

Attachment 4 Section 32AA Assessment

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>a. Amend objective PREC-O1 to include reference to transport and stormwater effects to be managed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the objective • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. 	<p>Option 1 is considered to be appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA for reasons detailed in the s32 Report, however it is not the most appropriate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The change does not alter the appropriateness of the Objective, rather clarifies the link between objective, policies and rules bespoke to the Awakino Precinct, improving the efficiency and effectiveness of provisions. b. The recommended objective PREC-O1 is consistent with KDP residential zone objectives 13.5.1 – 7, whilst seeking to achieve outcomes specific to the plan change area. The objective addresses residential opportunities and housing choice which is not referenced in the KDP objectives; therefore, the objective will achieve a more directive outcome than that of the KDP residential zone objectives. c. The language of the objective is consistent with objectives 13.5.1 and 13.5.4 seeking to manage effects, whilst being more specific with respect to what effect must be managed (reverse sensitivity) and what effects must be managed on (character and amenity and ecology). d. The recommended Awakino Precinct objective will still give effect to sections 5 – 8 of the RMA, as relevant, for the reasons detailed in section 9.2.2 of the s32 Report.
<h3>Quality Built Environment</h3>		
<p>a. Amend PREC1-P2 to delete clause (1)(i)</p> <p>b. Amend PREC1-P2 to amend clause (1)(ii) to refer to “principal”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the policy. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. 	<p>Costs and benefits and Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>Recommended changes do not alter the effect of the policy, including the management of potential effects.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
c. Amend 13.10.7a to include landscaping along designation 34 legal boundary.		
Ecology		
<p>a. Amend the precinct plan to identify the stand of Kanuka as an indigenous biodiversity feature.</p> <p>b. Include reference to the NPS-IB in rule 13.13A(22).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the precinct plan. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. 	<p>Costs and benefits</p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 – The subdivision provisions and precinct plan will establish protection of natural wetlands and waterbodies in accordance with the NPS-FW resulting in significant environmental and cultural benefits and giving effect to section 6(a) of the RMA. There is an economic cost for future development as a result of the requirement to protect and maintain the wetland and waterbodies.</p> <p>Option 2 – The costs and benefits of Option 2 are considered to be the same as Option 1. As per the recommendations of Mr Warden the indigenous vegetation within the plan change area are the identified wetlands and a stand of Kanuka. It is recommended that this stand be identified within the precinct plan which will ensure that subdivision rule 13.13A will require protection of this at time of future subdivision. It is considered that this will ensure that the recommended provisions will give effect to the NPS-IB.</p> <p>Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>Option 2 is more efficient and effective than Option 1 as it will give effect to the NPS-IB.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>
Open Space		
<p>a. Amend PREC1-P1 clause (4)(c) and delete clause 4(d)</p> <p>b. Amend subdivision rule 13.13A(12(a) to delete reference to legally establish and manage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the objective. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in 	<p>Costs and benefits</p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 – There is an economic cost for future development as a result of the requirement to set aside developable land as open space. The neighbourhood park will create considerable</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>c. Amend subdivision rule 13.13A (12)(b) to provide for 3000m2 neighbourhood park.</p>	<p>Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3: Delete requirement to provide a neighbourhood park. 	<p>social benefit to future residents, whilst improving residential amenity contributing an environmental benefit.</p> <p>Option 2 – The costs and benefits of Option 2 are considered to be the same as Option 1.</p> <p>Option 3 – Will have less economic cost to future development, however the lack of certainty as to whether or not open space will be created also has a significant social and environmental cost.</p> <p>Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>Option 2 is more efficient and effective than Option 1 as it removes uncertainty as to whether or not the neighbourhood park will be privately owned and refines the wording of PREC1-P1 to remove duplication and possible miss-interpretation.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>
Transport		
<p>a. Amend policy PREC-P5 clause 2 to remove /or.</p> <p>b. Amend subdivision rule 13.13A to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rule requiring the upgrade of Awakino Road to urban standard between the northern most proposed subdivision access point onto Awakino Road to 10 metres south of Paratai Place. Information requirement rule, to require an ITA if road upgrade rule is infringed. Information requirement rule, to require an ITA if cumulative traffic movements have a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. • Option 3: NTA Recommended provisions. 	<p>Costs and benefits</p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 - There is some economic, social, cultural and environmental benefit in these provisions as they provide the ability to assess potential effects at time of development with appropriate triggers to require an ITA allowing a case-by-case assessment. Cost associated with Option 1 is the delay of ITA and uncertainty for developers of future upgrade cost.</p> <p>Option 2 – The costs of Option 2 are considered to be more balanced than Option 1, and the benefits are greater because it provides clearer direction with respect to upgrades and more frequent assessment of the traffic effects. The main cost of this option, are associated with the urban upgrade of Awakino Road. However, this is significantly offset by the benefits which include district consistency, agreed triggers and a targeted information requirement that allow a case-by-case assessment and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Option 3 – The costs of Option 3 are considered to be excessively higher than Option 2, due to the cost of establishing a shared path along Awakino Road. Mr Kelly considers that the upgrades and shared path works required under Option 3 will far exceed the mitigation required as a result of potential development within the Plan Change Area. There are environmental</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>potential effect to the State Highway 12/Awakino Road Intersection.</p> <p>c. Amend rule 13.14.2 clause (3)(a)(ii) to provide on-street parking provisions for the loop road at a rate of 1 per 2 dwellings.</p> <p>d. Amend table 13.1 to clarify footpath requirements.</p>		<p>and social benefits associated with Option 3 and the provision of a shared path, however Mr Kelly considers these are reduced by the isolated nature of the path and limited users.</p> <p>Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>All options are considered to be efficient and effective district plan methods. Option 2 is considered to provide certainty and direction for future developers commensurate to potential effects.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>
Heritage		
<p>a. Amend the precinct plan to identify the archaeological site as identified in the Archaeological Assessment.</p> <p>b. Insert new clause to 13.13A requiring the permanent protection of the Archaeological site at time of subdivision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the precinct plan. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. 	<p>Costs and benefits</p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 – The notified provisions do not specifically protect archaeological features, other than reliance upon matters of discretion at time of subdivision. The site-specific archaeological assessment from Geometria has confirm that an archaeological site is present within the Plan Change Area. There is an environmental and cultural cost of Option 1 which does not effectively protect this historic heritage in accordance with section 6(f) of the RMA.</p> <p>Option 2 – Option 2 ensures that the identified archaeological site is protected at time of subdivision, this will have an environmental, cultural and social benefit when compared to Option 1, giving effect section 6(f) of the RMA.</p> <p>Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>Option 2 is more efficient and effective that Option 1 as it will protect the identified archaeological feature and give effect to the section 6(f) of the RMA protecting historical heritage from inappropriate subdivision and development.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>
Three Waters		

<p align="center">Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3</p>	<p align="center">Options Evaluated</p>	<p align="center">S32AA Assessment</p>
<p>a) New stormwater management policy.</p> <p>b) Amend rule 13.10.11 clause (2)(e) to ensure that buildings (including water tanks) are not located within private open space.</p> <p>c) Amend subdivision rule 13.13A to delete clause 10 minimum lot size 2,500m² and onsite wastewater.</p> <p>d) Amend subdivision rule 13.13A minimum net site area to exclude vested assets and ecological features.</p> <p>e) Amend subdivision rule 13.13A to include reference to sufficient water supply for firefight purposes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Notified provisions – no modification to the precinct plan. • Option 2: Recommended revised provisions as outlined in Attachment 3 - As outlined in the left column. 	<p>Costs and benefits</p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 – The notified provisions enable subdivision and development within the Plan Change Area both for smaller lots connected to reticulated services and larger lots with onsite wastewater and water supply. Option 1 has economic benefit of flexibility and development choice, whilst resulting in an economic cost of inefficient use of land. Provision of onsite services can have a higher environmental cost that reticulated services due to the need to monitor and manage on-going operation of individual services.</p> <p>Option 2 – The s42A report has highlighted issues with the enablement of onsite servicing of wastewater and water supply, considering that this is an inefficient use of land. Option 2 will have greater environmental, economic and social benefits that Option 1, providing for a higher density of residential development and an efficient use of land in accordance with section 7(b) of the RMA. Mr Pierard has confirmed that Option 2 will ensure that housing choice and typology will continue to be provided for contributing to quality urban environment. The main cost of this rule is that it will cost the developer to undertaken upgrades to reticulated infrastructure.</p> <p>Efficiency & Effectiveness</p> <p>Option 1 is consistent with the operative KDP management of three waters and is considered to be effective and efficient.</p> <p>Option 2 is ultimately deemed more efficient and effective as the recommended changes improve the efficient use of land.</p> <p>Risks</p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>