

**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 industrial development	Option 4 – Wait for MPDP review
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – opportunity to create wetlands and supporting reserve/public walkways lost.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – creation of jobs, support to existing business' all lost. Unable to meet the short-fall in industrial land supply. Critical mass of population opportunity for additional services for Matamata lost.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – opportunities for businesses lost. Lost opportunity for growth in support base for existing community services/groups etc.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> - lost opportunity for restoration and enhancement of mauri of taonga.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – industrial use on rural land, not in keeping with site being high quality soil and surrounding zone (policy conflicts and may 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 Plan Change and supporting 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 specificity required for consents now and the future (to meet range of market demand). Future regulatory changes may</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – less certainty of precise effects than consenting, noting that consenting (i.e. subdivision) 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 RMA reform and 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 industrial land supply significantly delayed.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – lost opportunity to expedite improvement to mauri of taonga across the site.</li> </ul>

		<p>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). Uncertainty of social outcomes from piecemeal consenting approach.</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>		
<b>Benefits</b>	<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.</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 consent/stage. Stormwater management and associated network constructed 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 provide specific industrial outcomes on the land.</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. Infrastructure management (i.e. stormwater) 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 industrial land in the area. Addresses short-fall in industrial land supply.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – with most expedient delivery of industrial land.</li> <li>• <b>Cultural</b> – most appropriate degree of influence in that a) the vision, framework and values are agreed to inform</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 lead plan change and minimise the total costs of</li> </ul>

			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.	development on applicants. <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, providing for the growth of Matamata and addressing the medium to long-term industrial land shortage that has been identified for the southern district and the District as a whole.</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 – A new General Industrial Zone	Option 3 – Alternatives considered
<b>Description</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applying the existing Industrial Zone provisions 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>Developing a new General Industrial Zone (GIZ) for the land.</li> <li>Introduction of a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption of modified Industrial Zone i.e. bespoke changes to some of the existing Industrial Zone provisions to address site specific issues and rectify issues with existing Industrial zoning.</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 Industrial Zone provisions, however, this is not precluded with Option 2 as those landuse are also enabled. 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 provide for all the activities reasonably anticipated to occur across the site, such as activities compatible with industrial land uses. Results in resource consents for these activities being required for activities that would be expected to operate in an industrial zone which adds time and costs to both Applicants and Council's resourcing.</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 activities not currently provided for, as they are non-complying, which in turn can affect affordability, and gives rise to notification and approval risks.</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 objective of providing for industrial activities and/or activities compatible with the effects of industrial activities is achieved. Environmental enhancement and opportunities arise 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 and provides the platform for reserve sensitivity effects to be managed (i.e. through provision for open space/buffers/ planting etc) at the external interface.</li> <li><b>Economic</b> – The zoning framework will provide greater certainty to developers and the community as the expected outcome across the site. The inclusion of activities reasonably anticipated in an industrial zone, enabled by the GIZ, will provide for a variety of land uses, as permitted activities, which will help reduce consenting costs. Will provide developer greater certainty to invest in and develop. Maximises development and land efficiency.</li> <li><b>Social</b> – The planning framework provides certainty of outcomes for Council and the community around land use expectations, over Option 1. The use of a DAP is important to provide adjacent landowners with certainty of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Environmental</b> – The option of a modified Industrial Zone would offer benefits over Option 1, but would still require site specific provisions to address interface and reverse sensitivity matters that arise at this time.</li> <li><b>Economic</b> – Similar benefits as option 2 but without the full variety of land uses that are enabled through that approach.</li> <li><b>Social</b> – Same benefits as option 2.</li> <li><b>Cultural</b> – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</li> </ul>

		<p>their amenity buffers and protection of the appearance of the site as one enters Matamata.</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 will not fully achieve the objectives of the plan change, particularly around enabling certain activities that are reasonably anticipated to occur in an industrial zone, that currently require a resource consent. This could result in an inefficient use of the resources to realise land development potential (i.e. through consenting time and costs).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of a GIZ is supported under the National Planning Standards.</li> <li>• The new zone will provide a framework to establish new forms of industrial activities, as well as effects-based rules to enable and manage anticipated landuse activities.</li> <li>• The GIZ chapter provides for a consolidated set of objectives, policies and rule mechanism which will provide ease of administration and linkages between plan provisions.</li> <li>• No changes to the Industrial Zone provisions are required, so there is not affected on existing industrial zone landowners.</li> <li>• The new zone 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>• 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 new General Industrial Zone, with a supporting DAP, will clearly identify the nature and location of future activities on the site, including reserve and stormwater requirements, giving the community surety over intended environmental outcomes for the site.</li> </ul>		

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

### Assessment of 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:
GIZ-O1	Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective makes it clear that industrial activities are central to the purpose of the zone, which addresses the fundamental issue sought to be addressed by the plan change.</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 a stormwater and supporting pedestrian network.</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 mana whenua. Implementation of this objective does not undermine this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling additional industrial land, to meet a projected short-fall, enables development outcomes for that land use to be planned and coordinated (Policy 6.1). Reverse sensitivity effects have been addressed through the DAP. The information contained in the application, and supporting technical reports, for PPC 57 address the potential effects of the development.</li> <li>• Ensuring that infrastructure to service the site can be provided as required by Policy 6.3 including through the DAP trigger’s and implementation of the DAP as it relates to integration with the state highway network.</li> <li>• Providing for energy demand management (policy 6.5) through providing for opportunities for walking and cycling through the development (as specified in the DAP), which will be linked to the wider network.</li> <li>• Enabling a compact urban form and supporting existing urban area by releasing land for industrial development adjacent to Matamata’s existing industrial land offering.</li> <li>• Providing a clear boundary for the industrial/rural interface through the buffers and stormwater network provided for in the DAP.</li> </ul>
GIZ-O2	The amenity level along key transport corridors within our towns are to be enhanced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective addresses the quality and amenity of the expected to be with a particular focus on gateways/entrances to towns, as is the case with PPC 57.</li> </ul>	

		<p>The requirements set out in the DAP will help achieve this objective, particularly around the interface.</p>	
GIZ-O3	<p>The adverse amenity values and adverse effects of industrial activities on surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas are to be avoided or mitigated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This objective builds on GIZ-O2 by reiterating that the impacts on industrial activities on non-industrial landuses and open spaces are to be avoided (i.e. reverse sensitivity effects). 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. As noted, above, this is supported by the DAP and the rule framework that includes increased setbacks from the zone boundary and open space areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressing the industrial land allocation short-fall which enables people to provide for the socio-economic wellbeing through the provision of additional business land.</li> <li>• Masterplanning infrastructure requirements concurrently to the plan change so as to enable efficient and use of infrastructure. Adding resilience into Matamata's water network by reallocation of an existing groundwater take.</li> <li>• Providing for enhancement and public access to natural features and along their margins as set out in the DAP.</li> <li>• Not giving rise in inappropriate effects on the state highway network nor regionally significant infrastructure.</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 GIZ	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 GIZ.</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 GIZ.</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 GIZ 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 Calcutta site and the activities anticipated to establish.</li> <li>• The overlap with and need to modify other sections of the District Plan is minimised.</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 compliance</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 creation of a new GIZ 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> <li>• The GIZ can be used by Council for other sites throughout the District, as Council see's fit.</li> </ul>	<p>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>	
<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 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the GIZ and the objectives and the plan change.</li> <li>• The opportunity to establish activity lists and performance standards specific to the GIZ is the most effective and efficient mechanism as it allows the rules to be tailored to the nature and character envisaged for the GIZ.</li> <li>• This approach allows an early adoption of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>		

Table No. 5 – Performance Standards for the General Industrial Zone

Section 32 – Objectives Assessment of Performance Standards			
MAXIMUM HEIGHT PROVISION			
	Option 1 – Utilise the existing Industrial Zone provision	Option 2 – Apply different standards to the GIZ	Option 3 – Alternatives Considered
<b>Description</b>	Adopt the 12m height limit for the GIZ that applies to the Industrial Zone	Adopt a 20m height limit for the GIZ <sup>1</sup> , with lower heights (i.e. 12m) on the periphery of the site.	No maximum height
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental</b> – The 12m height provision is tried and tested in the MPDC as being a suitable height for industrial landuses, 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. Further, Council staff have not identified the height limit as being a current consenting issue.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the height provision aligns with that reasonably expected in an industrial 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 height i.e. more opportunity to maximum built form and urban design outcomes, but would also require a tiered rule framework to ensure that off-site amenity is not adversely affected by 20m high buildings around the perimeter of the site.</li> <li>• <b>Economic</b> – Again, compliance expected, so additional consenting costs are not expected where compliance is achieved.</li> <li>• <b>Social</b> – Would require a further set of height provisions around the periphery of the site to address visual effects.</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 12m height provision is effective and efficient in that no identified issues with this height standard have arisen to date. It also maintains consistency between this site and the adjacent industrial zoning in terms of amenity outcomes.	This would enable higher built form in certain areas of the site which is both effective and efficient, but could lead to administration issues identifying which provision applies.	Having no height standards would be effective and efficient in providing for increased bulk, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that is out of character for the receiving environment.

<sup>1</sup> As per the Waipa District Plan – Industrial Zone (Rule 7.4.2.6) and the Hamilton City Council District Plan – Industrial Zone (Rule 9.4.2)

Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		
Preferred option	Option 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it retains the status quo for an industrial environment and is consistent with the character and amenity reasonably expected in an industrial environment. It is also simpler to administer as there is no need for a tiered height approach that Option 2 would require.		
YARDS PROVISION			
	Option 1 – Utilise the Industrial Zone yard standards	Option 2 – Adopt different yard standards for the GIZ	Option 3 – Alternatives Considered
Description	Adopt the Industrial Zone yard standards	Adopt the Industrial Zone yard standards and have additional standards to address zone interface, setbacks from open space areas and front yards along Key Transport Corridors.	No standards, or lesser yards.
Costs/benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Amenity outcomes are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for in an industrial environment.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the yard provision aligns with that reasonably expected in an industrial 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> – The provision provides the same standards for front yard but includes additional setbacks where there is zone boundary change to address potential reverse sensitivity effects. Amenity outcomes are therefore consistent with that reasonably anticipated or considered appropriate.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the yard provision aligns with that reasonably expected in an industrial 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> – Could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity/ the receiving streetscape and reverse sensitivity.</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>
Effectiveness/Efficiency	The existing yard provisions are efficient and effective on industrial zoned sites.	The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around the bulk form expected and enable additional protections near zone boundaries and open spaces areas, which in turn will help mitigate reverse sensitivity effects.	No yard setbacks would be effective and efficient in providing for increased bulk, however this could lead to unintended consequences relating to built form that could be out of character for the receiving environment.

Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.		
Preferred option	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it provides consistency with the existing industrial zone provisions but also addresses internal reverse sensitivity issues when industrial development is adjacent to open spaces areas, zone boundary issues associated with the zoning being on the periphery of town and provides an increased level of amenity along key transport networks.		
LANDSCAPING AND FENCING			
	Option 1 – Utilise the Industrial Zone standards (where applicable)	Option 2 – Adopt new standards for certain areas of the GIZ	Option 3 – Alternatives Considered
Description	Landscaping is required on sites that are located within the identified Principal Road landscaping areas and consists of 15% of the front yard requirement.	A landscaping requirement for front and corner sites adjoining a Key Transport Corridor, shall be landscaped to a depth of 2m along the entire road boundary and with 1 tree per 10m of frontage. Fencing requirements for key interface areas such as front boundaries, zone boundaries and boundaries with open space areas.	No standards.
Costs/benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Environmental</b> – There are no identified Principal Roads within or adjacent to the site, so new ones would need to be identified. The Principal Road could be the SH24 frontage, to be consistent with the District Plan, which will be a superfluous requirement because the DAP does not enable lots to have frontage to SH24. Does not address the Key Transport Corridor amenity outcomes that are internal to the site.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the landscaping is sited within the front yard requirements.</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> – This provision provides for enhanced amenity along the Key Transport Corridor (the spine road) that is not provided for in Option 1.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the landscaping is sited within the front yard requirements.</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>
Effectiveness/Efficiency	The existing landscaping provisions are effective for sites adjoining SH24, but do not address internal amenity within an industrial zone.	The standards are effective and efficient as they provide a clear set of standards around the location and type of landscaping and	No landscaping requirements would be effective and efficient, however this could lead to unintended

		fencing expected for the purpose of improving amenity values along key transport corridors, open space areas and where appropriate on the zone boundaries.	consequences in relation to the amenity of the Key Transport Corridor.
<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 for improved amenity along the Key Transport Corridor.		
<b>NOISE</b>			
	<b>Option 1 – Utilise the Industrial Zone standards</b>	<b>Option 2 – Adopt new standards for the GIZ</b>	
<b>Description</b>	Adopt the existing Industrial Zone standards using an L <sub>10</sub>	Adopt the existing Industrial Zone standards using an L <sub>Aeq</sub> and with noise standards for minor residential units.	
<b>Costs/benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Environmental</b> – Noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for in an industrial environment.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified.</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> – Noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes are consistent with that reasonably anticipated for in an industrial environment. The change in how noise is measured is considered to be representative of what is, on average, experienced and reflects the reaction of environmental effects based on worldwide research. The provision of noise standards for minor residential units is also an appropriate outcome from enabling that type of land uses.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – No significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the change is representative of what is experienced with the existing standard. The provision of a noise standard for minor residential units will also ensure that appropriate social outcomes/noise levels are achieved for both residents and the protection of industrial land uses.</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 do not reflect the latest noise standard.	The standards are effective and efficient and reflect the latest noise standards.	

Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.	
Preferred option	Option 2 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan because it reflects the current thinking around how noise is measured and it also protects residents and industrial land uses when minor residential units are built.	
SERVICE AND OUTDOOR STORAGE AREAS, SITE LAYOUT AND DESIGN		
	Option 1 – No standards	Option 2 – Adopt new standards for the GIZ
Description	Have no standards relating to service and outdoor storage areas, site layout and design.	Adopt standards relating to service and outdoor storage areas, site layout and design.
Costs/benefits	<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/diversity in built form.</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 attractive, and minimises the visual dominance of plant or machinery.</li><li>• <b>Economic</b> – Compliance is expected.</li><li>• <b>Social</b> – Attractive outcomes are enabled through opportunities for 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>
Effectiveness/Efficiency	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 will be achieved.
Risk of acting/not acting – uncertain or insufficient information	The information available is sufficient to provide an informed assessment of the planning alternatives and costs and benefits.	
Preferred option	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.	