

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

Assessment of Options to Achieve Objectives

Table 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 the status quo and progress non-complying resource consent applications	Option 3 – Rezone the site to enable industrial development	Option 4 – Wait for the ODP to be reviewed
Costs	<p>Environmental – by not addressing the shortfall of industrial land supply, there would be a risk of unplanned ad-hoc industrial development which could have worse environmental effects. Ongoing use of the site for rural activities would result in continued absence of treatment of stormwater runoff from the site to the Morrinsville Stream.</p> <p>Economic – there would be lost opportunities to retain and grow business revenue in Morrinsville given the identified shortfall of Industrial zoned land, with the likelihood that residents and businesses would increasingly bear the costs of travelling out of Morrinsville</p>	<p>Environmental – there would be relatively small costs associated with loss of high-quality soils. There would be potential adverse effects on rural activities that would require managing through consent conditions. Option 2 would be an inefficient method of managing environmental effects due to the required staging of development across such a large site and the likelihood of piecemeal delivery of industrial development and infrastructure.</p> <p>Economic – high ‘up front’ costs to Applicant of obtaining resource consents with high risk of resource consent applications being declined due to policy</p>	<p>Environmental – there would be relatively small costs associated with loss of high-quality soils. There would also be potential adverse effects on rural activities that would require managing through specific district plan provisions.</p> <p>Economic – significant costs to Applicant of obtaining a plan change with subsequent costs to obtain resource consents for subdivision and many land uses. There would be economic costs associated with the loss of high quality soils from productive rural uses but the existing landholding is small and only suited as a hobby farm or lifestyle block. The productive capacity and the suitability of the land for</p>	<p>Environmental – by not addressing the shortfall of industrial land supply in a timely manner, there would be a risk of unplanned ad-hoc industrial development which could have worse environmental effects. This may include greater reverse sensitivity adverse effects arising from conflict between rural activities and ad hoc industrial development. There would be a lost opportunity to expedite treatment of stormwater runoff from the site to the Morrinsville Stream.</p> <p>Economic – there would be a delayed injection of industrial land supply to meet identified demand, with consequential lost opportunities to retain</p>

	<p>for access to work and services. There would be a lower economic return associated with use of the site for rural activities compared to industrial activities.</p> <p>Social – opportunities would be lost for employment and other benefits to businesses and the local community, with the likelihood that residents would increasingly need to travel out of Morrinsville for access to work and services which would impact people’s time and wellbeing.</p> <p>Cultural – lost opportunity for treatment of stormwater from the site to enhance the water quality and mauri of the Morrinsville Stream.</p>	<p>conflicts, representing high risk use of finance. There is a further risk that consents may not be granted given the uncertainty with proposed legislative and regulatory changes. There would also be higher up-front costs associated with the details required to accompany resource consent applications and the specific details required for activities would limit flexibility in terms of development activities and buildings.</p> <p>Social – would result in permanent, cemented loss of rural use, and associated amenity values, across part/all of the site if successful. The size of the site and its restricted use for productive purposes mean that its contribution to factors such as connection of the community to the land, sense of identity and future food security are negligible. Risk of decline of resource consents means it is less likely that social benefits of industrial development would be realised. The quality of the development would be poorer due to the piecemeal</p>	<p>other rural uses is restricted due to wetness and slope.</p> <p>Social – would result in permanent, cemented loss of rural use, and associated amenity values, across part/all of the site if successful. The size of the site and its restricted use for productive purposes mean that its contribution to factors such as connection of the community to the land, sense of identity and future food security are negligible.</p> <p>Cultural – no identifiable cultural costs.</p>	<p>and grow business revenue in Morrinsville given the identified shortfall of Industrial zoned land, with the likelihood that residents and businesses would increasingly need to bear the costs of travelling out of Morrinsville for access to work and services. If unplanned ad-hoc industrial development occurred, there is a risk it could be in locations which are less suitable and which have lower economic benefits. There would also be significant loss of realisable value for the landowners due to the need to wait until the District Plan provisions in respect of the site are reviewed.</p> <p>Social – delay in employment and other benefits to businesses and the local community due to needing to wait for industrial land to be rezoned, with the likelihood that residents would increasingly need to travel out of Morrinsville for access to work and services which would impact people’s time and wellbeing.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>approach that would be required.</p> <p>Cultural – there would be less opportunity for mana whenua influence over holistic development outcomes with individual staged consent applications.</p>		<p>Cultural – lost opportunity for treatment of stormwater from the site to enhance the water quality and mauri of the Morrinsville Stream.</p>
<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Environmental – no change to current landscape character.</p> <p>Economic – no financial costs associated with plan change, resource consent processes or land development.</p> <p>Social – amenity of existing site and locality retained.</p> <p>Cultural – no benefits.</p>	<p>Environmental – there would be high specificity and certainty of effects within each consent/stage due to the level of information that would be required to accompany resource consent applications. Potential adverse effects of industrial development could be managed through consent conditions.</p> <p>Economic – there could potentially be lower regulatory costs than Option 3 without the costs associated with a plan change, although that would depend on consents being granted and on notification and appeals. If consents were granted then opportunities to retain and grow business revenue in Morrinsville would be realised given the identified shortfall of Industrial zoned land in</p>	<p>Environmental – Option 3 would enable holistic and comprehensive consideration and planning for the entire site which is likely to lead to better development outcomes. In particular, infrastructure planning (roading and three waters) could be effectively and efficiently co-ordinated and integrated across the site and spatially planned within a Development Area Plan (DAP).</p> <p>Economic – opportunities to retain and grow business revenue in Morrinsville would be realised given the identified shortfall of Industrial zoned land, with better access for residents and businesses to local work and services, particularly given the sites location adjacent to existing industrial areas. There would be a higher economic return associated with use of the site for industrial activities</p>	<p>Environmental – the same benefits as for Option 3 could potentially be achieved, albeit they would be delayed.</p> <p>Economic – the same benefits as for Option 3 could potentially be achieved, albeit they would be delayed and the identified shortfall of industrial land supply would not be addressed as quickly. Rezoning through a Council led plan change would minimise the regulatory costs for the Applicants.</p> <p>Social – the same benefits as for Option 3 could potentially be achieved, albeit they would be delayed.</p> <p>Cultural – the same benefits as for Option 3 could potentially be achieved, albeit they would be delayed.</p>

		<p>Morrinsville, with better access for residents and businesses to local work and services, particularly given the sites location adjacent to existing industrial areas. There would be a higher economic return associated with use of the site for industrial activities compared to rural activities.</p> <p>Social – there would be more frequent opportunities to challenge consent applications and address specific amenity concerns as stages come in for consenting. If consents were approved, opportunities for employment and other benefits to businesses and the local community would be realised, with the likelihood that residents would need to travel out of Morrinsville for access to work and services less frequently which would improve people’s time availability and wellbeing.</p> <p>Cultural – mana whenua input would be consulted and have opportunities to provide input into individual resource consent applications.</p>	<p>compared to rural activities. Rezoning the site would address the identified shortfall of industrial land supply, signal to the market the forthcoming availability of industrial land in the area and avoid ad-hoc development elsewhere. Rezoning would enable future flexibility in terms of development activities and buildings. There would be a higher economic return associated with use of the site for industrial activities compared to rural activities.</p> <p>Social – rezoning through a private plan change would enable expedient delivery of industrial land. Holistic and comprehensive consideration and planning for the entire site is likely to lead to better development outcomes. Opportunities for employment and other benefits to businesses and the local community would be realised, with the likelihood that residents would need to travel out of Morrinsville for access to work and services less frequently which would improve people’s time availability and wellbeing.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			Cultural – a private plan change would enable an appropriate degree of influence by mana whenua in that it could a) establish the vision, framework and values to inform the plan provisions and DAP, b) enable engagement with Council through the plan change process and c) future engagement opportunities could be established by way of proposed consenting framework.	
Effectiveness/efficiency	Nil – objective not achieved and fundamental issue giving rise to the plan change not addressed. MPDC’s obligations under the NPS-UD to provide at least sufficient development capacity would not be met.	Somewhat effective if successful and would address the fundamental issue giving rise to the plan change, although ineffective in terms of piecemeal approach and 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 in a timely manner. The delay means this option would be ineffective and inefficient relative to Option 3.
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 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 Morrinsville and addressing the medium to long-term industrial land shortage that has been identified for Morrinsville and the District as a whole.			

Table 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 ODP	Option 2 – A new General Industrial Zone	Option 3 – Alternatives considered
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applying the existing Industrial Zone provisions to the site with no changes to the existing provisions. Introduction of a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing a new General Industrial Zone (GIZ) for the land. Introduction of a Development Area Plan (DAP) for the site. 	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.
Costs/benefits	<p>Environmental – the objective of providing for industrial activities and/or activities compatible with the effects of industrial activities would not be achieved as effectively as Option 2 because of the more limited range of activities enabled in the Industrial Zone provisions. For example, the existing provisions would not efficiently enable activities such as ancillary retail, cafes and takeaway food outlets, veterinary clinics, wholesale retail and trade supply, yard based retail, building improvement centres and small ancillary residential units (for live-work opportunities). Environmental effects could be effectively managed through a concurrent master planning approach for the site and the adoption of a DAP. The use of a DAP would have benefits by enabling the land use outcomes to be spatially defined and would assist in managing adverse effects (i.e. through infrastructure planning and provision for buffer planting etc).</p>	<p>Environmental – the objective of providing for industrial activities and/or activities compatible with the effects of industrial activities would be achieved. Environmental effects could be effectively managed through a concurrent master planning approach for the site and the adoption of a DAP. The use of a DAP would have benefits by enabling the land use outcomes to be spatially defined and would assist in managing adverse effects (i.e. through infrastructure planning and provision for buffer planting etc).</p> <p>Economic – the GIZ would provide greater certainty to developers and the community as to the expected outcomes across the site. The inclusion of activities reasonably anticipated in an industrial zone, enabled by the GIZ, would provide for a variety of land uses as permitted activities, which would help reduce consenting costs. The GIZ provisions would provide developers greater certainty to invest and develop the site</p>	<p>Environmental – the option of a modified Industrial Zone would offer benefits over Option 1 but would still require site specific provisions to manage potential effects.</p> <p>Economic – similar benefits as Option 2 but without the full variety of land uses that are enabled through that approach.</p> <p>Social – same benefits as Option 2.</p> <p>Cultural – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>

	<p>Economic – Option 1 would not provide for all the activities reasonably anticipated to occur across the site, such as activities compatible with industrial land uses. It would result in resource consents being required for activities that would be expected to operate in an Industrial zone which would give rise to costs and notification and approval risks and potentially inefficient use of land if consents were declined.</p> <p>Social – the use of a DAP would provide adjacent landowners with certainty of landscaping buffers and development outcomes. However, there would be less certainty than Option 2 due to the likelihood that more activities would require resource consents.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>and would maximise development and land efficiency.</p> <p>Social – the GIZ provides improved certainty of outcomes for Council and the community around land use expectations compared to Option 1. The use of a DAP would provide adjacent landowners with certainty of landscaping buffers and development outcomes.</p> <p>Cultural – No significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	
<p>Effectiveness/efficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Industrial Zone provisions are not in accordance with the National Planning Standards. This means that adopting Option 1 would not be lawful under the requirements of the RMA so it would not be effective or efficient. • The existing zoning provisions would not fully achieve the objectives of the plan change, particularly around enabling certain activities that are reasonably 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of a GIZ is in accordance with the National Planning Standards. • 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 land use activities. • The GIZ chapter provides for a consolidated set of objectives, polices and rule mechanism which will provide ease of administration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Industrial Zone provisions would need to be modified in accordance with the National Planning Standards. The Industrial Zone is not part of the Zone Framework Standard in Table 13 of the National Planning Standards. • A complex set of amendments to the District Plan provisions would be required to achieve the objectives of the plan change. There would be potential for confusion across other Industrial Zones in the District.

	<p>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).</p>	<p>and linkages between plan provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the Industrial Zone provisions are required, so there is no effect on existing industrial zone landowners. The new zone could be adopted by MPDC in future to apply to other industrial areas of the District as Council sees fit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a private plan change affecting a single site, Option 2 is more efficient and effective than modifying the existing 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 2 is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives of the plan change and the District Plan. The adoption of a new GIZ is in accordance with the National Planning Standards and will provide the developer, Council and the community the best certainty over intended environmental outcomes for the site. 		

2. SECTION 32 EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES (S32(1)(a))

Assessment of Objectives

Table 3 – Assessment of General Industrial Zone Objectives

Section 32 – Proposed General Industrial Zone Objectives			
Objective		Resource Management Act	Waikato Regional Policy Statement
		<p>These objectives achieve the purpose of the RMA by:</p>	<p>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:</p>
GIZ-01	<p>Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning additional industrial land, to meet a projected shortfall, enables development outcomes for that land use to be planned and coordinated in an integrated manner which would be consistent with Objective 3.12 and

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of the land for industrial purposes will enable people and the local community's social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety to be provided for. • 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 maintained and enhanced through the implementation of development in accordance with both. • The proposed provisions and the DAP address infrastructure servicing (three waters and roading) for industrial activities and will assist in maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment and avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects. • The technical assessments that support the plan change confirm that the site is not subject to outstanding natural features or outstanding natural landscapes. • The site does not contain any areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna. • The relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions has been recognised and provided for through engagement undertaken with mana whenua. Implementation of this objective does not undermine this. 	<p>Policy 6.1. The information contained in the application, and supporting technical reports, for PC58 address the potential effects of industrial development. Those effects will be managed through the proposed provisions, including the DAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning the land would enable infrastructure for industrial activities to be planned with better certainty in a manner that is consistent with Policy 6.3 and the NPS-UD. The DAP refers to the infrastructure that is required to service the site which will be further addressed through future consenting phases. • In relation to Policy 6.5, the site's location adjacent to the urban edge of Morrinsville (including existing industrial areas) will result in energy-efficient urban form by minimising transportation costs relative to a more remote location for industrial activities (such as the Morrinsville-Walton Road Industrial Area). Waste will be minimised by requiring water re-use. • Objective GIZ-01 would be consistent with Policy 6.16 by maintaining industrially zoned land for industrial activities unless it is ancillary to those industrial activities, while also recognising that specific types of commercial development would be appropriately located in industrially zoned land. • Objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03 would be consistent with Objective 3.21 which seeks to maintain and enhance the qualities and characteristics of areas and features that contribute to amenity. There are no specific features of high amenity value of the kind referred to in Policies 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3.
GIZ-02	The amenity values along <i>key transport corridors</i> within our towns are to be enhanced.	This objective addresses the higher amenity expectations in high profile locations, including gateways/entrances to towns. The objective is appropriate for maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment and amenity values across the district where industrial areas are in	

		high profile locations, however, the PC58 site does not contain any key transport corridors.	
GIZ-03	The adverse amenity values and adverse effects of industrial activities on surrounding non-industrial activities and reserve areas are to be avoided or mitigated.	This objective builds on GIZ-02 by requiring that the impacts of industrial activities on non-industrial land uses (including within the Rural Zone which adjoins the PC58 site) and open spaces must be avoided or mitigated. The objective is appropriate for achieving the purpose of the RMA by avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects, and for maintaining and enhancing the quality of the environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed objectives (and associated provisions) would be consistent overall with 6A Development principles, because they will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support an existing urban area (Morrinsville) rather than create a new one. - achieve clear delineation between the urban area and the rural area, particularly due to the proposed landscaping buffer at the interface with the Rural Zone. - meet an identified need for more industrial land. Intensification and redevelopment alone would not be suitable to meet demand. - being adjacent to an existing Industrial Zone, the site will connect well with existing and planned development and infrastructure. - be serviced with reticulated water supply and achieve the efficient use of water through storage and re-use requirements. - be on a site which does not contain identified mineral resources, high class soils which are capable of use for highly productive purposes, natural hazard areas, energy and transmission corridors, or an identified likely renewable energy generation site. - promote compact urban form. - existing rural landscape values will be affected, but the proposed provisions (including landscaping buffers) will manage these effects so that they will be low. - opportunities exist for enhancement within future public areas of the site (particularly the wetland) using native planting.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low-impact stormwater management measures (such as on-site storage and re-use, a wetland and swales) can be implemented. Future design will take account of projected effects of climate change. - there is already an industrial/rural interface in the general location of the site. Although the location of the interface will change, the effects can be managed such that the rezoning will not result in incompatible land uses. - Tangata whenua relationships, values and aspirations have been taken into account through the consultation which has occurred and through consideration of iwi management plans.
--	--	--	--

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

Assessment of Proposed Provisions to Achieve Objectives

Table 4 – Activity Lists and Performance Standards

Section 32 – Objectives Assessment of Activity Status		
	Option 1 – Activity Lists and Performance Standards included	Option 2 – Effects based rules
Description	Activity lists and associated performance standards are identified for the GIZ.	Activities are assessed in terms of effects-based criteria and standards.
Costs/benefits	<p>Environmental – enables activities to be listed and performance standards to be adopted which are suited to the characteristics of the site and surrounding area.</p> <p>Economic – certainty over plan provisions may enable more confidence in terms of building and development within the GIZ.</p>	<p>Environmental – lack of activity lists 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. There is also a risk of inefficient use of scarce industrial land due to the potential establishment of non-industrial activities which may be better located elsewhere.</p>

	<p>Social – activity-based rules are a simple and easy way to represent planning rules. They are also generally easier to understand, particularly for lay-persons.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>Economic – lack of certainty may lead to additional assessment and compliance costs before a decision can be made to invest in or develop a property.</p> <p>Social – 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. However, plan provisions may be more difficult to understand, particularly for lay-persons.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>
Effectiveness/efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of a GIZ enables activities to be listed and performance standards to be adopted which are suited to the characteristics of the site and surrounding area. • The overlap with and need to modify other sections of the District Plan is minimised. • 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. • The activity list approach is also adopted for other zones in the District Plan and there is efficiency in maintaining a consistent approach. • The GIZ could be adopted by MPDC in future to apply to other industrial areas of the District as Council sees fit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The disadvantage is that there is often inefficiency created with the assessment of permitted activities, and where compliance with performance standards must be demonstrated in order to assess whether an activity require land use consent. • Providing advice and certainty to users of the District Plan is more difficult to achieve.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the GIZ and the objectives and the plan change. • Establishing activity lists and performance standards specific to the GIZ is the most effective and efficient approach as it allows activities to be listed and performance standards to be adopted which are suited to the characteristics of the site and surrounding area. • This approach allows an early adoption of the National Planning Standards. 	

Table 5 – Performance Standards for the General Industrial Zone

Section 32 – Objectives Assessment of Performance Standards			
Maximum Height			
	Option 1 – Utilise the existing Industrial Zone provisions	Option 2 – Apply different standards for the GIZ	Option 3 – Alternatives considered
Description	Adopt the 12m building height limit for the GIZ that currently applies to the Industrial Zone.	Adopt a 20m height limit for the GIZ ¹ , with lower heights (i.e. 12m) on the periphery of the zone.	No maximum height.
Costs/benefits	<p>Environmental – the 12m height provision is tried and tested in the MPDC as being a suitable height for industrial land uses, giving rise to suitable amenity outcomes. Adopting this standard would enable consistency with other industrial areas (including the existing industrial areas adjacent to the site) and would minimise the visual impact of the development on the surrounding environment to a level that is reasonably anticipated.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. Further, Council staff have not identified the height limit as being a current consenting issue.</p> <p>Social – no significant social issues or benefits/costs identified as the height provision aligns with the existing maximum building height and therefore the outcomes which are reasonably expected in an industrial environment.</p>	<p>Environmental – this option would provide opportunities to increase height in specific locations i.e. more opportunity to maximum built form and urban design outcomes, whilst managing effects on the nearest receivers (i.e. non-industrial activities) outside the GIZ.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. However, Council staff have not identified the height limit as being a current consenting issue so it is therefore unlikely there would be any significant economic benefits from increasing the height limit.</p> <p>Social – would require a further set of height provisions around the periphery of the zone to address visual effects. There would still be potential amenity effects from taller buildings within the interior parts of the zone where they would be visible outside the zone.</p>	<p>Environmental – this option could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity and visual and landscape effects.</p> <p>Economic – there would be no compliance costs, as there would be no standards to consider/no specific consenting requirements.</p> <p>Social – there would be no certainty for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>

¹ 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)

	Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.	Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.	
Effectiveness/efficiency	The existing 12m height provision is effective and efficient in that no identified issues with this height standard are known to have arisen to date. It also maintains consistency between this site and the adjacent industrial zoning in terms of amenity outcomes.	This option would enable higher built form in specific parts of the GIZ with the efficiency benefits of less consenting, but it may result in permitted development which is inconsistent with objectives GIZ-O2 and GIZ-O3. It would be more complex to administer than Option 1 because there would be different standards across the zone. Given it is unlikely there would be any significant economic benefits from increasing the height limit, this option is not considered to be the most effective or efficient approach.	This option would enable higher built form in the GIZ with the efficiency benefits of less consenting, but it may result in permitted development which is inconsistent with objectives GIZ-O2 and GIZ-O3. Given it is unlikely there would be any significant economic benefits from increasing the height limit, this option is not considered to be the most effective or efficient approach.
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 industrial areas in the District and is consistent with the character and amenity reasonably expected in an industrial environment. It will also assist in achieving objectives GIZ-O2 and GIZ-O3 and is simpler to administer than Option 2.		
Yards			
	Option 1 – Utilise the existing Industrial Zone provisions	Option 2 – Apply different 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	Environmental – the yard provisions align with that reasonably expected in an industrial environment. However, they may not achieve the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-O2 seeks for development along Key Transport	Environmental – the yard provisions align with that reasonably expected in an industrial environment (including other industrial areas in the District) whilst also contributing to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-	Environmental – this option could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity, streetscape and effects on adjoining zones.

	<p>Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected but there will be future costs when changing the plan to achieve National Planning Standards.</p> <p>Social – the yard provisions may not achieve the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>O2 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. There would be some costs relative to other options in terms of loss of efficiency of developable land where larger yards are required.</p> <p>Social – the yard provisions would contribute to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>Economic – there would be no certainty for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p> <p>Social – no certainty of outcome for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>
Effectiveness/efficiency	The existing yard provisions are efficient and effective for typical outcomes for industrial zoned sites but would not be the most effective and efficient way to achieve the higher amenity outcomes sought by objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.	The yard standards would be an effective and efficient way of achieving the amenity outcomes sought by objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.	This option would result in improved efficiency of developable land in the GIZ as well as the efficiency benefits of less consenting, but it may result in permitted development which is inconsistent with objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03. It is therefore not considered to be the most effective or efficient approach.
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, whilst also contributing towards achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.		
Landscaping and Fencing			
	Option 1 – Utilise the existing Industrial Zone provisions (where applicable)	Option 2 – Apply different 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.	Landscaping for front and corner sites adjoining a Key Transport Corridor 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 and other boundaries.	No standards.
Costs/benefits	<p>Environmental – there are no identified Principal Roads within or adjoining the PC58 site, so there would be unlikely to be any specific landscaping standards applicable. In a broader sense, this option would be unlikely to achieve the environmental outcomes sought in objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected.</p> <p>Social – the landscaping provisions may not achieve the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p>	<p>Environmental – the landscaping and fencing standards will contribute to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. There would be costs associated with planting and the design and construction of fences and retaining walls to the required standards.</p> <p>Social – the landscaping and fencing standards will contribute to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that</p>	<p>Environmental – this option could give rise to inappropriate environmental outcomes in relation to off-site amenity, streetscape and effects on adjoining zones.</p> <p>Economic – there would be no certainty for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p> <p>Social – there would be no certainty for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p>

	Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.	objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas. Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.	Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.
Effectiveness/efficiency	The existing landscaping provisions would only apply where there are Principal Roads and would not be the most effective and efficient way to achieve the higher amenity outcomes sought by objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.	There will be some additional costs associated with planting and the design and construction of fences and retaining walls to the required standards. However, the landscaping and fencing standards would be an effective and efficient way of achieving the amenity outcomes sought by objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.	This option would result in less costs than the other options because of the absence of any specific landscaping and fencing standards as well as the efficiency benefits of less consenting, but it may result in permitted development which is inconsistent with objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03. It is therefore not considered to be the most effective or efficient approach.
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 would contribute to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.		
Noise			
	Option 1 – Utilise the existing Industrial Zone provisions	Option 2 – Apply different standards for the GIZ with notional boundary standards limited to dwellings in the Rural Zone existing at notification date	Option 3 – Apply different standards for the GIZ with notional boundary standards applying to all dwellings in the Rural Zone
Description	Adopt the existing Industrial Zone standards using an L ₁₀ .	Adopt the existing Industrial Zone standards using an LA _{eq} and apply the noise standards to the notional boundary of dwellings in the Rural Zone existing at the date of PC58 notification and adopt noise standards for minor residential units.	Adopt the existing Industrial Zone standards using an LA _{eq} and apply the noise standards to the notional boundary of all dwellings in the Rural Zone and adopt noise standards for minor residential units.
Costs/benefits	Environmental – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be consistent with that reasonably	Environmental – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be generally consistent with that reasonably	Environmental – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be generally consistent with that reasonably

	<p>anticipated in other industrial areas in the District. The standards would assist in achieving objective GIZ-03. However, the ongoing reference to an L₁₀ standard would be inconsistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected.</p> <p>Social – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be consistent with that reasonably anticipated in other industrial areas in the District. The standards would assist in achieving objective GIZ-03.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>anticipated in other industrial areas in the District. The limitation for the noise standards applying only at dwellings in the Rural Zone existing at the date of notification of PC58 will avoid unduly constraining lawfully established industrial activities in the GIZ. In that regard, the standards would assist in achieving objective GIZ-01 by enabling industrial activities to establish and operate in the GIZ in an effective and efficient manner. People who choose to build a dwelling close to the GIZ would do so in the knowledge that the noise standards would not apply at that dwelling, with the consequential potential that there could be adverse environmental effects on occupiers due to noise. Compliance would be required at existing dwellings to achieve amenity outcomes in accordance with objective GIZ-03. The change in how noise is measured is considered to be representative of what is, on average, experienced and is consistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards. Noise standards for minor residential units will manage the effects of noise from industrial activities on residents to achieve appropriate amenity outcomes.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. A benefit of Option 2 is the certainty that it would provide industrial developers regarding noise standards which is likely</p>	<p>anticipated in other industrial areas in the District. The standards would ensure amenity outcomes would be achieved for all dwellings in the Rural Zone which would assist in achieving objective GIZ-03. However, the potential would exist that dwellings built in the Rural Zone after industrial activities have established in the GIZ could constrain the previously lawful operation of those industrial activities by requiring their noise levels to be reduced. This would not be consistent with objective GIZ-01 which seeks to enable industrial activities to establish and operate in the GIZ in an effective and efficient manner. The change in how noise is measured is considered to be representative of what is, on average, experienced and is consistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards. Noise standards for minor residential units will manage the effects of noise from industrial activities on residents to achieve appropriate amenity outcomes.</p> <p>Economic – there would potentially be significant costs for industrial developers if a person chose to build a dwelling in the Rural Zone near a GIZ boundary and the previously lawful industrial activities had to be limited in some way (i.e. by limiting the scale of activities, reducing the hours of operation or upgrading buildings or plant). Alternatively, there could be high consenting costs and the risk of consents being declined for proposals seeking to infringe noise</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>to enable greater confidence to invest the large sums of capital often required for the establishment of industrial businesses.</p> <p>Social – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be generally consistent with that reasonably anticipated in other industrial areas in the District, except at any new dwellings in the Rural Zone built after the PC58 notification date. Noise standards for minor residential units will manage the effects of noise from industrial activities on residents to achieve appropriate amenity outcomes.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>standards at newly constructed dwellings in the Rural Zone.</p> <p>Social – noise levels and the associated amenity outcomes would be generally consistent with that reasonably anticipated in other industrial areas in the District. The standards would assist in achieving objective GIZ-03. Noise standards for minor residential units will manage the effects of noise from industrial activities on residents to achieve appropriate amenity outcomes.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>
<p>Effectiveness/efficiency</p>	<p>The ongoing reference to an L₁₀ standard would be an ineffective and inefficient approach because it is inconsistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to an LA_{eq} standard is the most effective and efficient approach because it is consistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards. • Option 2 would achieve amenity outcomes at existing dwellings in the Rural Zone and minor residential units within the GIZ in accordance with objective GIZ-03. • The limitation for the noise standards applying only at dwellings in the Rural Zone existing at the date of notification of PC58 will avoid unduly constraining lawfully established industrial activities in the GIZ. This approach is consistent with GIZ-01. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to an LA_{eq} standard is the most effective and efficient approach because it is consistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards. • Option 2 would assist in achieving amenity outcomes at dwellings in the Rural Zone and minor residential units within the GIZ in accordance with objective GIZ-03. • However, there would potentially be significant costs for industrial developers if a person chose to build a dwelling in the Rural Zone near a GIZ boundary and previously lawful industrial activities had to be limited in some way. Option 3 is therefore

			not an effective or efficient way of achieving objective GIZ-01.
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 is consistent with expert noise advice and the latest NZ standards, it would assist in achieving objective GIZ-01 by enabling industrial activities to establish and operate in the GIZ in an effective and efficient manner, it would achieve amenity outcomes at existing dwellings in the Rural Zone and minor residential units within the GIZ in accordance with objective GIZ-03.		
Service and Outdoor Storage Areas, Site Layout and Design			
	Option 1 – No standards	Option 2 – Apply different 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	<p>Environmental – this option could give rise to inappropriate environmental effects in relation to off-site amenity and streetscape.</p> <p>Economic – there would be no compliance costs, as there would be no standards to consider/no specific consenting requirements.</p> <p>Social – there would be no certainty for the community around planned built form outcomes. Council would have no ability to refuse consent for poorly designed outcomes, or for developments that do not achieve acceptable amenity for surrounding sites.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	<p>Environmental – the rules, when combined, will contribute to a high-quality public realm that is attractive, and minimises the visual dominance of plant or machinery from key transport corridors and open spaces which are used for public access which is consistent with the outcomes sought in objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.</p> <p>Economic – compliance is likely to be achieved in most instances so additional consenting costs are not expected. There would be costs associated with additional design standards and less efficiency of developable land.</p> <p>Social – the service and outdoor storage area, site layout and design provisions would contribute to achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.</p> <p>Cultural – no significant cultural issues or benefits/costs identified.</p>	
Effectiveness/efficiency	This option would result in less costs than the other options because of the absence of any specific standards as well as the efficiency benefits of less consenting, but it may result in	There will be some additional costs associated with meeting the additional design standards and less efficiency of developable land. However, the service and outdoor storage	

	permitted development which is inconsistent with objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03. It is therefore not considered to be the most effective or efficient approach.	area, site layout and design standards would be an effective and efficient way of achieving the amenity outcomes sought by objectives GIZ-02 and GIZ-03.
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 and contribute towards achieving the higher amenity expectations that objective GIZ-02 seeks for development along Key Transport Corridors and that objective GIZ-03 seeks for surrounding non-industrial activities and open space areas.	