZ</b>	<b>Option 3 – Alternatives Considered</b>
<b>Description</b>	Adopt the Residential Zone standard i.e. 2m plus the shortest horizontal distance between that part of the building and the nearest site boundary	Apply a standard that is less stringent than the current Residential Zone standard i.e. 3m and 45 degrees depending on site boundary affected	No height relative to site boundaries standard
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Amenity outcomes are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for a residential environment.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Likely to result in a consent being required for breaches of the standard, particularly for double storey outcomes. This will add time and cost to the built outcome.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Compliance unlikely to be achieved, so density outcomes may not be realised, or consent will need to be obtained.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The provision provides additional flexibility over the existing residential standard to enable and encourage diversity of housing typologies and on smaller lots.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is easier to achieve, so less consenting is likely to result. A preclusion where neighbours approval is provided, will help with this outcome too.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Density and diversity of housing typology outcomes will be able to be realised.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – No compliance costs, as no standards to consider/no consenting requirements.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No certainty of outcome for the community around the bulk of built form. Council has no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding residents.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	The existing height relative to boundary provision is efficient and effective for single storey dwellings or on larger residential sites where double storey buildings can be setback further than 1.5m from site boundaries. On smaller sites, such as that proposed in the MRZ, where double storey buildings are likely the provision will not provide a practicable building envelope and may lead to unintended urban design outcomes where compliance is sought to be achieved.	The increased height for a starting point and angle adopted will provide more flexibility over and above the existing residential standard which is more in line with increasing density and diversity of built form in the MRZ. The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around the building envelope expected. They are also easy to use and interpret being applicable to all boundaries and having one angle.	Having no height relative to boundary standards would be effective and efficient in providing for increased density, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that is out of character for the receiving environment.

<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		
<b>Preferred option</b>	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it provides create flexibility to increase density on the smaller sites that are anticipated in the MRZ through enabling a more permissive recession plane than the current Residential Zone provisions.		
<b>YARDS PROVISION</b>			
	<b>Option 1 – Utilise the Residential Zone yard standards</b>	<b>Option 2 – Adopt different yard standards for the MRZ</b>	<b>Option 3 – Alternatives Considered</b>
<b>Description</b>	Adopt the Residential Zone yard standards	Apply yard standards that are less stringent than the current Residential Zone standards i.e. 3m for front yard, 5m for garaging and option for rear access lots	No standards, or lesser yards.
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Amenity outcomes are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for a residential environment.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Likely to result in a consent being required for breaches of the standard, particularly on smaller sites where a 5m setback to the front yard serves no apparent amenity purpose. This will add time and cost to the built outcome.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Density outcomes may not be realised, or consent will need to be obtained.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The provision provides additional flexibility over the existing residential standards to enable and encourage diversity of housing typologies and on smaller lots. The increased setback for garaging provides sufficient space for off-street vehicle parking.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is easier to achieve, so less consenting is likely to result.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Density and diversity of housing typology outcomes will be able to be realised. The bulk of the built form will protrude forward of the garage which is a good urban design outcome.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity/ the receiving streetscape.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – No compliance costs, as no standards to consider/no consenting requirements.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No certainty of outcome for the community around the bulk of built form. Council has no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding residents.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	The existing yard provisions are efficient and effective on larger residential sites. On smaller sites, such as that proposed in the MRZ, there is a desire to maximise the available building envelope. This outcome is not achieved using the Residential Zone standards.	The proposed yard standards provide reduced setbacks that are reflective of the size of the site, albeit still maintaining suitable separation for the street and a suitable level of on-site and off-site amenity. The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around the bulk form expected.	No yard setbacks would be effective and efficient in providing for increased density, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that is out of character for the receiving environment.

<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		
<b>Preferred option</b>	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it provides create flexibility to increase the building envelope on the smaller sites that are anticipated in the MRZ, whilst at the same time achieving a suitable level of on-site and off-site amenity.		
<b>MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE AND PERMEABLE SURFACE AREA</b>			
	<b>Option 1 – Utilise the Residential Zone standards (where applicable)</b>	<b>Option 2 – Adopt standards for the MRZ</b>	<b>Option 3 – Alternatives Considered</b>
<b>Description</b>	Applying the maximum building coverage that applies to residential infill development being 45%	Applying a maximum building coverage of 50% and a minimum permeable surface area requirement of 20%	No building coverage and permeable surface area requirements.
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The outcomes is consistent with that reasonably anticipated for smaller lot development as enabled by the infill provisions, however, that the coverage only enables a 130m<sup>2</sup> dwelling on a 325m<sup>2</sup> section.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Likely to result in a consent being required for breaches of the standard, particularly on smaller sites where a 5m setback to the front yard serves no apparent amenity purpose. This will add time and cost to the built outcome.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Density outcomes may not be realised, or consent will need to be obtained.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The provision provides additional flexibility over the existing infill standards and specifically will enable a 162.5<sup>2</sup> single storey dwelling to be built on a 325m<sup>2</sup> site, which is a reasonable built form outcome, counterbalanced with providing sufficient room for outdoor living and building separation from neighbouring form.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is easier to achieve, so less consenting is likely to result.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Density and diversity of housing typology outcomes will be able to be realised. 50% of the site will still be available for alternative uses, including 20% that is permeable.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity/ the receiving streetscape.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – No compliance costs, as no standards to consider/no consenting requirements.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No certainty of outcome for the community around the bulk of built form. Council has no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding residents.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	The existing building coverage provisions for infill development are effective, however, are not efficient in maximising the resulting built form that could eventuate by applying a lower coverage.	The increased site coverage, counterbalanced by a requirement for a minimum permeable surface area reflects the size of MRZ sites, whilst still providing for reasonable built form outcomes and an appropriate residential amenity. The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around the bulk form expected.	No site coverage and permeable surface areas requirements would be effective and efficient in providing for increased density, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that is out of character for the receiving environment and less protection of residential amenity.

<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.	
<b>Preferred option</b>	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it provides create flexibility to increase built form on the smaller sites that are anticipated in the MRZ, whilst providing good on-site amenity.	
<b>INTERFACE BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE</b>		
	<b>Option 1 – No standards</b>	<b>Option 2 – Adopt standards for the MRZ</b>
<b>Description</b>	Have no standards relating to the interface between public and private realm	Adopt standards relating to the interface between public and private realm i.e. to control garage widths, glazing, entrance location, maximum fence heights and outlook space.
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity/ the receiving streetscape.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – No compliance costs, as no standards to consider/no consenting requirements.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No certainty of outcome for the community around the bulk of built form. Council has no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding residents.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The rules, when combined, will contribute to a high-quality public realm that is safe and attractive, and minimises the visual dominance of garaging and fencing.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is easier to achieve, so less consenting is likely to result.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Safe and attractive outcomes are enabled through opportunities for passive surveillance, variation to the façade and good interaction with the streetscape.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness/Efficiency</b>	No standards would be efficient and effective, however would not result in good urban design outcomes.	The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around how a high-quality public realm that is safe and attractive will be enabled. The standards have been determined with urban design input.
<b>Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information</b>	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.	
<b>Preferred option</b>	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it will provide for good quality urban design outcomes.	