

**SECTION 32 REPORT
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN
CHANGE 76**

Section 32 Report

PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 76: GENERAL MINOR AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT PLAN TEXT AND MAPS

1.0 Introduction

The Council is required to undertake an evaluation of the Proposed Plan Change before the Plan Change can be publicly notified. This duty is conferred by Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act). This evaluation must examine:

- (a) *the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act; and*
- (b) *whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.*

An evaluation must also take into account:

- (a) *the benefits and costs of policies, rules, or other methods; and*
- (b) *the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules or other methods.*

Benefits and costs are defined as including benefits and costs of any kind, whether monetary or non-monetary.

A report must be prepared summarising the evaluation and giving reasons for the evaluation, and must be available for public inspection at the time the proposed Plan Change is publicly notified. This report is Wellington City Council's response to this statutory requirement.

2.0 Statutory Context

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management includes managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety.

Section 6 of the Act contains an explicit obligation for territorial authorities to *maintain and enhance amenity values and the quality of the environment, and to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.*

Section 7 of the Act states that in managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, Council must have particular regard to (amongst other things):

- (b) *the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources*
- (c) *the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values,*

(d) intrinsic values of ecosystems.

3.0 Description of the Plan Change

This Plan Change comprises 68 separate minor changes to the District Plan. The changes include a number of re-zonings; text changes; and the removal of a number of heritage tree listings (where the trees no longer exist).

This Plan Change does not involve any changes to existing objectives and policies and proposes to make general minor amendments to the District Plan in order to ensure its efficient functioning. Due to the nature of the proposed amendments there are only limited options available and this report has been prepared to address the Section 32 requirements.

3.1 Rezoning for Open Space and Conservation Purposes (Maps A to X)

In 2009 and 2010, Parks and Gardens undertook a Reserves Classification Study to tidy up the classifications of parks and reserves under the Reserves Act 1977. This will strengthen and standardise the protection of the reserves included. During this study, a number of District Plan zonings were identified as being incorrect for the use of the land and subsequently, Parks and Gardens have requested to have the zoning of these areas changed.

All of the park and reserve land included in the wider Reserves Classification Study and the Proposed Plan Change are Council owned. None of the parks and reserves are being removed from Council ownership or are losing their reserve status.

The zoning changes proposed for the reserve sites will better reflect the actual and intended recreation use of the reserves and better protect and enhance the recreation, heritage, ecological and/or landscape values of these reserves. A range of different zone changes are proposed and a detailed list is provided in the Plan Change document (Appendix 1).

The District Plan contains a range of zonings that reflect the different types of reserves that Councils owns and manages. A brief description of the different types is provided below:

- Open Space A – active recreation, sports fields, community halls, and sports buildings and club rooms;
- Open Space B – passive recreation, walking tracks with an emphasis on protecting the natural environment;
- Open Space C – Inner Town Belt; and
- Conservation Site – sites identified for their ecological value.

In general the zone changes proposed are from one type of Open Space zoning to another, from Open Space to Conservation Site or from Rural or Residential to an Open Space zoning.

3.2 Other Rezonings

3.2.1 Quarry Site, Owhiro Bay (Map 8)

In November 2009, the Environment Court issued a Consent Order on Plan Change 55 which confirmed that the majority of the former Owhiro Bay quarry site would be rezoned from Rural to Open Space B. As part of that Consent Order, the Court also rezoned the Hape Stream catchments and the catchment above Whare Raurekau (baches) located within the former quarry site as Conservation Area. As with any Consent Order issued by the Environment Court, this had immediate effect in the District Plan. Although the zoning is now operative, there still remains an agreed outstanding appeal matter relating to Conservation Site zoning on the site that is now being addressed as part of Plan Change 76.

In October 2007 Council released its decision on Plan Change 55 confirming the Open Space B zoning for the former quarry site. The decision also included a recommendation to investigate the conservation values of the area. This decision was appealed by Southern Environmental Association (Wellington) Incorporated (SEA) who requested that the Hape Stream catchments and the catchment above Whare Raurekau (baches) be zoned Conservation Site immediately.

As part of the mediation process, Council undertook a ecological study of the wider area which showed that the catchments identified by SEA, as well as the upper areas of the site, indeed had sufficient values to warrant their recognition as Conservation Site in the District Plan. The terraced area of the former quarry however, is still in a state of rehabilitation and does not hold quite the same value and therefore Open Space B zoning would be more applicable. This outcome was acceptable to SEA and in November 2008, the Council's Regulatory Processes Committee agreed to settle the appeal on this basis. However, when this mediated settlement was presented to the Environment Court, they considered that the Conservation Site zoning of the upper areas of the site was beyond the scope of SEA's appeal. As a result, the above mentioned Consent Order was issued instead. Given the position taken by the Court, it was agreed by the appellants and Council that the Conservation Site zoning would be addressed via a future Plan Change.

The proposed rezoning of part of this site from Open Space B to Conservation Site is therefore the final stage of Council's commitment made during the resolution of the Plan Change 55 Appeals. An ecological assessment has confirmed the conservation values of the site and the proposed rezoning will reflect this formally in the District Plan. In addition to the rezoning on the District Plan Map 8, a description of the Conservation Site will be inserted in Chapter 19 (Conservation Site) as shown in Map 8 of Attachment 1 to this report.

3.2.2 Part of Salisbury Garden Court (M6)

Land adjoining Salisbury Garden Court is owned by Wellington City Council. WCC purchased this land in 2008. The land adjoins the Inner Town Belt and its current zoning is Residential (Outer). The land will not be used for residential purposes and looks and feels part of the adjoining town belt area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the land be rezoned to Open Space B to reflect its actual and intended use and improve and enhance the recreational opportunities of the adjoining residential area.

APPENDIX 2

3.2.3 11 Vennell St (Map 4)

The land at 11 Vennell Street was formerly a works depot used by the City Operations Business Unit of the Wellington City Council. The depot has since closed. The site is zoned Open Space A, but is not a reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

The site adjoins the Vogelmorn Community Hall and Bowling Club to the west and the Vogeltown Tennis Club is located across the road to the north. The land has been used in the past as spill over car parking for the tennis and bowling clubs and part of the property was used to provide alternative pedestrian access to a tennis club residential building adjoining the rear of the property to the south.

All building improvements, other than the remains of a concrete structure, have been removed from the site and the property has become overgrown.

It is considered that a residential zoning is appropriate as it adjoins residential properties to the east and it is in close proximity to existing community facilities. It is proposed to rezone the property from Open Space A to Residential (Outer).

3.2.4 Land Adjoining Houghton Bay School (Map 7)

Two lots adjoining Houghton Bay School (Lots 1 & 2 DP 9018) were transferred from a private owner to Wellington City Council in 1957.

In 2009, the Ministry of Education applied for, and was granted, an extension to the designation around Houghton Bay School to include Sec 1 SO 384813 (land on which the existing Houghton Bay school playground is located) to the east of the two Council owned lots. This lot lies between the Council owned lots and the residential lots adjoining Houghton Bay Rd.

Lots 1 & 2 DP 9018 are now land locked with no legal access or road frontage and would be inappropriate to develop for residential purposes. It is therefore considered appropriate to change the zoning of the land to Open Space A. The lots are contiguous with an area of existing Open Space A to the west of the land.

3.2.5 Sunhaven Drive, Newlands (adjoining 28 and 43 Sunhaven Drive) (Map5)

The land at Sunhaven Drive was recently purchased by Wellington City Council. It is currently zoned Residential (Outer).

The site contains road frontage onto Sunhaven Drive which leads to a steep site containing regenerating vegetation. The site adjoins an existing Conservation Area (5I Gilberts Bush). It is proposed that the land be rezoned to Conservation Area (5I Gilberts Bush) to become part of the existing conservation site.

3.2.6 16 & 16A Monorgan Rd, Strathmore (Map 1)

A zone change is proposed for 16 & 16 A Monorgan Rd from Airport and Golf Course Precinct to Residential (Outer). Previously part of the Airport and Golf Course Precinct the land has now been developed for residential use and is no longer required for Airport or Golf Course purposes.

APPENDIX 2

3.2.7 Girl Guide Land (Map 3)

44 Silverstream Road is a large Conservation Site owned by the Girl Guides. The site contains a clubroom, a carparking area, grassed areas, a ropes course and a steep hillside covered in native bush.

In 2006, Wellington City Council agreed that the current Conservation Site zoning of the lower portion of the site containing the grassed area, ropes course, carpark and clubrooms, did not reflect the existing use requirements of that part of the site.

It was proposed to include a rezoning within a Plan Change relating to Huntleigh Park (Plan Change 61). However, it was later decided to exclude the girls guides land as it was considered inappropriate to have the rezoning of the girl guides land tied up in a controversial rezoning proposal at Huntleigh Park Way, Heke St, and Thatcher Crescent.

Hence, a zone change from Conservation to Open Space B is seen as appropriate to reflect the lands actual use.

It is proposed to rezone 0.80 hectares of the site containing the grassed area, ropes course, carpark and clubrooms from Conservation Site to Open Space B. The remainder of the site will retain its Conservation Site status.

3.3 Removal of Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, Khouri Ave (Map 2)

It is proposed to remove the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay line from the properties at 43, 45, 47 and 49 Khouri Avenue, Karori. These four properties have been developed for residential purposes as part of a previous Council plan change and land exchange process with Wellington City Council. The overlay line was introduced to protect ridgelines and hilltops of significant value to the Wellington landscape. The ridgeline and hilltops overlay is not considered appropriate now the properties have been developed.

3.4 Night Flying Operations

The District Plan currently allows for defence aircraft to take off outside of the night flying operation hours (i.e. after midnight) for national Civil Defence Emergencies but does not provide for flights outside night flying operation hours to respond to international Civil Defence Emergencies. Responding to the Samoan tsunami in 2009 the NZ Defence Force was breaching the night flying operation rules when taking off after midnight.

It is therefore proposed to amend Rule 11.1.1.1.6 in the District Plan to allow for New Zealand Defence Forces to respond to International Civil Defence Emergencies outside of the night flying operation hours.

Additionally, the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 1983 has been replaced by the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002. The Civil Defence Emergency Act 2002 changes the terminology from 'national or civil defence emergency' to 'any state of civil defence emergency'. Therefore, it is proposed to amend the wording of the rule to align with the correct legislation and terminology used in that legislation.

3.5 Heritage Tree Listings (Maps 9 to 14)

In 2008 Council undertook a study of heritage trees around the city. At the completion of this study, it was found that six of the heritage trees identified in the District Plan have either died; been removed; or upon visiting the sites, were no longer there. Parks and Gardens have requested that the individual listing of these six trees to be removed from the District Plan.

4.0 Process & Consultation

4.1 Identification of Issues and Statutory Consultation

Since the District Plan became operative, a file has been maintained of issues or items that might be dealt with by way of a change to the Plan. At least once a year, minor items are been collected and put forward as a composite Plan Change.

Consultation on the entire proposed District Plan Change has been undertaken with those parties identified in the First Schedule of the RMA as follows:

- Ministry for the Environment
- Tenth's Trust (Te Atiawa)
- Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira Inc
- Greater Wellington (Regional Council)
- Department of Conservation

4.2 Specific Consultation

Consultation has been done for specific sites only.

4.2.1 Reserve Rezoning

The proposed rezoning of reserve land has been the subject of consultation undertaken under the Reserves Act 1977. Submissions on the reserve reclassifications closed on 10 December 2010. While the consultation was specifically about reserve classifications under the Reserves Act the consultation document did highlight that as a result of reserve classification changes, zoning changes under the District Plan would also be necessary and that Plan Changes are required.

4.2.2 11 Vennell Street

Council's use and disposal of this property has been the subject of several reports to SPC and as part of this process Property (WCC) has talked to the local community about the future use of this land. Opportunities were provided to interested groups to submit feasibility studies and/or discuss possible uses for recreation uses.

APPENDIX 2

In addition, letters were sent out to neighbouring properties of 11 Vennell Street to explain the proposed rezoning and the plan change process. The letters explained when the plan change will be publicly notified and that they will have the opportunity to make a submission at that time if they wished

4.2.3 16 and 16A Monorgan Road

Letters were sent to the owners of 16 and 16A Monorgan Road to explain the proposals and the plan change process necessary to amend the zoning. The letters outlined the approximate date of notification and the opportunities that are provided for public submissions.

4.2.3 Airport Noise Management Committee

A letter was also sent to the Airport Noise Management Committee to inform them of Council's intentions to amend Rule 11.1.1.1.6 to allow for night flying operations in the event of a civil emergency.

5.0 Options

The following eleven tables provide an analysis of the costs and benefits of the proposed amendments.

This analysis enables an assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the proposed Plan Change. Instead of assessing the selected cases individually, a cost/benefit and appropriateness assessment has been undertaken for each subject group.

Only two options have been considered for these assessments due to the nature of the proposed minor amendments; do nothing or to amend the District Plan as proposed.

Table 1: S32 analysis of the changes to the zoning at Owhiro Bay		
	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change of the old quarry site in Owhiro Bay (Lot 1 DP 26786 and Lot 1 DP 61218) from Open Space B to Conservation Site	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – Medium. If proposed zoning is not applied then conservation values of the site may be lost and inappropriate development may occur. Open Space B allows a greater degree of development and provides for recreation activities and does not necessarily provide for the protection of ecological values. Economic costs – None identified Social costs – High. Community concern at potential loss of ecological values demonstrated through appeals on District Plan Change 55. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – None identified Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change. Social costs – Low. Loss of potential passive recreational use with the rezoning.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – None identified Economic benefits – None identified Social benefits – Low. Potential use of site for passive recreation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – High. Conservation site can be maintained and enhanced and development restricted, which will enable the ecological and landscape values of the land to be protected and enhanced. Economic benefits – None identified Social benefits – High. Ecological values can be enhanced, and community aspirations for the protection of the site will be met.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively be achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate, because the zoning of the site does not reflect the current land use (and may lead to land use conflicts and greater costs of compliance). Open Space zoning provides for the maintenance and enhancement of recreational values and does not necessarily provide for the protection of the ecology/conservation values of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate, because proposed changes reflect current land use and will allow the conservation values of the site to be protected and enhanced.

Table 2: S32 analysis of the changes to the zoning at Salisbury Court

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change of part of Salisbury Garden Court from Residential Area (Outer) to Open Space B (Natural Environment)	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – High. If proposed zoning is not applied the natural character and recreation values of the site may be lost. The current zoning would allow residential development that would be inappropriate in this location which adjoins the Inner Town Belt and the Salisbury Garden Court Heritage Area. • Economic costs – None identified • Social costs – High. If the land is inappropriately developed as a result of the residential zoning, the site becomes unavailable for active or passive recreational use. Also the loss of setting to adjoining heritage building (Salisbury Garden Court) and Inner Town Belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – High. Missed revenue from the sale of the property for residential use on the open market. • Social costs – None identified
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – High. Land remains available for residential development. • Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – High. Open Space land can be maintained and enhanced (with landscaping, plantings, paths etc) which will enable the natural and landscape values of the land to be protected and enhanced. • Economic benefits – Medium. Improvements in Open Space areas can help improve surrounding property values • Social benefits – High. Recreational opportunities can be enhanced (e.g. at playground and park sites, bush walks etc)
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan's objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan's objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. • Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.

APPENDIX 2

Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate, because the zoning of the site does not reflect the current land use (and may lead to land use conflicts and greater costs of compliance). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate, because proposed changes reflect current land use. The land is owned by Council and adjoins the Town Belt.
--	--	---

Table 3: Section 32 analysis of the Rezonings at Vennell Street

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change to 11 Vennell Street, Brooklyn from Open Space A to Residential Area (Outer)	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – High. Land remains in unkempt condition and remains unsightly. Economic costs – High. Economic potential of the land can not be presently realised. Land cannot be used for residential development except by applying for a resource consent. Social costs – Medium. Land remains under utilised and does not contribute to the community in a positive way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs –Low. May be loss of some natural values when land is developed. Economic costs – Low. Cost of processing the Plan Change. Social costs – Low. Loss of poor quality greenspace.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – Low. May be some natural values associated with undeveloped land. Economic benefits – None identified Social benefits – Low. Greenspace maintained but quality of space is low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – High. Future residential development will enhance the local environment. Economic benefits – High. Land value is maximised and land can be fully utilised for development without Open Space A provisions restricting development. Social benefits – High. Residential development will contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the local community.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan's objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan's objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. Improves the efficient and effective functioning of the District Plan.

APPENDIX 2

Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate because, the zoning of this site only provides for recreation and community facilities. These activities are already well represented in the immediate and wider neighbourhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate because, land adjoins existing residential zone and is close to community facilities such as schools and clubs and future residential users of the land will benefit from these facilities and add to the quality of the local environment.
--	--	---

Table 4: S32 analysis of the changes to the zoning at Houghton Bay School

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change to Houghton Bay School (Pt Lot 1 DP 9018 & Pt Lot 2 DP 9018) from Residential (Outer) to Open Space B	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – Low. Inappropriate zoning can result in inappropriate land use. Economic costs – None identified Social costs – Medium. Potential for land to be used for other than recreational uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – None identified Economic costs – Low. Land has no access and so is not available for development. Social costs – None identified
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – None identified Economic benefits – None identified. While land is zoned residential, it is not available for development because of lack of access. Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – High. Open Space land can be maintained and enhanced (with landscaping, plantings, paths etc) which will enable the natural and landscape values of the land to be protected and enhanced. Economic benefits – High. Improvements in Open Space areas can help improve surrounding property values. Social benefits – High. Passive recreational opportunities can be enhanced.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan's residential objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning as the land has no legal access and therefore cannot be developed for residential purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan's objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land cannot be developed for residential purposes and therefore is not appropriate in achieving the plans objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate, because the land will be zoned in accordance with its use.

Table 5: S32 analysis of the changes to the zoning at Sunhaven Drive

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change to Sunhaven Drive (Lot 1 DP 433198) from Residential (Outer) to Conservation 5l	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – Medium. Residential zoning does not reflect values of adjoining conservation site, and value of access to the site. • Economic costs – Medium. If inappropriate zoning has to be changed at a later stage through a Private Plan Change (additional costs of compliance) or if inappropriate decisions are made when sites are not zoned appropriately • Social costs – Low. Potential for land to be used for other than conservation uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change. • Social costs – None identified
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – Medium. Land could be utilised/sold to adjoining land owners for residential purposes. • Social benefits – Low. May be some benefits to adjoining owners if land was available for their use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – High. Conservation land can be maintained and enhanced which will enable the ecological and landscape values of the land to be protected and enhanced. • Economic benefits – High. Improvements in conservation areas can help improve surrounding property values. • Social benefits - High. Appropriately zoned access to existing conservation land provides additional opportunities for active and passive recreation.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. • Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has (or is intending) to purchase this site for access to an exiting block of land zoned conservation. The site is vacant and does not contain any residential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land will be zoned in accordance with its intended use; will provide additional access to a block of land zoned conservation; and adjoins existing conservation zoned land.

Table 6: S32 analysis of the changes to the zoning at 16 and 16A Monorgan Road

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Zone Change Airport and Golf Course Recreation Precinct land at 16 and 16A Monorgan Rd, Strathmore (Lots 1 & 2 DP 81401) to Residential (Outer)	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – Medium. Inappropriate zoning may result in the owners having to obtain Resource Consents for activities that would normally be permitted under the correct zoning. • Social costs – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs –Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change. • Social costs – None identified
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – High. The zoning will reflect the actual use of the land • Economic benefits – High. The land can be used for residential purposes without the need to obtain a resource consent. • Social benefits – None identified
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. • Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considered appropriate, because the land is not being used for Airport/Golf course purposes and contains residential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate, because the land is being used for residential purposes.

Table 7: S32 analysis of the changes to zoning of Girl Guide Land at 44 Silverstream Road

	<p>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings</p>	<p>OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.</p>
	<p>Zone Change to Girl Guide Land at Silverstream Road, Crofton Downs from Conservation Site to Open Space A</p>	
<p>Costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – High. If inappropriate zoning has to be changed at a later stage through a Private Plan Change (additional costs of compliance) or if inappropriate decisions are made when sites are not zoned appropriately. Inappropriate zoning may also result in Resource Consents for an activity that would normally be permitted under the correct zoning. • Social costs – High. Potential for the Conservation Site zoning to restrict use for girl guiding activities (active and passive recreation activities). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – Low. The portion of the site proposed to be rezoned is relatively flat and grassy. It is currently used for outdoor recreation activities associated with the girl guiding. • Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change • Social costs – None identified
<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – High. The activities currently undertaken can continue. The rezoning of the site will correctly reflect the actual use of the site. Recreational opportunities and girl guiding activities can be enhanced.
<p>Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. • Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
<p>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considered appropriate because the zoning of the site does not reflect the current land use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate, because proposed zone changes reflect current land use and will better provide for future girl guiding activities.

Table 8: S32 analysis of the changes to zoning of Parks and Reserves land

	<p>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings</p>	<p>OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.</p>
	<p>Zone Changes to Parks and Reserves land (Council owned)</p>	
<p>Costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – High. If proposed zoning is not applied to sites with natural character or recreation values (Open Space) then these values may be lost. • Economic costs – High. If inappropriate zoning has to be changed at a later stage through a Private Plan Change (additional costs of compliance) or if inappropriate decisions are made when sites are not zoned appropriately. Inappropriate zoning may also result in Council having to obtain Resource Consent for an activity that would normally be permitted under the correct zoning. • Social costs – High. If the Open Space sites become unavailable for active or passive recreational use due to inappropriate zoning and development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change. • Social costs – None identified
<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – High. Open Space land can be maintained and enhanced (with landscaping, plantings, paths etc) which will enable the ecological and landscape values of the land to be protected and enhanced. • Economic benefits – Medium. Improvements in Open Space areas can help improve surrounding property values. • Social benefits – High. Recreational opportunities can be enhanced (e.g. at playground and park sites, bush walks etc).
<p>Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan’s objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. • Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.

Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate because the zoning of selected sites does not reflect the current land use (and may lead to land use conflicts and greater costs of compliance). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate, because proposed zone changes reflect current land use and proposed reserves classifications under the Reserves Act.
--	---	---

Table 9: S32 analysis of the realignment of the Ridgeline and Hilltops Overlay

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zonings	OPTION 2: Rezone land as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Remove Ridgeline and Hilltops Overlay from 43, 45, 47 and 49 Khouri Ave.	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – Low. Land has already been rezoned residential as a result of a previous plan change, land swap, and reserve uplifting process. Environmental costs have been considered as a result of these processes. Economic costs – Medium. Costs to landowners of having a district plan provision applying that may require a different level of assessment when they wish to undertake additions or site works. Social costs – Medium. Potential confusion over which provisions apply. The Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay applies primarily to land zoned Rural and Open Space and is not compatible with the residential provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – Low. Land has already been rezoned residential as a result of a previous plan change, land swap, and reserve uplifting process. Environmental costs have been considered as a result of these processes. Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change. Social costs – None identified.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits– None. The land has already been developed for residential purposes. Economic benefits – None identified. Social benefits – None identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – Medium. Land can be used and developed for residential purposes. Economic benefits – Medium. Land can be used and developed for residential purposes. Social benefits – Low. Less confusion over what provisions apply.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan's objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved in terms of land use planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An efficient and effective way to achieve the Plan's objectives and policies in terms of land use planning. Guarantees the efficient functioning of the District Plan.

APPENDIX 2

Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate, because the majority of the overlay provisions do not apply to residentially zoned land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate, because the land is zoned residential and being used for residential purposes. The overlay provisions do not fit well with the residential provisions and were not designed to apply to residentially zoned land.
--	--	--

Table 10: S32 analysis of the changes to the heritage tree listings

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Plan Provisions	OPTION 2: Amend District Plan rules as proposed This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Remove heritage tree listings from heritage lists and notations on the planning maps.	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – None identified Economic costs – High. Resource consents are required when a heritage tree no longer exists. Social costs – Medium. Potential for community to be unsatisfied with planning outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental costs – None identified. The trees no longer exist. Economic costs – Low. Cost of processing the Plan Change. Social costs – None identified
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – None identified Economic benefits – None identified Social benefits – None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental benefits – None identified. The trees no longer exist. Economic benefits – High. Reduced risk of misinterpretation of rules due to improved clarity. Avoidance of inappropriate resource consent fees. Social benefits – Medium. Heritage items are important to the community. Ensuring their proper identification and protection will have social benefits for the immediate and wider community and maintain the integrity of the remaining listings.
Efficiency & effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan's objectives cannot be efficiently nor effectively achieved as long as District Plan rules are inconsistent and/or contain anomalies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan's objectives. Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not considered appropriate as long as District Plan rules are inconsistent and/or contain anomalies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This approach is appropriate as the proposed minor amendments will improve consistency throughout the District Plan.

Table 11: S32 analysis of the Minor Text Changes and Corrections

	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing text.	OPTION 2: Undertake Minor text Changes and Corrections. This is the RECOMMENDED option.
	Correction Rule 11.1.1.1.6 (Night flying Operations)	
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – None identified • Economic costs – High. Cost of enforcement action against airport and/or operator of emergency flights. • Social costs – High. Potential for delay in responding to international civil defence emergencies as the rule does not currently provide for the operation of flights between midnight and 6am for this purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental costs – Low. Potential for flights to depart between midnight and 6am with associated noise issues if there is an international emergency that requires a response from NZ, but this is anticipated to be very limited. • Economic costs – Low. Cost of plan change. • Social costs – Low. Potential for there to be additional noise effects from flights at night, but this is anticipated to be very limited.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits –Low. Reduces the potential for noise effects from additional flights at night, but this is anticipated to be very limited. • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – Low. Reduces the potential for noise effects from additional flights at night, but this is anticipated to be very limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits – None identified • Economic benefits – None identified • Social benefits – High. Ability to respond to international civil defence emergencies from Wellington Airport at anytime without the threat of enforcement action from the Council for failure to comply with the night time flying rule. Alignment of wording with the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002.
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	Enforcement action would be required if flights operated during night time hours. Reference to Civil Defence Act 1992 is out of date.	Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives Improves the efficient and effective functioning of the District Plan.
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	Not considered appropriate as the reference to the Civil Defence Act is out of date and the reference to civil defence emergencies does not take into account New Zealand’s international obligations.	Appropriate, provides an up to date reference to the Civil Defence Act and provides for flights in all civil defence emergencies.