

APPENDIX 3: ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES (s32(1)(b)(i))

The following assessment consists of an examination of the reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives of the Plan as required under Section 32(1)b of the RMA.

The High Court has commented that the requirement to identify all reasonably practicable options in this context will always involve “at least two options” and “consequently, there will always be a choice to be made between doing nothing and doing something” Whakatane District Council v Bay of Plenty Regional Council, CIV-2007-463-000606 (HC), para 40(iii)

The purpose of this assessment is not to assess all options in detail, rather screen options at a high level before determining what is appropriate for further analysis under Section 32(2). Full assessment of the costs and benefits; and environmental, economic, and cultural effects of the options deemed appropriate in the section are assessed in Appendix 5.

The issues and subsequent options have been broken up into the relevant District Plan chapters as follows:

- Appendix 3A- Chapter 4 Residential Zones
- Appendix 3B- Chapter 6 Business Zones
- Appendix 3C- Chapter 7 Central City Zones
- Appendix 3D- Chapter 9 Industrial Zones
- Appendix 3E- Chapter 16 Community Facilities Zone
- Appendix 3F- Chapter 22 Natural Hazards
- Appendix 3G- Chapter 23 Subdivision
- Appendix 3H- Chapter 25.2 Earthworks
- Appendix 3I- Chapter 25.5 Landscaping and Screening
- Appendix 3J- Chapter 25.8 Noise and Vibration
- Appendix 3K- Chapter 25.10 Signs
- Appendix 3L- Chapter 25.14 Transportation
- Appendix 3M- Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements
- Appendix 3N- Appendix 17 Planning Maps

APPENDIX 3A: CHAPTER 3- RESIDENTIAL ZONES

<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options in relation to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Explanation to strategic objective 2.2.6 does not reflect the outcomes that are resulting from development in the General Residential Zone and the General Residential Zone purpose statement does not reflect the outcomes that are occurring from development. - Development in the Residential Intensification Zone occurs on sites of all sizes and is not dependent on the amalgamation of land to form large development sites 				
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Objective 2.2.6- A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures. Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is responsive, efficient, affordable, safe, accessible, sustainable, integrated with land use. Objective 25.13.2.3- Three waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is integrated, effective, efficient, functional, safe and sustainable</p>				
<p>Options Approach to achieve objectives</p>	<p>Description (brief) Describe the option and acknowledge the source of this option (if there is one e.g. feedback from consultation, suggestions from workshops with elected members etc)</p>	<p>Relevance How effective provisions are in achieving the objective(s)</p>	<p>Feasibility Within council’s powers, responsibilities and resources, degree of risk and uncertainty of achieving objectives, ability to implement, monitor and enforce</p>	<p>Acceptability Level of equity and fair distribution of impacts, level of community acceptance Where possible identify at a broad level social, economic, environmental, cultural effects</p>	<p>Recommendation Discard or evaluate further (with brief explanation) [REJECT/SUPPORT]</p>
<p>Option 1- Do Nothing</p>	<p>Retain the existing provisions</p>	<p>The existing provisions are working adequately in achieving the objectives however they are not the most efficient.</p>	<p>It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.</p>	<p>There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve</p>	<p>Discard An inefficient District Plan is not best practice.</p>

				the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	
<p>Option 2- Amend the explanation to Strategic Objective 2.2.6, the purpose of the Residential Zone and Residential Intensification Zone to delete statements around residential areas remaining unchanged and higher density developments occurring on amalgamated sites.</p>	<p>In 2017 Council appointed a task force to review the Operative District Plan under the Regulatory Efficiency and Effectiveness Programme (REEP) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the rules and methods framework of the District Plan in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness in meeting the Plan's objectives and policies • Identify any objectives and policies that do not serve a resource management purpose or Council function under the RMA • Recommend changes to provisions when evidence demonstrates that they add cost and delay to the development process without delivering actual resource management or urban planning benefits. <p>The REEP project team spent 18 months</p>	<p>This option would achieve the objectives through supporting a range of housing types and good urban design which contributes to neighbourhood amenity.</p>	<p>It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it will align the purpose of the Residential Zone with development that is occurring in the city. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further This option achieves the objectives of providing a range of housing types whilst contributing to good neighbourhood amenity and aligns the District Plan with the nature of development that is occurring and anticipated for the city</p>

	<p>collecting data, undertaking stakeholder engagement through questionnaires and interviews, and holding internal workshops to build an evidence base. This was followed by in-depth analysis and developing recommendations. The detailed recommendations reports were provided to Councillors and presented at a workshop in November 2018. Drop-in sessions were held after the briefing to discuss the recommendations in detail.</p> <p>This option is a recommendation of the REEP review to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.</p>				
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to whether all multi-unit residential development proposals that comply with all development control standards should require resource consent				
Objectives	<p>Objective 2.2.6- A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities.</p> <p>Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.</p> <p>Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do Nothing	Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.				

<p>Option 2- Enable establishment of up to 3 detached residential units per site as a permitted activity including one duplex on a rear site as a Permitted Activity.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>Existing and proposed bulk and location controls achieve the objective to produce good on-site and neighbourhood amenity.</p>	<p>It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision. This would reduce the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good neighbourhood amenity. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further This option achieves the objectives and reduces the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options in relation to increasing the eave width</p>				
<p>Objective</p>	<p>Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p>				
<p>Options (See page 2 for header description)</p>	<p>Description (brief)</p>	<p>Relevance</p>	<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>Acceptability</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Option 1- Do nothing</p>	<p><i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i></p>				
<p>Option 2- Amend the definitions for Eave, Site Coverage and Building Setback to Setback to increase the eave overhang exclusion in site coverage calculations.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option would achieve the objectives. An increase to the eave width would not impact on the scale or bulk of building as a whole or reduce the ability to meet the objective in contributing to good neighbourhood amenity.</p>	<p>This is within Council’s powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good neighbourhood amenity. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options in relation to the following issues: - Permeable surface standards impose unreasonable restrictions on the use and development of land in association with residential purposes and leads to unreasonable requirement for resource consent.</p>				

	- The definition of what constitutes a permeable surface is too narrow and compliance with standards is difficult to monitor and enforce.				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures. Objective 25.13.2.3- Three waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is integrated, effective, efficient, functional, safe and sustainable				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Reduce the level of permeability required in the front yard setback. Amend the definition of permeable surface to enable the use of permeable pavers for parking, access and manoeuvring areas.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. The provision of a planted or grassed area in the front yard setback contributes to good neighbourhood amenity and control of stormwater will ensue that three waters infrastructure is provided in an effective, efficient and functional way.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. There will be difficulty in monitoring the maintenance of pavers to ensure their ongoing permeability.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good neighbourhood amenity.	Evaluate further The objectives to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity and to provide effective, efficient, functional three waters infrastructure will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Option 3- Delete Rule 4.4.3a relating to permeability within the front yard setback.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The lack of green space in the front yard setback would not achieve the objective in contributing to good neighbourhood amenity.	There is a high risk of not achieving the good neighbourhood amenity objective. Council would not be able to fulfil their responsibilities and obligations under the RMA.	There would be a mixed level of acceptance to this provision as it would enable flexibility for developers and occupants however it would compromise amenity of the streetscape which would have a low level of acceptance from the community.	Discard This option will not achieve the objective to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity.
Option 4- Calculate permeable surfaces over net site area rather than entire site area.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This will result in a reduction to the level of permeability over the entire site. Any reduction to the 30% permeability	Whilst stormwater can be controlled on site, this will still result in an increase in run-off to the network. Council's Infrastructure	There will be a low level of acceptance if storm water infrastructure is compromised.	Discard This option will not achieve the objective for efficient and effective infrastructure.

		requirement is a risk to the efficiency and effectiveness of three waters infrastructure and may result in the three waters objectives not being achieved.	Planning Team Leader has identified this as a high risk for the network. There is a high risk that the three waters objective won't be achieved.		
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to whether the height in relation to boundary requirements impose unreasonable design constraints on residential development.				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Amend Rule 4.4.5 to include exemptions for gable ends of buildings and to specify where measurement is to be taken from when property boundaries adjoin land used exclusively for vehicle access to neighbouring sites.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. Controlling the bulk of a building and enabling access to sunlight contributes to good neighbourhood and on-site amenity.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There would be a high level of acceptance at social and political level to this change as it will increase flexibility for developers whilst maintaining neighbourhood and onsite amenity. It will reduce the need for unnecessary resource consent. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood and on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to whether front yard setbacks should apply to segregation strips				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures. Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is responsive, efficient, affordable, safe, accessible, sustainable, integrated with land use.				
Options	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

(See page 2 for header description)					
Option 1- Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The current provisions do not achieve the objectives in relation to contributing to neighbourhood amenity and providing a safe and efficient transport network	There will be on-going issues with implementation and uncertainty of achieving objectives.	There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard This option is not consistent with the objectives of the Plan.
Option 2- Amend the definition of Transport Corridor to include access segregation strips	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives by maintaining the safety of the road network and ensuring buildings do not detract from the amenity and character of the neighbourhood.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There would be a high level of acceptance at social and political level to this change as it will improve the legibility of the Plan. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity and providing a safe transport network will be achieved whilst improving legibility of the Plan.
Issue	Assessment of options on whether setbacks of buildings from internal vehicle access should not apply to buildings on the same site or separate sites in common ownership.				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Reduce the building setback from internal vehicle access.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. Unimpeded vehicle access contributes to the on-site amenity and safety of occupants.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of social and political acceptance to this change as it will reduce the unnecessary need for resource consent whilst providing good onsite amenity. There will be minimal impacts at a social,	Evaluate Further The objectives to maintain good on-site amenity and safe access will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.

				economic, environmental and cultural level.	
Issue	Assessment of options on whether provision should be made for the siting of small garden sheds or similar within a rear or side yard setback.				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 3.</i>				
Option 2- Enable siting of one small building on a site within the side or rear yard setback area.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. A small building at the height of a standard boundary fence would not reduce the ability of development to contribute to neighbourhood amenity.	The intention is to avoid small buildings (e.g garden sheds) from needing to obtain a resource consent. A number of garden sheds around the city already do not comply with this rule. The change will reduce time required to monitor non-compliant garden sheds.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change as it is common practice for people to put garden sheds within the 1.5m yard setback. This will avoid the need for unnecessary resource consent. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options on the following issues: - No provision is made for detached accessory buildings to be located forward of the front façade of a dwelling. - Garages and carports that have vehicle entrances facing a transport corridor can be located in a position which restricts visibility of the road and pedestrians and which results in vehicles blocking footpaths. - Accessory buildings should be able to be located forward of the front façade of a dwelling provided that passive surveillance of the road from the dwelling is not blocked and the buildings do not present featureless walls to the street.				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				

<p>Option 2- Amend the interface rules to make it clear that rules only apply to dwellings and accessory buildings that directly front onto a transport corridor.</p> <p>Enable accessory buildings to be located forward of the front building line of a dwelling subject to design parameters</p> <p>Ensure that garages with vehicle doors facing the street are setback sufficient distance from the road boundary to reduce safety hazards for pedestrians.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option would achieve the objectives.</p> <p>Interface standards are in place to ensure development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity.</p>	<p>This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of social and political acceptance to this change as it will reduce the unnecessary need for resource consent whilst providing good on-site amenity.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further The objectives to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options on the limited explanation provided as to how height standards for fences and walls are to be administered and complied with.</p>				
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p>				
<p>Options (See page 2 for header description)</p>	<p>Description (brief)</p>	<p>Relevance</p>	<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>Acceptability</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Option 1- Do nothing</p>	<p><i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i></p>				

<p>Option 2- Amend Rule 4.4.8 to provide clarification on fences and walls</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option would achieve the objectives.</p> <p>The clarifications do not alter the intent of the existing fence and wall rule. No change is proposed to the height of boundary fences which are in place to protect neighbourhood amenity which achieves the objective.</p>	<p>The change will improve legibility of the Plan and therefore improve the ability to monitor, implement and enforce the provisions.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it will improve legibility of the Plan and reduce the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent and improving legibility of the Plan.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options on the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the requirement to provide outdoor living areas be based on the intensity of occupation arising from a dwelling and not a one size fits all approach? - Is the requirement to accommodate a 6m diameter circle within required outdoor living areas necessary and is the ability to design quality residential buildings constrained by this? - The design of outdoor living areas should be based on whether they are useable and functional. 				
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.</p>				
<p>Options (See page 2 for header description)</p>	<p>Description (brief)</p>	<p>Relevance</p>	<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>Acceptability</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Option 1- Do nothing</p>	<p><i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i></p>				
<p>Option 2- Amend the outdoor living area provisions to allow decks and patio areas to be covered, reduce the minimum outdoor living area and delete the orientation provisions.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>Amenity of outdoor living area is dependent on number of factors including access to sunlight, outlook and privacy. Developers and owners should get the flexibility to decide where the outdoor living area would provide their desired level of amenity. The minimum outdoor living area dimensions are sufficient to achieve the</p>	<p>This is within Council’s powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good on-site amenity.</p>	<p>Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.</p>

		objective for good on-site amenity.			
Issue	Assessment of options on whether the minimum required areas and dimensions for service areas are excessive				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Amend the unit size rules to apply to all residential zones, amend minimum floor area requirements and introduce a minimum living area.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. The minimum unit size areas provide an appropriate size for living as to achieve good on-site amenity.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good on-site and amenity.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options on the following issues: - The minimum required floor area for two and three bedroom units is excessive. - Minimum floor area requirements are not specified for developments in the general residential zone				
Objectives	Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	There is an inconsistency with the Residential Intensification Zone and General Residential Zone floor area provisions. The existing provisions are therefore not adequate in achieving the objective for good on-site amenity.	There will be on-going issues with implementation and uncertainty of achieving objectives.	There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard This option does not consistently achieve the objective for good on-site amenity.
Option 2- Incorporate minimum living area requirements for 2+	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. Minimum floor and living areas	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as	Evaluate Further

bedrooms and amend the rule to apply to residential units in the General Residential Zone.		ensures that adequate on-site amenity is achieved.	require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	it provides consistency with the District Plan provisions and achieves good on-site and amenity.	The objective to contribute to good on-site amenity will be achieved.
Option 3- Delete minimum floor area provisions.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The objective for good on-site amenity may not be achieved as dwellings may not meet the needs of the people living there.	There will be on-going issues with implementation and uncertainty of achieving objectives.	There would be a low level of acceptance to this approach at a social level due to resulting decreased levels of amenity in living environments. It does not provide for social and environmental well-being.	Discard This option provides for poor on site amenity.
Issue	Assessment of options on whether the number of apartments permitted to form part of an integrated residential development are unnecessarily restrictive and whether integrated residential development should be required to provide shared facilities or communal activities.				
Objectives	Objective 2.2.6- A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity. Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.				
Option 2- Increase the allowable Apartment mix in an Integrated Residential Development to 30% and amend the definition of Integrated Residential Development so that it no longer needs to be integrated.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. The mix of typologies is of a scale which is compatible with other residential development. The integrated development approach ensures that development contributes to good on-site and neighbourhood amenity.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers and maintains on-site and neighbourhood amenity.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood and on-site amenity will be achieved.

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the following issues:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restrictions on residential units only being able to contain one kitchen area are causing problems for people who wish to have alternative areas within their self-contained residential units because they are deemed to be creating more than one residential unit in doing so. - It is difficult to monitor and enforce situations where people undertake modifications to existing accessory buildings with the express purpose of enabling them to be used as self-contained housekeeping units. - Should the establishment of sinks in bedrooms result in each bedroom in a residential unit being treated as a self-contained unit? - Definitions relating to residential units are unclear as to what they actually constitute. 				
Objectives	<p>Objective 2.2.6- A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities.</p> <p>Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.</p> <p>Objective 4.2.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Include definitions of self-contained house-keeping unit and kitchen	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives by providing a range of housing types.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities however it will be difficult to monitor the difference between a residential unit and an ancillary residential unit.	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as the provisions provide flexibility for developers whilst maintaining on-site and neighbourhood amenity.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good neighbourhood and on-site amenity will be achieved.

APPENDIX 3B: CHAPTER 6 BUSINESS ZONES

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to Gymnasiums being non-complying activities in the Business 1 (Commercial Fringe) and 6 (Neighbourhood Centre) Zones but permitted in all other Business Zones and restricted discretionary activities in the Industrial Zone.				
Objectives	<p>Objective 6.2.3- A distribution of locally based centres that provide services and health-care services capable of meeting the day-to-day needs of their immediate neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.6- Provide for a range of business activities that support and complement the Central City, Sub-Regional and Suburban Centres.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.7- Provide for a range of community facilities, residential and business activities that may not be appropriate for, or are not able to locate in centres in the business hierarchy.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This approach does not achieve the objective as it does not provide for all services required to meet the day to day needs of residents and workers.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions. There is a low risk of not providing for the day to day needs of the community.	This option would have a low level of acceptance as it does not adapt the District Plan to the modern day to day needs of the community. There is a high level of political and public pressure to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan.	Discard This option does not achieve the objective.

		density for the area would stay the same.		environmental well-being. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	the needs of a diverse range of people.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to outdoor living area requirements being excessive				
Objectives	<p>Objective 2.2.6-A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2- A distribution of suburban centres that provide a mixed use environment with health-care services, goods, services and employment at a scale appropriate to suburban catchments, while not undermining the primacy, function, vitality, amenity or viability of the Central City.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.3 - A distribution of locally based centres that provide services and health-care services capable of meeting the day-to-day needs of their immediate neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.7 - Provide for a range of community facilities, residential and business activities that may not be appropriate for, or are not able to locate in centres in the business hierarchy.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 -Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	There is an issue achieving the current objectives due to a gap in the policies around residential amenity.	There will be on-going issues with implementation and uncertainty of achieving objectives and enforcing rules.	There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard This option does not achieve the objectives.
Option 2 - Amend the outdoor living area rules to decrease the area required per apartment and change orientation requirement of outdoor living areas; and include relevant policy for achieving a high amenity living environment.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The objective to provide a range of housing types would continue to be achieved and the use of the business zone would not be altered.	This is within council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it increases flexibility for developers whilst maintaining high quality living environments.	Evaluate further This option will continue to achieve the relevant objectives, increase flexibility for developers and meet the needs of residents.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the minimum floor area for two and three bedroom units being excessive				

Objectives	<p>Objective 2.2.6-A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2- A distribution of suburban centres that provide a mixed use environment with health-care services, goods, services and employment at a scale appropriate to suburban catchments, while not undermining the primacy, function, vitality, amenity or viability of the Central City.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.3 - A distribution of locally based centres that provide services and health-care services capable of meeting the day-to-day needs of their immediate neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.7 - Provide for a range of community facilities, residential and business activities that may not be appropriate for, or are not able to locate in centres in the business hierarchy.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 -Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 17.</i>				
Option 2: Incorporate minimum living area requirements for residential units	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This provision supports the objective to provide a range of housing types.	This is within council’s powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good on-site amenity.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	Evaluate further This option will continue to achieve the relevant objective of providing a range of housing to meet the needs of people and communities.
Option 3 - Delete minimum floor area provisions.	REEP recommendation	There is a risk that the size of housing types provided will not meet the needs of people living there.	Any enforcement from not meeting the day to day needs of occupants would be unenforceable.	There would be a low level of acceptance to this approach at a social level due to resulting decreased levels of amenity in living environments. It does not provide for social and environmental well-being.	Discard This option provides poor onsite amenity.

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to providing reasonable external outlook areas from living areas				
Objectives	<p>Objective 2.2.6-A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.2- A distribution of suburban centres that provide a mixed use environment with health-care services, goods, services and employment at a scale appropriate to suburban catchments, while not undermining the primacy, function, vitality, amenity or viability of the Central City.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.3 - A distribution of locally based centres that provide services and health-care services capable of meeting the day-to-day needs of their immediate neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Objective 6.2.7 - Provide for a range of community facilities, residential and business activities that may not be appropriate for, or are not able to locate in centres in the business hierarchy.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 -Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 17.</i>				
Option 2 - Amend the external outlook area rules and include relevant policy for achieving a high amenity living environment.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will improve legibility and implementation of the Plan and not reduce the ability to meet the relevant objectives.	This is within council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision. The additional policy will aid in enforcing this rule.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it provides for social, environmental well-being. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will continue to achieve the relevant objectives and improve the legibility and implementation of the Plan.

APPENDIX 3C: CHAPTER 7-CENTRAL CITY ZONE

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to it being unreasonable that all alterations and additions to existing buildings in the central city zone require resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.				
Objective	<p>Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre.</p> <p>Objective 7.2.2 – the form, scale and diversity of activities support and facilitate the role of the Central City as the Regional Centre</p> <p>Objective 7.2.5- A pedestrian-orientated Central City</p> <p>Objective 7.2.6 – Continued development and growth which enhances the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian oriented City centre that is accessible to all levels of mobility and has a strong relationship with the Waikato River.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 - Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				

<p>Option 2: Make alterations and additions to existing buildings in the Central City Zone a permitted activity and add new specific standards for alterations and additions.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option is consistent with the objective as it will contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the Central City which supports the role of the Central City as Regional Centre.</p>	<p>This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for unnecessary resource consent and supports the role of the Central City.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective; and avoid unnecessary resource consent whilst enhancing the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian orientated city.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options in relation to why floor area ratios need to be specified for the Central City Zone?</p>				
<p>Objective</p>	<p>Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre. Objective 7.2.2 – the form, scale and diversity of activities support and facilitate the role of the Central City as the Regional Centre Objective 7.2.5- A pedestrian-orientated Central City Objective 7.2.6 – Continued development and growth which enhances the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian oriented City centre that is accessible to all levels of mobility and has a strong relationship with the Waikato River.</p>				
<p>Options (See page 2 for header description)</p>	<p>Description (brief)</p>	<p>Relevance</p>	<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>Acceptability</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Option 1- Do nothing</p>	<p><i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i></p>				
<p>Option 2: Delete the floor area ratio provisions</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>The existing bulk and location controls are adequate in ensuring that the relevant objectives are achieved.</p>	<p>This option will not require any implementation, monitoring or enforcement.</p>	<p>This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for unnecessary resource consent and it simplifies the District Plan provisions.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective; and avoid unnecessary resource consent whilst ensuring that the form and scale of buildings support and facilitate the role of the Central City as Regional Centre.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Assessment of options on the following issues:</p>				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why are maximum height limits specified for the Central City Zone? - Why are maximum height limits able to be increased if public amenities are provided? - Should public amenities be required to be provided where any multi-storied building for public use is proposed? 				
Objective	<p>Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre. Objective 7.2.2 – the form, scale and diversity of activities support and facilitate the role of the Central City as the Regional Centre Objective 7.2.5- A pedestrian-orientated Central City Objective 7.2.6 – Continued development and growth which enhances the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian oriented City centre that is accessible to all levels of mobility and has a strong relationship with the Waikato River.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 - Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The District Plan does not contain any objectives relating to bonusing outcomes expected. The provisions do not align with the objectives.	The District Plan does not contain any objectives or policies relating to bonusing outcomes expected. The existing provisions are therefore difficult to implement and enforce.	There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard The provisions do not align with the objectives.
Option 2 - Remove the height and bonusing provisions from the plan and only specify height limits for overlays 2 and 3.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objective. It will enable increased development which will enhance the vitality and vibrancy of the city centre. This is within Council’s powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.	This option will have a high level of acceptance. It will enable greater flexibility for developers and enable additional floor space which will enhance the vitality and vibrancy of the city centre.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective in supporting the vitality and vibrancy of the city centre.
Issue	Assessment of options on whether the requirements for ground floor glazing are overly restrictive				
Objective	<p>Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre. Objective 7.2.2 – the form, scale and diversity of activities support and facilitate the role of the Central City as the Regional Centre Objective 7.2.5- A pedestrian-orientated Central City</p>				

	Objective 7.2.6 – Continued development and growth which enhances the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian oriented City centre that is accessible to all levels of mobility and has a strong relationship with the Waikato River.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Allow windows in active frontages to be covered or used for purposes other than the display of goods	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objectives as it enhances the commercial heart of the city by supporting the operation of existing permitted activities.	This is within Council’s powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will increase flexibility for business owners and support permitted activities in the city centre. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objectives by supporting the commercial heart of the city.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the veranda cover rule which requires exercise of discretion and subjective judgement to determine compliance.				
Objective	Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre. Objective 7.2.2 – the form, scale and diversity of activities support and facilitate the role of the Central City as the Regional Centre Objective 7.2.5- A pedestrian-orientated Central City Objective 7.2.6 – Continued development and growth which enhances the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian oriented City centre that is accessible to all levels of mobility and has a strong relationship with the Waikato River.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The exercise in discretion of rules risk incorrect interpretation and the objectives not being achieved.	There will be on-going issues with implementation and uncertainty of achieving objectives and enforcing rules.	There will be a low level of political and social acceptance to this option as it will miss the opportunity to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard This option does not adequately achieve the objectives.

Option 2- Amend the veranda cover provisions	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objectives as it will improve legibility of plan which will increase the ability to give effect to the objectives.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities and it improves the interpretation of the Plan and increases the ability to enforce provisions.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve legibility of plan. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objectives by enhancing the commercial heart of Hamilton as an attractive and vibrant pedestrian orientated city and avoid unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options on how Residential Density provisions are to be applied to development sites				
Objective	Objective 2.2.6 -A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Amend the minimum density rules to be calculated by site area rather than per hectare.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Amending the density rules would assist in meeting the objective by simplifying the density calculation. The overall density for the area would stay the same.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities and it improves the interpretation and ability for enforcement of provisions.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change as it will improve interpretation of the Plan whilst maintaining social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being.	Evaluate further This option will improve the legibility of the Plan and continue to achieve the relevant objective.
Issue	Assessment of options on whether the minimum required floor area for two and three bedroom units is excessive.				
Objective	Objective 2.2.6 -A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 7.2.1 – The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

Option 1- Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 17.</i>				
Option 2- Incorporate minimum living area requirements for apartment units	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This provision supports the objective to provide a range of housing types.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to achieve good on-site and amenity. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Option 3- Delete minimum floor area provisions.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	There is a risk that the size of housing types provided will not meet the needs of people living there.	Any enforcement from not meeting the day to day needs of occupants would be unenforceable.	There would be a low level of acceptance to this approach at a social level due to resulting decreased levels of amenity in living environments. It does not provide for social and environmental well-being.	Discard This option provides poor onsite amenity.
Issue	Assessment of options on whether the outdoor living area controls are excessive				
Objectives	Objective 2.2.6- A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 7.2.1- The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 17.</i>				

Option 2- Amend the outdoor living area rules to decrease the area required per apartment and change orientation requirement of outdoor living areas.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives. The outdoor living area provisions are in place to meet the needs of people and communities.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers, reduces unnecessary need for resource consent and continues to meet the needs of people.	Evaluate Further The objective to contribute to good on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the interpretation of the external outlook area requirements				
Objectives	Objective 2.2.6 -A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of a diverse range of people and communities. Objective 7.2.1 -The Hamilton Central City is the heart of the Waikato region acting as a diverse, vibrant and sustainable metropolitan centre.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1 -Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 17.</i>				
Option 2- Amend the external outlook rule to allow more flexibility.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will improve legibility and implementation of the Plan and not reduce the ability to meet the relevant objectives.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it provides for social, environmental well-being. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will continue to achieve the relevant objectives and improve the legibility and implementation of the Plan.

APPENDIX 3D: CHAPTER 9 INDUSTRIAL ZONE

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to why resource consent is required for new buildings and alterations / additions to existing buildings in some parts of the Industrial Zone. Confusion is created between rules relating to alterations and additions to existing buildings and the definition of minor works
Objective	Objective 9.2.1 – Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner. Objective 9.2.3 – The amenity levels of industrial areas are to be enhanced.

Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2: Make alterations and additions to existing buildings in the Industrial Zone a permitted activity and add new standards for buildings adjoining Major Arterial Roads	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objective as it will enhance the amenity of the Major Arterial routes.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for unnecessary resource consent. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective to enhance amenity levels in industrial areas and avoid unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the use of Comprehensive Development Consent provisions in Rotokauri				
Objective	Objective 9.2.1 – Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2</i>				
Option 2: Delete the Comprehensive Development Consent requirement for properties within Rotokauri	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objective as it will improve the ability to implement the objectives of the Plan by removing non-mandatory and confusing provisions.	The proposal will improve the ability to implement and enforce the Plan.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes unnecessary provisions.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to efficient yard setback requirements for Industrial Zoned land				
Objective	Objective 9.2.1 – Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner. Objective 9.2.3 – The amenity levels of industrial areas are to be enhanced.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions are adequate in achieving the objectives however they are not best practice.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to the opportunity available to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.	Discard An inefficient District Plan is not best practice.
Option 2: Reduce the front boundary setback from collector and local roads and open space	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objective as the yard setback provisions enable the amenity of industrial areas to be enhanced.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for unnecessary resource consent. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective as yard setbacks are in place to enhance the amenity of industrial areas.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to the front yard setback being used for outdoor storage areas				
Objective	Objective 9.2.1 – Industrial activities are able to establish and operate within the zone in an efficient and effective manner. Objective 9.2.3 – The amenity levels of industrial areas are to be enhanced.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions do not adequately achieve the objective for enhanced amenity levels.	The risk of not achieving the objectives is low.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to the opportunity available to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.	Discard This option does not adequately achieve the objective for enhanced amenity levels in industrial areas.
Option 2: Amend rule 9.4.7 to control the use of the front yard setback in all industrial zone locations	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option is consistent with the objective as control of storage areas helps to enhance the	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor,	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it improves the efficiency	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective as control of outdoor storage areas

for outdoor storage purposes.		amenity of industrial areas.	implement or enforce the provision.	and effectiveness of the Plan. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	enhances the amenity of industrial areas.
Issue	Assessment of options in relation to aligning the provisions relating to residential development on the land shown in Figure 9.3a with recommendations made for the residential zone				
Objective	Objective 9.2.7- Enable the redevelopment of the site in a state of land use transition described as Lot 3 DP S270, Pt Lot 3 DRO 346, Pt Lot 2 DRO 346, Pt Lot 1 DPS 4044 and Pt Lot 2 DPS 4044 to include provision for managed care facilities; retirement villages, rest homes and visitor accommodation in a manner that achieves a high level of on-site amenity for those activities whilst ensuring that reverse sensitivity effects on surrounding industrial activities are avoided.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2 Amend Rule 9.5.9 to include exemptions for gable ends of buildings and to specify where measurement is to be taken from when property boundaries adjoin land used exclusively for vehicle access to neighbouring sites. Amend the interface rules to make it clear that rules only apply to dwellings and accessory buildings that directly front onto a transport corridor. Enable accessory buildings to be located forward of	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would ensure consistency in the Plan provisions and achieve the objective in providing a good standard of on-site amenity.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of social and political acceptance to this change as it will reduce the unnecessary need for resource consent whilst providing good onsite amenity.	Evaluate Further The objectives to achieve high on-site amenity will be achieved whilst reducing the need for unnecessary resource consent.

<p>the front building line of a dwelling subject to design parameters</p> <p>Ensure that garages with vehicle doors facing the street are setback sufficient distance from the road boundary to reduce safety hazards for pedestrians.</p> <p>Allow 30% of residential units to be apartments.</p> <p>Amend the outdoor living area provisions to allow decks and patio areas to be covered, reduce the minimum outdoor living area and amount that needs to be on the north, east or west of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reduce the service area and allow it to be provided in two separate areas, with areas for rubbish / recycling storage to be accessible to the road frontage.</p> <p>Reduce the minimum dimension of service area required to 1.5m.</p>					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Reduce screening requirements to apply only to areas which can be viewed from the road.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 3E: CHAPTER 16 COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to setback requirements for alterations and additions being unreasonable				
Objective	Objective 16.2.2-Activities have minimal adverse environmental effects.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2: Provide for new buildings and relocated buildings as permitted activities and incorporate new standards for new buildings and alterations / additions to existing buildings relating to the interface with transport corridors.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objective of resulting in minimal adverse environmental effects (on the amenity of the streetscape) by including specific standards for buildings where within 10m of a transport corridor.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for unnecessary resource consent whilst resulting in minimal environmental effects.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective whilst avoiding unnecessary resource consent.
Issue	It is inappropriate to require consent for every new and relocated building for existing schools.				
Objective	Objective 16.2.2-Activities have minimal adverse environmental effects.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2: Provide for existing lawfully established	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The bulk and location controls will achieve the objective by ensuring that	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective.

schools as a Permitted Activity.		there are minimal environmental effects.	resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	for unnecessary resource consent whilst resulting in minimal environmental effects.	
----------------------------------	--	--	---	---	--

APPENDIX 3F: CHAPTER 22 NATURAL HAZARDS

Issue	Assessment of options in relation to an inconsistency in swimming pools in gully hazard area provisions				
Objective	<p>Objective 25.10.2.1- Manage activities to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on, and minimise risk to people; property; and the environment, from natural hazards, in order to increase community resilience, reduce the risks from natural hazards, and support effective and efficient response and recovery from natural hazard events.</p> <p>Objective 21.2.1- The ecological, amenity, landscape and cultural values of the river corridor and gully system are restored and protected.</p> <p>Objective 21.2.4- The health and well-being of the Waikato River and gully systems shall be restored and protected.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option would result in ongoing confusion and inconsistency in achieving the objective.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions. There is a low risk of the objective not being achieved.	The option would have a low level of political and community acceptance as it does not enable improvements to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Discard This option does not adequately achieve the objective.
Option 2: List swimming pools as a Discretionary Activity in the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will ensure consistency with the provisions and achieve the objectives in relation to mitigating the effects from natural hazards.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will create consistency with the Natural Hazard rules whilst reducing risks from natural hazards.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective by minimising risk to people; property; and the environment from natural hazards

APPENDIX 3G: CHAPTER 23 SUBDIVISION

Issue	Plan provisions are unclear as to the appropriate form of land tenure for the subdivision of apartment units.				
Objective	<p>23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.</p> <p>23.2.6- The type of land tenure promoted by applications for subdivision consent is appropriate to the nature of existing or approved development.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions do not achieve the objectives as they enable fee simple subdivision of apartments which is not sustainable without appropriate management structures and legal mechanisms to enable effective ongoing management, maintenance and operation.	Enforcing appropriate tenure for apartments is difficult because fee simple subdivision is provided for as a Restricted Discretionary Activity and there are no relevant provisions to discourage fee simple subdivision. There is a risk for inappropriate land tenure for apartments.	The lack of adequate provisions can result in adverse economic, social and environmental effects from inappropriate tenure of apartments	Discard Does not achieve the purpose of the Act.
Option 2: Include a policy to discourage fee simple subdivision of apartments and list fee simple subdivision of apartments as a Discretionary Activity	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option provides for sustainable management of apartments after subdivision.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities and will enable council to implement, monitor and enforce on-going management, maintenance and operation apartments.	This option will align the rules with the objectives and should therefore be accepted. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects	Evaluate further This option will achieve the purpose of the Act and ensure provisions are clear.
Issue	The application of general and specific standards to cross-lease conversions is unclear				
Objective	23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2: Include a new rule to make it clear that subdivision design standards do not apply to cross lease conversions and amend the rules to require boundaries to be	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will achieve the objective as it provides for subdivision of existing development in a functional way.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve the efficiency of the Plan whilst maintaining a functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective and avoid the need for unnecessary resource consent.

based on exclusive pattern of occupation where the underlying cross lease plan does not identify exclusive use areas.				well-designed environment	
Issue	Specifying the average net site area for the General Residential Zone (within the Rototuna Structure Plan area), the Rototuna North East Character Zone and the Special Natural Zone (Ridgeline Character Area) is unnecessary.				
	Specifying the maximum net site area in the General Residential Zone (within the Rototuna Structure Plan area) is unnecessary				
Objective	23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	There are no specifically relevant objectives or policies relevant to the maximum and average net site area.	No clear objectives and policies make the existing provisions difficult to implement. The rule currently results in subdivisions with large balance lots to circumvent the rules.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to the opportunity available to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.	Discard The existing provisions do not align with the objectives
Option 2: Delete the requirements for average and maximum net site area in General Residential Zone (within the Rototuna Structure Plan area), the Rototuna North East Character Zone and the Special Natural Zone (Ridgeline Character Area)	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The minimum density standard is sufficient in achieving the objective for a functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well-designed environment.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve the efficiency of the Plan whilst maintaining a functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well-designed environment	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective and avoid the need for unnecessary resource consent
Issue	It is not clear that any subdivision which results in existing development not complying with development control standards for the underlying zone also requires the granting of a separate land use consent as part of the subdivision.				
	Assessment of compliance with development control standards should not be confined to subdivisions creating additional lots.				
	It is not clear what other rules are required to be complied with to ensure that subdivision suitability requirements of Rule 23.7.2 are met.				

Objective	23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions around whether separate applications are required for land use consent are unclear. On-going confusion can compromise achieving the objectives.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.	There will be a low level of acceptance at a political and social level as there will be on-going confusion with District Plan interpretation.	Discard On-going confusion in achieving the objectives
Option 2: Clearly stipulate land use consent requirements within the subdivision suitability provisions.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Clarification of the subdivision suitability rules aids in ensuring applications achieve the relevant objective.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve the legibility of the Plan whilst maintaining a functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well-designed environment.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective
Issue	Private way length is too short and is inconsistent with the Residential Intensification Zone; the requirement for private ways on cul de sacs are unclear; the private way rules do not align with the transportation chapter				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1 - An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use 23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions are adequate in achieving the objective, however they are not the most efficient.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.	There will be a low level of acceptance at a political and social level as there will be on-going confusion with District Plan interpretation and it misses the opportunity to	Discard An inefficient District Plan is not best practice.

				improve the efficiency of the Plan.	
<p>Option 2: Align the rules with the Transportation chapter</p> <p>Include new requirements for vesting of an access as a public road where more than 6 fee simple lots are to be served and making provision for 7 – 20 units under unit title arrangement to be shared by a private way under common property.</p> <p>Increase the maximum length of a private way in the General Residential Zone from 50m to 100m.</p> <p>Change standards relating to private ways accessing onto a cul-de-sac to apply to the turning head of the cul-de-sac only.</p>	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The provisions will achieve the objectives through enabling safe and efficient access and adequate functioning of the road network.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve the efficiency of the Plan whilst maintaining a functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well-designed environment.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective

APPENDIX 3H: CHAPTER 25.2 EARTHWORKS

Issue	<p>It is not clear what the 12 month period specified in the earthwork rules includes or when this commences.</p> <p>It is not clear what earthworks is limited to when being undertaken within or outside of a building footprint.</p> <p>It is not clear when the rules are to be taken to apply to proposed subdivision and land use activities.</p>				
Objective	Objective 25.2.2.1- Minimise the adverse effects of earthworks and vegetation removal on people, property, and the environment.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				

<p>Option 2: Alter the wording of Policy 25.2.2.1 to include the words 'minimise adverse effects on'</p> <p>Amend Earthworks Rule 25.2.4.1 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove reference to the building footprint and authorised construction work and replace with '<i>associated with any activity requiring building consent (including associated site works)</i>' - Include earthwork provisions for subdivision - Remove reference to 12 month period and replace with one calendar year - Separate requirements for the Special Natural Zone and Rototuna North East Character Zone - Include a standard to ensure earthworks do not result in instability - Include a new standard to ensure earthworks do not cause malfunction or result in the damage of network utilities. 	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option will achieve the objective to minimise the adverse effects of earthworks and vegetation removal.</p>	<p>This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.</p>	<p>This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	<p>Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective whilst improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan.</p>
---	--	---	---	--	---

- Simplify volume standards					
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 3I: CHAPTER 25.5- LANDSCAPING AND SCREENING

Issue	Landscaping and screening requirements are considered unnecessarily complicated and onerous. Residential service areas should not be required to be fenced or screened from neighbouring residential properties				
Objectives	<p>Objective 4.2.3- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.</p> <p>Objective 4.4.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p> <p>Objective 4.2.5- Protect and enhance the character values of the Hamilton East portion of the Residential Intensification Zone.</p> <p>Objective 5.2.1- The Special Character Zones retain and enhance their identified values.</p> <p>Objective 5.2.2- Residential development produces good on-site amenity.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Delete the requirement for screening of residential service areas when these are visible from other residential properties.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Amenity values can be maintained and enhanced without compulsory screening of service areas between residential units.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives. If residents would like to maintain or enhance the amenity on their properties, they can always provide screening.	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it increases flexibility of developers and reduces unnecessary need for resource consent.</p> <p>There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.</p>	Evaluate further This option will improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan whilst achieving good on-site amenity.
Issue	Landscaping and screening requirements are considered unnecessarily complicated and onerous. Landscaping requirements for boundaries with Open Space Zones should not be treated differently to Residential and Special Character Zone boundaries.				
Purpose	Avoid unnecessary resource consent achieving good on-site and neighbourhood amenity				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				

<p>Option 2- Require the provision of a buffer strip along an Open Space Zone.</p> <p>Reduce the width of a buffer strip in the Industrial Zone where adjoining the Residential and Special Character Zone.</p> <p>Enable fences to be constructed on the boundary of a property unless they adjoin a transport corridor or other publicly owned land.</p>	<p>REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)</p>	<p>This option would achieve the objectives by contributing to good amenity of the Residential, Special Character and Open Space Zone.</p>	<p>It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it enhances the amenity of Open Space Zones whilst not being overly onerous.</p>	<p>Evaluate further This option is consistent with the objectives to achieve good onsite and neighbourhood amenity.</p>
<p>Issue</p>	<p>Landscaping should be required where carparks associated with residential development are proposed to be located within the front yard setback.</p>				
<p>Objectives</p>	<p>Objective 4.4.4- The development contributes to good neighbourhood amenity as the area matures.</p>				
<p>Options (See page 2 for header description)</p>	<p>Description (brief)</p>	<p>Relevance</p>	<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>Acceptability</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Option 1- Do nothing</p>	<p>Retain the existing provisions</p>	<p>The provisions will not work adequately to achieve the objective for good neighbourhood amenity if the interface rules are amended as proposed as part of this plan change.</p>	<p>It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.</p>	<p>This option would have a reasonable level of political and social acceptance.</p>	<p>Discard This option will not be effective in achieving the objectives if the interface rules are changed as part of this plan change.</p>

Option 2- Include a new landscaping requirement for the provision of a planting strip where parking spaces are located within 3m of the front boundary in the Residential Zone.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives by enhancing the amenity of the Residential Zone.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it enhances amenity whilst improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan and reducing the need for unnecessary interface resource consents.	Evaluate further This option is consistent with the objectives whilst improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.
Issue	Planting strips are ineffective in screening activities and softening buildings where industrial properties back onto a Major Arterial Road				
Objectives	Objective 25.5.2.1- To maintain and enhance amenity values within and around development, while contributing to local ecology and cultural connection where possible. Objective 9.2.3- The amenity levels of industrial areas are to be enhanced.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	Retain the existing provisions	There is a risk of not achieving the objectives as the existing provisions are not sufficient in enhancing amenity along Major Arterial Roads.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions.	This option would have a reasonable level of political and social acceptance.	Discard This option is not effective in achieving the objectives.
Option 2- Require the provision of a buffer strip along a Major Arterial Road when vehicle access is not obtained.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives by enhancing the amenity of Major Arterial Roads.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a reasonable level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it enhances the appearance of Major Arterial Roads whilst not being overly onerous.	Evaluate further This option is consistent with the objective to enhance the amenity of Major Arterial Transport Corridors
Issue	The number of specimen trees required within parking areas is overly onerous				
Objectives	Objective 25.5.2.1- To maintain and enhance amenity values within and around development, while contributing to local ecology and cultural connection where possible.				

Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 2.</i>				
Option 2- Increase the trigger for provision of additional specimen trees in parking areas	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objectives to enhance and maintain amenity values by softening the bulk of hard surfaces.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	There will be a high level of acceptance to this change at a political and social level as it maintains amenity whilst not being overly onerous. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option is consistent with the objectives to maintain and enhance amenity values whilst avoiding the need for unnecessary resource consent.

APPENDIX 3J: CHAPTER 25.8 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Issue	There are inconsistencies in the noise provisions				
Objective	25.8.2.1-Activities have minimal adverse noise and vibration effects on other activities and sites, consistent with the amenity values of the receiving environment.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions do not adequately achieve the objective for minimal adverse noise effects because the ADDT values held by Council are not reliable and can be out be significant margins; and the rules do not capture designated transport corridors where the carriageway is not defined.	There is a risk that noise levels will not be adequately assessed, and the objective will not be achieved.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to existing ineffective and confusing provisions.	Discard This option does not achieve the objective

Option 2: Redraft the noise sensitive activities rule	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option would achieve the objective of minimal adverse noise effects by the use of clear and concise rules.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it removes the requirement for as it improves the legibility and effectiveness of the Plan rules.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective as it will provide clear and concise provisions.
---	---	---	--	--	---

APPENDIX 3K: CHAPTER 25.10 SIGNS

Issue	No standards for electronic signs are specified for the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zones.				
Objective	Objective 25.10.2.1- Provide for signs which contribute positively to an area and do not compromise visual amenity and transport safety.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the status quo	This option would result in an inconsistent approach to achieving the objective when establishing electronic signage in various zones.	There is a risk that the objective will not be achieved in the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zone due to the lack of standards around electronic signs.	The option would not have a high level of political or community acceptance as it does not enable improvements to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. This inhibits the environmental, social, cultural and economic well-being of the area.	Discard This option does not adequately achieve the objective
Option 2: Include standards for electronic signs in the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura industrial Park Zone	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will achieve consistency with the objective by ensuring that transport safety and visual amenity are not compromised from electronic signs in the Ruakura Logistics and Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	This is within council's powers and responsibilities. It aligns with the existing electronic signage rules in Central City, Business and Industrial Zones which are working sufficiently to achieve the objective in those zones.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will create consistency throughout the Plan whilst maintaining amenity and traffic safety. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective to ensure that transport safety and visual amenity are not compromised.

Issue	Temporary Sign provisions are unnecessarily complex and do not align well with the Electoral Act 1993 election signs provisions				
Objective	Objective 25.10.2.1- Provide for signs which contribute positively to an area and do not compromise visual amenity and transport safety.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1:	Retain the existing provisions	This option would result in ongoing confusion in achieving the objective.	There will be ongoing inefficiencies and confusion with implementation of the provisions.	The option would not have a high level of political or community acceptance as it does not enable improvements to the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. This inhibits the environmental, social, cultural and economic well-being of the area.	Discard This option results in ongoing confusion in achieving the objective.
Option 2: Simplify the existing temporary signage rules by combining the provisions, adjusting the maximum total area of signage per site, deleting the specific provisions for heritage sites, simplifying the height provisions and aligning the size of temporary signs with the Electoral Act 1993.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will simplify the temporary signage provisions while continuing to meet the objective in ensuring that visual amenity, traffic safety and heritage values are maintained.	This is within council's powers and responsibilities. It would improve interpretation and enforcement through alignment with the electoral signage provisions and simplification of the Plan provisions.	This option will have a high level of political and social acceptance as it will simplify the Plan and avoid the requirement for unnecessary resource consent. There will be minimal impacts at a social, economic, environmental and cultural level.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective by ensuring that transport safety and visual amenity are not compromised.

APPENDIX 3L: CHAPTER 25.14 TRANSPORTATION

Issue	<p>The vehicle crossing separation rules are hard to apply in particular, land use consent is required at the time of development where it is not possible to comply with separation distance requirements.</p> <p>The Plan allows multiple entranceways to adjoin or be located within 2m of each other. This has the potential to create adverse amenity and safety effects.</p>
--------------	--

Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1 - An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions allow multiple entrance ways to adjoin or be located within 2m of each other. This does not achieve a safe and efficient transport corridor.	There is a risk that the existing objective will not be adequately achieved.	There will be a low level of acceptance to retaining the existing provisions as they are not the most efficient and result in the potential for adverse environmental effects.	Discard There is a risk of the relevant objective not being achieved.
Option 2: Include an exemption to the vehicle separation distance requirements where there is no ability to comply with the separation distance requirements. Include a provision that subdivisions need to identify a location where a complying entranceway could be located or apply for dispensation as part of the subdivision	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will ensure that the objective is achieved through safe and efficient site access.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision	This option would have a high level of political and community acceptance as it improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective by improving safety and amenity of the transport corridor. It will also improve the efficiency of the Plan.
Issue	<p>There is conflict between formation requirements for vehicle access at land use stage and the legal width at subdivision stage.</p> <p>There is conflict between the number of units that can be served by a private way at land use stage and when a public road is necessary at subdivision stage.</p> <p>No guidance is provided by the District Plan on what formation requirements for a public road serving 7-20 residential units should be.</p>				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1 - An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

(See page 2 for header description)					
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The inconsistency and gaps in the access provisions result in inefficiencies and compromise the ability to achieve the objective relating to safe and efficient access.	The inconsistencies mean that the existing provisions are difficult to implement and enforce.	There will be a low level of acceptance to retaining the existing provisions as they are not the most efficient and result in the potential for adverse environmental effects.	Discard The existing provisions are inefficient and compromise the ability to achieve the objectives.
Option 2: Amend requirements for internal access widths to state legal widths and identify when public roads might be required and what standard of design is expected.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will achieve the objective by providing safe and efficient access.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision	This option would have a high level of political and community acceptance as it improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	Evaluate Further This option will achieve consistency with the objective by providing safe vehicle access.
Issue	Compliance with the internal vehicle access requires exercise of discretionary judgement				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1- Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions require the exercise of discretionary judgement to interpret. This compromises the ability to achieve the objective.	It is difficult to implement or enforce rules which require a discretionary judgement.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to existing ineffective and confusing provisions.	Discard This option results in ongoing confusion in achieving the objective
Option 2: Amend the design and access width requirements to include minimum width and height of access,	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The clear provisions will enable safe and efficient access of vehicles (including emergency vehicles). This will be	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor,	This option would have a high level of political and community acceptance as it improves the	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective.

require splays, require internal vehicle access to remain unobstructed.		effective in achieving the objective.	implement or enforce the provision.	effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	
Issue	There is a contradiction between definition of service area and requirements of a rule and whether it can include access and loading areas.				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	Inconsistencies between the definitions and the rules compromise the ability to achieve the relevant objective.	Inconsistencies between the definitions and the rules compromise the ability to implement, monitor and enforce rules.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to existing confusing provisions and missing the opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.	Discard There is a risk of the relevant objective not being achieved.
Option 2: Exclude access and loading provision in the definition of service area	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option will align the definition with the intent of a service area for storage and clothes drying whilst ensuring that the relevant objectives are achieved.	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision	This option would have a high level of political and community acceptance as it improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective.
Issue	No provision of acceptable tracking curves are contained within the District Plan or Infrastructure Technical Specifications				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

(See page 2 for header description)					
Option 1- Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The existing provisions are not effective in achieving the objective as adequate provision is not provided to ensure that vehicles can access parking spaces and manoeuvre on the site.	The existing parking dimension rules are difficult to implement and enforce to ensure usable parking spaces.	Low level of acceptance at a social and political level due to existing confusing provisions and missing the opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the District Plan.	Discard There is a risk of the relevant objective not being achieved.
Option 2- Include tracking curve diagrams in the District Plan for 99th percentile car tracking curve for internal manoeuvring, 90th percentile car tracking curve for parking space manoeuvring, 8m Medium Rigid Truck for loading spaces.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Provision of tracking curves will achieve the objective for a transport network that is responsive, efficient, affordable, safe, accessible, sustainable and integrated with land use	This is within Council's powers and responsibilities. It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provision	This option would have a high level of political and community acceptance as it improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the Plan. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	Evaluate further This option will achieve consistency with the objective and remove reference to non-existent provisions.
Issue	The Integrated Transport Assessment requirements are excessive; and consent triggers for Integrated Transport Assessments are unnecessary				
Objective	Objective 25.14.2.1- An integrated multi-modal transport network that meets national, regional and local transport needs and is Responsive, Efficient, Affordable, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable and Integrated with land use				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	<i>Discard for the same reasons as Option 1 on Page 3.</i>				
Option 2- Amend the tables for Simple and Broad Integrated Transport Assessment checklists to remove unnecessary information requirements	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	This option sets out information requirements and triggers for simple and broad integrated transport assessments which are sufficient to achieve the objective for a transport network that is	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There will be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan whilst maintaining the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions whilst achieving the objectives of the Plan.

Alter the thresholds and circumstances under which requirement to provide any Integrated Transport Assessment is triggered		responsive, efficient, affordable, safe, accessible, sustainable and integrated with land use			
--	--	---	--	--	--

APPENDIX 3M: APPENDIX 1 INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

Issue	Too much information is required to be provided upfront with resource consent applications. Council staff should be afforded the discretion to determine what information they require on a case by case basis.				
Objectives	None identified				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option ensures there is full detailed information provided with an application for resource consent in order to make a good assessment on whether a proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Plan.	Whilst the objectives of the Plan are achieved, information is currently being requested that is not necessary to assess an application.	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current requirements are excessive.	Discard Whilst this option achieves the objective it is excessive.
Option 2: Amend the information requirements to be less mandatory in some cases.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	There are no relevant objectives. Council staff should be afforded the discretion to decide what information is required in order to make an adequate assessment against the objectives relevant to the rule failure.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There will be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan whilst Council staff maintain the ability to require additional information deemed necessary to assess the application.	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions whilst achieving the objectives of the Plan.
Issue	Too much information is required to be provided with subdivision applications.				
Objectives	23.2.2- Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well designed environments.				
Options	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

(See page 2 for header description)					
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option ensures there is full detailed information provided with subdivision resource consent applications in order to make a good assessment on whether a proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Plan.	Whilst the objectives of the Plan are achieved, information is currently being requested that is not necessary to assess an application.	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current requirements are excessive.	Discard Whilst this option achieves the objective it is excessive.
Option 2: Remove requirement for a concept analysis plan and site analysis plan as being part of any subdivision concept plan.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Council staff should be afforded the discretion to decide what information is required in order to make an adequate assessment against the objectives relevant to the rule failure.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There will be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan whilst Council staff maintain the ability to require additional information deemed necessary to assess the application. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions
Issue	The requirement for upfront detailed landscaping plans is problematic because it forces design responses to be finalised before detailed design of the development has been completed.				
Objectives	25.5.2.1-To maintain and enhance amenity values within and around development, while contributing to local ecology and cultural connection where possible.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option ensures that a detailed landscaping plan is provided at the time of lodgement of a resource	Whilst the objective of the Plan is achieved, detailed landscaping plans are not always necessary to	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as	Discard Whilst this option achieves the objective it is excessive.

		consent. This enables a thorough assessment on whether a proposal is consistent with the relevant objective of the Plan.	adequately assess an application where there is a landscaping infringement.	the current requirements are excessive.	
Option 2: Delete the requirement for a detailed landscaping plan as part of resource consent and replace with a provision which requires developers to demonstrate how landscaping and screening requirements will be accommodated.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Conditions of consent are able to be included to ensure that adequate landscaping is provided in order to meet the objective.	The processing planner can make their own assessment on the level of landscaping detailed required. It is within councils powers, responsibilities and resources to include conditions of consent in relation to landscaping detail. There is a low risk of the objective not being achieved.	There will be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option reduces the need for finalised design responses before detailed design of development has been completed. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions
Issue	The Water Impact Assessment information requirements re-state the rules.				
Objectives	25.14.2.3- Three Waters infrastructure is provided as part of subdivision and development, and in a way that is Integrated, Effective, Efficient, Functional, Safe and Sustainable				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option adequately achieves the objectives.	Whilst the objectives of the Plan are achieved, information is currently being requested that is not necessary to assess an application.	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current requirements are excessive.	Discard Whilst this option achieves the objective it is excessive.
Option 2: The information requirement be re-written to delete reference to the situations where a water impact assessment is required to be provided.	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Existing provisions adequately cover when a water impact assessment should be provided and the assessment of three water failures. This option will not reduce the	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There will be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan.	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions

		ability to ensure integrated, effective, efficient, functional, safe and sustainable three waters infrastructure is achieved.		At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects.	
Issue	The requirement for a waste minimisation plan for activities not complying with a zone service or outdoor area requirement, or activities that fail to provide appropriate on-site areas for recycling and litter bins is excessive.				
Objectives	Objective 25.12.2.1- Reduce the amount of solid waste generated and ultimately entering landfills Objective 25.12.2.2- Solid waste activities and facilities are managed in a way that addresses adverse effects from the storage and disposal of solid waste.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	This option ensures that a waste minimisation plan is provided at the time of lodgement of a resource consent where there is a service area or outdoor storage area infringement. This requirement is excessive, and the processing planner can still request this information if considered necessary to ensure that the relevant objective is achieved.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the existing provisions	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current provisions are unnecessary and excessive.	Discard The existing provisions are unnecessary and excessive.
Option 2: Delete the waste minimisation plan information requirement	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Council staff can use their discretion to request additional information considered necessary to ensure that the objectives relevant to storage are achieved.	This option is feasible. The existing information requirements are excessive.	There would be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan. At a broad level there will be minimal social,	Evaluate further This option achieves the objectives whilst removing unnecessary provisions.

				economic, environmental and cultural effects	
Issue	The information requirements for Managed Care Facilities re-iterate specific zone standards.				
Objectives	<p>4.2.1 - A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the needs of all communities.</p> <p>4.2.7- Activities in Residential Zones are compatible with residential amenity.</p> <p>5.2.1- The Special Character Zones retain and enhance their identified values.</p> <p>16.2.1- Ongoing operation and development of accessible community facilities.</p> <p>16.2.2- Activities have minimal adverse environmental effects.</p>				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The information requirement aids in assessment of objectives.	This information requirement is duplicated as rules and is therefore unnecessary in order to achieve objectives and implement, monitor and enforce provisions.	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current provisions are unnecessary.	Discard Duplicated provisions are unnecessary
Option 2: Delete information requirement for managed care facilities	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	The existing rules will ensure any objectives relevant to the operation of managed care facilities are achieved.	This option will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There would be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan.	Evaluate further This option removes duplicated provisions.
Issue	The Centres Assessment Report requirements are excessive and result in time delays and additional costs for resource consent applications.				
Objectives	2.2.4 - Establish and maintain a hierarchy of viable and vibrant business centres that provide a focus for retail, commercial and entertainment activities and serve the social, cultural, environmental and economic needs of the community.				
Options	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation

(See page 2 for header description)					
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing provisions	The information requirement aids in assessment of objectives.	Whilst it is within council's powers to request this information it is unnecessary and excessive in some cases.	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance as the current provisions are unnecessary in some cases.	Discard Retains unnecessary and excessive provisions.
Option 2: Amend the information requirement so that Council staff can determine what needs a centres assessment	REEP recommendation (described in detail in page 3)	Council staff have the discretion to determine whether a centres assessment should be provided. There is adequate scope within the rules to ensure that the objectives will be achieved.	It will not require any additional resources to monitor, implement or enforce the provisions. There is a low risk of not achieving the objectives.	There would be a high level of community and political acceptance as this option simplifies the Plan and removes unnecessary requirements. At a broad level there will be minimal social, economic, environmental and cultural effects	Evaluate further This option removes unnecessary provisions

APPENDIX 3N: APPENDIX 17 PLANNING MAPS

Issue	The National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor shown on the planning maps is incorrectly mapped on Maps 4A&B, 10A&B, 29A&B, 38A&B, 48A&B				
Objectives	Objective 25.7.2.1- The importance of network utilities to support the development and functioning of Hamilton is recognised. Objective 25.7.2.4- Efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of the existing electricity transmission network and to enable the establishment of new electricity transmission resources.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Keep the Planning Maps as they are	This approach is not effective in achieving the objective as the National Grid Corridor and National Grid Yard are incorrectly mapped. This does not enable the efficient operation,	This does not satisfy councils responsibilities under the RMA (s5 and s31). This also does not give effect to higher order statutory documents including the National Policy Statement and	There would be a low level of community and political acceptance to not correcting an error in the Plan. This approach could have a significant effect as	Discard This option does not achieve the objective and does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, National Policy Statement and RMA.

		<p>maintenance and upgrade of the electricity network.</p>	<p>Waikato Regional Policy Statement. There is a high risk of not achieving the objectives as the incorrect mapping could allow sensitive activities to establish and buildings to be constructed in areas which should be protected by the National Grid Yard.</p>	<p>there would be no control of buildings in areas which should be protected by the National Grid Yard.</p>	
<p>Option 2: Amend the planning maps to reflect the national grid data provided to Council in July 2012.</p>	<p>In April 2011 data was received by Council and used to map the national grid. In July 2012 updated data was received from Transpower in relation to the national grid. This was not incorporated into the District Plan due to the Proposed District Plan (PDP) being notified at the same time. The PDP maps continued to use the 2011 data and not the new data received in 2012.</p> <p>Due to proposed development in Tramway Road further investigation was undertaken and it was found that the National</p>	<p>Correctly mapping the National Transmission Corridor and Yard in the Planning Maps is consistent with the Objectives 25.7.2.1 and 25.7.2.4 of the District Plan which seek to provide for safe and efficient operation and maintenance of infrastructure, avoid reverse sensitivity effects and maintain the amenity and safety of the residents.</p>	<p>This option would ensure that the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement is given effect to.</p>	<p>There will be a high level of political and community acceptance to correcting and error in the Plan. The location of the transmission lines will not be change.</p> <p>This option will improve safety of the community and ensure on-going electricity supply.</p>	<p>Evaluate further This option will achieve the objectives and give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, National Policy Statement and RMA by correctly positioning the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor in the District Plan</p>

	Grid and National Grid Corridor are incorrectly mapped in the current District Plan.				
Issue	Lot 2 DP 425316 needs to be re-zoned as Destination Open Space to align with the Local Purpose Reserve use that was gazetted on the site in July 2016				
Objective	Objective 15.2.9 -Provide high-quality open spaces that cater for a city-wide and regional catchment and accommodate a variety of uses and values.				
Options (See page 2 for header description)	Description (brief)	Relevance	Feasibility	Acceptability	Recommendation
Option 1: Do Nothing	Retain the existing zone.	The gazetted local purpose reserve use for the site does not align with the objectives for the Special Natural Zone. The site will not be used for residential purposes.	There is a risk that Council will not be able to use the site for the purpose which it was gazetted for.	There will be a low level of acceptance to this option as it does not align with the gazetted local purpose reserve use of the site.	Discard The objectives do not align with the intended purpose of the site.
Option 2: Rezone Lot 2 DP 425316 as Destination Open Space Zone and make all relevant consequential changes to the Plan.	In May 2016 Council declared the subject site (Lot 2 DP 425316) local purpose reserve. It was Gazetted as a Reserve-Waiwhakareke Natural Heritage Park on 7 July 2016. The site is currently zoned Special Natural Zone, Rotokauri -Lake Waiwhakareke Landscape Character Area. This zone enables residential development through Comprehensive Development Plan resource consent	The objectives of the Destination Open Space Zone align with the use of the site. The site provides for open space that allows people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing.	Re-zoning the site will enable council to implement, monitor and enforce the local purpose zone use of the site.	There will be a high level of political and social acceptance as it aligns with Council's decision in 2016 to declare the land as Local Purpose Reserve. The zoning also aligns with the adjoining reserve. There are social, cultural and environmental benefits to re-zoning the land as Destination Open Space Zone.	Evaluate further This option will achieve the objective and is consistent with the purpose of the site.

	applications. The site needs to be re-zoned to align with its purpose as requested by the Parks and Open Spaces Unit.				
--	---	--	--	--	--