



**PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 80:  
*GENERAL MINOR AMENDMENTS TO  
DISTRICT PLAN TEXT AND MAPS***

**Section 32 Report: Consideration of alternatives,  
benefits and costs**

**November 2015**

# Table of Contents

PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 79: .....	1
Table of Contents .....	2
1. Introduction .....	4
2. Statutory Context.....	4
2.1. Purpose and Principles of the RMA.....	4
2.2. Consultation.....	5
3. Description of the Plan Change .....	5
3.1. Clarifications and Corrections .....	5
3.1.1 Earthworks Rule reference in Appendix 7 Residential Chapter (Silverstream Rd) .....	5
3.1.2 Early Childhood Centres (Residential Rule 5.3.3) - Car parking provision.....	5
3.1.3 Building Height - Fraser Ave Business 1 Area, Glenside Business 1 Area, Ngauranga Business 1 Area (Standard 34.6.2.1 Maximum Height) .....	6
3.1.4 Classification of Miramar properties (zoned Centres) as Neighbourhood Centre.....	6
3.1.5 Height Standard 5.6.2.5.5 – amendments .....	7
3.1.6 Including a Reference to Central Area Policy 12.2.1.2 in Residential Chapter in the explanation to Policy 4.2.7.3.....	7
3.1.7 Correction of ratio in standards 5.6.2.7.1 Maximum Height of Infill development and 5.6.2.9.3 Alterations and additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance.....	8
3.1.8 Removing adequate onsite car parking as a matter for discretion in Rule 34.3.6 (Buildings for residential purposes) .....	8
3.2. Mapping Errors and Clarifications.....	8
3.2.1 17 Glover St.....	8
3.3. Rule Changes.....	9
3.3.1 Yards / non-notification clause - Residential Rule 5.3.4 – Residential Buildings and Structures.....	9
3.3.2 Yards / non-notification clause – Centres Rule 7.3.7 and Business Areas Rule 34.3.99	
3.3.3 Existing Multi Unit Developments – additions and alterations (Residential Rule 5.3.7) .....	10
3.3.4 Residential Standard 5.6.2.9 – Alterations and Additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance.....	10
3.3.5 Residential Height Standard 5.6.2.5.1 .....	10
3.3.6 Central Area Noise Standard - 13.6.2.1.3 .....	11
3.3.7 Residential Vehicle Access Standards 5.6.1.4.....	11
3.4. Updates .....	12
3.4.1 Reference to Wellington Record Sheets – Section 3.2.3.6 .....	12
3.4.2 Definition of Noise Emission Level Section 3.10 .....	12
3.4.3 Central Area Noise Standard 13.6.1 – Side note .....	12
3.5. Zoning Changes.....	13
3.5.1 190-209 Darlington Rd, Miramar .....	13

3.5.2	49 – 67 Epuni St, Aro Valley.....	13
3.5.3	150 Cockayne Rd, Khandallah .....	13
3.5.4	16 Punjab St, Khandallah .....	14
3.5.5	23 Batchelor St, Newlands .....	14
3.5.6	Truby King Park, Melrose .....	14
3.5.7	Bolton St Memorial Park, Thorndon .....	14
3.5.8	Wilf Mexted Reserve, 111 Collins Ave (strip) .....	14
3.5.9	14 and 16 Kotinga St, Melrose .....	15
4.	Section 32 Considerations.....	15

## 1. 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). Under this section, this evaluation must:

- 1(a) *examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
- 1(b) *examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—*
  - (i) *identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and*
  - (ii) *assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and*
  - (iii) *summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and*
- 1(c) *contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.*

An evaluation must also:

- 2(a) *identify and assess the benefits and costs of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, including the opportunities for—*
  - (i) *economic growth that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
  - (ii) *employment that are anticipated to be provided or reduced; and*
- 2(b) *if practicable, quantify the benefits and costs referred to in paragraph (a); and*
- 2(c) *assess the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.*

The evaluation report 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. Statutory Context

### 2.1. Purpose and Principles of the RMA

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Sustainable management means the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while:

- (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- (b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
- (c) *avoiding, remedying and mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

Section 6 of the Act includes seven matters of national importance which need to be recognised and provided for. Section 7 of the Act requires particular regard to be given to a range of other matters, including:

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

Section 8 of the Act requires the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi to be taken into account.

## **2.2. Consultation**

2.2.1 Consultation with the adjoining owners of all sites proposed to be rezoned has been undertaken. In addition consultation with the owners of properties in the Centres Area where it is proposed to change the Centres classification to Neighbourhood and the Business Areas where it is proposed to include a maximum building height, has been undertaken.

2.2.2 Consultation on the entire proposed Plan Change will be undertaken with parties identified in the First Schedule of the RMA, specifically:

- Ministry for the Environment
- Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust
- Te Runanga O Toa Rangatira Inc.
- Greater Wellington Regional Council
- Department of Conservation

## **3. Description of the Plan Change**

This Plan Change comprises 28 separate changes to the District Plan. The changes include a number of text changes, rezoning's and rule clarifications. The rule changes are principally to the Residential Centres and Business Area Chapters and are errors or omissions identified as part of making Plan Changes 72 (Residential ) and 73 (Centres and Business Areas) operative. In the majority of cases the rezoning is to reflect existing land use or inconsistencies between reserve areas.

The Plan Change does not involve any changes to existing objectives and policies; instead it proposes to make amendments to the District Plan to ensure its efficient functioning. This report has been prepared to address the Section 32 requirements of the resource Management Act.

### **3.1. Clarifications and Corrections**

#### **3.1.1 Earthworks Rule reference in Appendix 7<sup>1</sup> Residential Chapter (Silverstream Rd)**

Earthworks references throughout the plan were amended when Council undertook a plan change to put all the earthworks provisions in one Chapter (Plan Change 70). As a result of those changes an incorrect rule reference was inserted in Appendix 7 to the Residential Area.

The Appendix allows the same earthworks that are permitted in other Residential Outer Areas but has its own restricted discretionary rule relating to earthworks. Currently the Appendix states that 30.1.1 (the permitted activity earthworks rule) will not apply and that a site specific restricted discretionary activity rule will apply instead. However, it should state that the restricted discretionary rule of the earthworks chapter (Rule 30.2.1) should not apply.

#### **3.1.2 Early Childhood Centres (Residential Rule 5.3.3) - Car parking provision**

Early Childhood centres are a restricted discretionary activity in the Residential Area. The rule retains discretion over a number of matters then lists the standards that must be met. Failure to meet a standard referred to makes the Early Childhood Centre a discretionary unrestricted activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 7 Particular provisions for the land described as Lot 1 DP 29604, CT 49D/212 (Wellington Registry) off the end of Silverstream Rd, Ngaio.

The rule retains discretion over car parking but does not include the car parking standard (standard 5.6.1.3) in the list of standards that must be met, However, in the car parking standards (5.6.1.3) a standard for Early Childhood Centres exists. The car parking standard has been inadvertently left off the list in the rule and should be included in the list alongside the other standards.

*'provided that the early childhood centre complies with the standards specified in 5.6.1.1 (noise), 5.6.1.2 (fixed plant noise), 5.6.1.3 (vehicle parking) and 5.6.1.4 (site access). Any construction, alteration of, or addition to buildings or structures must comply with the standards in 5.6.2 (buildings and structures)'*

### 3.1.3 Building Height - Fraser Ave Business 1 Area, Glenside Business 1 Area, Ngauranga Business 1 Area (Standard 34.6.2.1 Maximum Height)

A number of Business 1 Areas are not listed in the table associated with Standard 34.6.2.1 Maximum Height. During the decision making process on Plan Change 73, a number of areas were changed from Business 2 to Business 1. These Areas were then not included in the relevant Business 1 section of the Height Table (Standards 34.6.2.1) resulting in the relevant height standard for these areas being unclear or absent.

It was not the intention of the Centres and Business Areas plan change to remove heights associated with these pieces of land. Height is an important bulk and location control that determines the overall effect of development on surrounding land uses and the streetscape and therefore it is not considered appropriate for these areas to have no height limit.

The Plan Change 73 reviewed and modified heights for a large number of Centres and Business Areas. In determining an appropriate height for these areas consideration has been given to the heights on adjoining areas zoned Business; the specific location ; the characteristics of the surrounding environment; the height that applied prior to PC73 and the height as notified in PC 73 (when zoned Business 2).

	Height	Planning Map No.
Ngauranga Business 1 Area	18m	22
Glenside Business 1 Area	15m	26
Fraser Ave Business 1 Area	12m	23

### 3.1.4 Classification of Miramar properties (zoned Centres) as Neighbourhood Centre

A number of single or small groups of properties zoned Centres are located along Park Rd Miramar, between the town centre proper and the Business Area to the north. These are:

- Cnr Park Rd and Brussels St
- Cnr Park Rd and Rex Street (east and west side s of Park Rd)
- Cnr Park Rd and Rotherham Tce
- Cnr Para St and Rotherham Tce

These properties have been incorrectly classified as part of Miramar 'town centre'.

A town centre is described as a place that '*services one or more suburbs*' will '*be anchored by a traditional main street...contain at least one supermarket ...civic and government services...community, recreational and entertainment activities*'. In addition '*residential uses will generally be above ground floor*'.

The areas identified above are physically separate from Miramar town centre and do not create a continuous shopping strip. Therefore they do not meet the definition of a 'town centre' and would more appropriately be classified as a 'Neighbourhood centre'. Neighbourhood centres will '*service the surrounding residential neighbourhood and offer small scale convenience based retail*'.

The type of classification (Sub Regional, Town Centre, District or Neighbourhood) of a centre has an effect on what is permitted on the site. The maximum height of a building in a Neighbourhood Centre is 9m and in a town centre is 12m. In a Neighbourhood Centre residential is permitted on the ground floor while in the majority of Town Centres it must be above ground floor.

Classification as a Neighbourhood Centre will result in a reduction in the permitted height that applies to the sites from 12m to 9m. However, it is unlikely that a 12m height would be able to be reached on these sites as they all adjoin residentially zoned properties on one or two boundaries. Consequently, the daylight recession and side yard provisions apply, which would have restricted the size and height of any future building.

Centre	Height (standard 7.6.2.1.1)	Planning Map No.
<b>Neighbourhood Centre</b>		
Miramar – - Cnr Park Rd and Brussels St - Cnr Park Rd and Rex Street (east and west side s of Park Rd) - Cnr Park Rd and Rotherham Tce - Cnr Para St and Rotherham Tce	9m	7

### 3.1.5 Height Standard 5.6.2.5.5 – amendments

Height standard 5.6.2.5.5 allows an extra 1 metre of height if certain conditions are met. The standard makes a broad statement that it applies to heights ‘stated in the rules’. However, a number of the rules (and associated standards) specify absolute heights e.g. residential coastal edge where the maximum height is expressed as a height above sea level.

As currently written the extra height allowance appears to refer to all rules/standards, and conflicts with the standards that are absolutes, creating confusion about which standard applies. It is proposed to insert references to the specific standards to which the extra height applies, thereby avoiding any conflict between standards and avoiding confusion in administering the height standards.

5.6.2.5.5 In Residential Areas (excluding the Oriental Bay Height Area) an additional 1 ~~m~~ metre can be added to the maximum height (stated ~~in the rules~~ in standard 5.6.2.5.1 or 5.6.2.7) of any building with a roof slope of 15 degrees or greater (rising to a central ridge) as illustrated on the following diagram:

### 3.1.6 Including a Reference to Central Area Policy 12.2.1.2 in Residential Chapter in the explanation to Policy 4.2.7.3

The District Plan provides a framework to ensure that non-residential activities or development, in Residential Areas do not have an adverse effect on those residential areas. For Inner Residential Areas adjoining the Central Area the additional issue of the expansion of Central Area activities into the adjoining Residential Area may also be an issue. The Central Area contains a policy that seeks to ensure that Central Area activities do not expand into the adjoining residential area, however its location in the Central Area Chapter means that it might be overlooked in resource consent applications.

It is proposed to provide a cross reference in the explanation to the Policy 4.2.7.3 to Policy 12.2.1.2 to ensure that for Inner Residential Areas, consideration is given to avoiding the expansion of Central Area activities into adjoining Residential Areas.

The following wording is proposed to be inserted at the end of the fourth paragraph to the explanation to Policy 4.2.7.3.

*For non-residential activities in Inner Residential Areas adjoining the Central Area consideration should also be given to Policy 12.2.1.2.*

### **3.1.7 Correction of ratio in standards 5.6.2.7.1 Maximum Height of Infill development and 5.6.2.9.3 Alterations and additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance**

Standards 5.6.2.7.1 and 5.6.2.9.3 both refer to 'a slope of no more that 3:1 (approximately 15 degrees). A 3:1 slope is in fact approximately 71 degrees which would be a very steep slope. The reference to 3:1 is incorrect and it should be 1:3.

A slope of 1:3 which is approximately 18 degrees therefore the reference to 15 degrees should be corrected to 18 degrees.

It is proposed to correct this error and amend the two bullet points in standards 5.5.2.7.1 and 5.6.2.9.3 to state:

- 4.5 metres on a building site that has a slope of no more than ~~3:1 (approximately 15 degrees)~~ 1:3 (approximately 18 degrees).
- 6.0 metres on a building site that has a slope of more than ~~3:1 (approximately 15 degrees)~~ 1:3 (approximately 18 degrees).

### **3.1.8 Removing adequate onsite car parking as a matter for discretion in Rule 34.3.6 (Buildings for residential purposes)**

Rule 34.3.6 makes the construction or conversion of a building for residential purposes a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is retained over a number of matters including '*adequate on-site car parking provision*'.

The Business 1 Area does not require residential activities to provide car parking and the Section 32 analysis undertaken for Plan Change 73 (which related to Business Areas) states '*residential activities in the Business 1 Area will not be required to provide parking for residents in order that public transport options are promoted*'.

When residential development occurs in the Business 1 Area and provides car parking complying with minimum standards such as carpark size, layout and access is important. The Rule contains another matter of discretion '*site layout, parking and site access*', which addresses this matter.

Retaining discretion over '*adequate onsite car parking*' is therefore unnecessary and it is proposed to be deleted from the matters of discretion in Rule 34.3.6.

## **3.2. Mapping Errors and Clarifications**

### **3.2.1 17 Glover St**

17 Glover St was an area unformed legal road adjoining a Business 2 Area in Ngauranga. The Council declared the area surplus to requirements and stopped the road under the Local Government Act. The land is now in private ownership and used in conjunction with the adjoining Business 2 use.

When road stoppings are undertaken the area takes on the zoning of the adjoining area to the centre line of the road and a plan change is not usually required. 17 Glover Street adjoins two roads, Glover St to the west and Wakely Rd (unformed) to the east. As the site adjoins two roads it does not clearly fit within the district plan description to establish a zoning.

The piece of land is flat and adjoins a Business 2 Area to the south. It is proposed to zone the area Business 2 to be consistent with the zoning to the south of the property.



### 3.3. Rule Changes

#### 3.3.1 Yards / non-notification clause - Residential Rule 5.3.4 – Residential Buildings and Structures

The non-notification clauses in the Residential Chapter were amended significantly as a result of the Council Decision on Plan Change 72 (Residential).

The non-notification clause for Rule 5.3.4 (additions and alterations that do not meet the permitted activity standards) was the subject of a number of submissions, including a submission from Greater Wellington Regional Council (GW). GW requested that they be an affected party in relation structures near streams and that submission as accepted. In accepting this submission and redrafting the non-notification clause the changes inadvertently removed the requirement to obtain the consent of affected parties (i.e. neighbours) for all yard infringements.

Breaches of bulk and location requirements generally require the consent of the affected party (i.e. the neighbour/s) as the infringement may raise privacy, overlooking or sunlight access issues. As publicly notified PC72 required neighbours consents for these infringements. There was no submission or specific decision commentary on removing the requirement to obtain the consents of affected parties (i.e. neighbours) for yard infringements.

The current non-notification clause also requires that consent from GW be obtained when structures are proposed in the side yard adjoining **any** stream. However, GW has since indicated that they are only interested in the side yard adjoining Porirua Stream.

The following is the wording as a result of the decision on PC72 and subsequently made operative:

*In respect of item 5.3.4.2 (yards) applications will not be publicly notified (unless special circumstances exist) or limited notified, except that Greater Wellington Regional Council will be considered to be an affected party to any application that breaches standard 5.6.2.2.10.*

And the following is the wording proposed to correct the unintended error and the need to obtain consent from GW for yard breaches on every stream:

*In respect of item 5.3.4.2 (yards) Greater Wellington Regional Council will be considered to be an affected party to any application that breaches standard 5.6.2.2.11 in relation to Porirua Stream and tributaries.*

#### 3.3.2 Yards / non-notification clause – Centres Rule 7.3.7 and Business Areas Rule 34.3.9

The non-notification clause for Rules 7.3.7 and 34.3.9 (additions and alterations that do not meet the permitted activity standards) require Greater Wellington Regional Council to be considered an affected party for all infringements of yard standards 7.6.2.5.1 and 36.6.2.4. This includes infringements of all yard requirements relating to distance from all streams; distance to the coastal marine area; and distance of impervious surface from the coastal marine area. To be consistent with the request relating to Rule 5.3.4 GW has indicated that they are only interested in being an affected party to the yard requirements relating to Porirua Stream and its tributaries.

The following wording is proposed:

*In respect of item 7.3.7.5 (yards) applications will not be publicly notified (unless special circumstances exist) or limited notified except that Greater Wellington Regional Council will be considered to be an affected party to any application that breaches standard 7.6.2.5.1 in relation to Porirua Stream and tributaries.*

And

*In respect of item 34.3.9.4 (yards) applications will not be publicly notified (unless special circumstances exist) or limited notified except that Greater Wellington Regional Council will be*

considered to be an affected party to any application that breaches standard 34.6.2.4 in relation to Porirua Stream and tributaries.

### **3.3.3 Existing Multi Unit Developments – additions and alterations (Residential Rule 5.3.7)**

All multiunit developments require a resource consent under Rule 5.3.7 as a restricted discretionary activity. Discretion is restricted to matters such as design, external appearance, traffic, parking and site access. However, it is unclear how additions and alterations to multi-unit developments should be dealt with once they have been constructed.

Once the development has been established any additions or alterations to the buildings should also be reassessed against these matters. This will ensure that the additions and alterations will have no adverse effects on the environment, and are consistent with the original design of the development.

In order to make it explicit that future additions and alterations to multi-unit developments are assessed on the same basis as the original application amendments are proposed to Rule 5.3.7 to state *“Or the addition to or alteration of an existing multi-unit development”*.

### **3.3.4 Residential Standard 5.6.2.9 – Alterations and Additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance**

There has been confusion in the interpretation of Residential Standard 5.6.2.9 that provides for additions and alterations to buildings with an existing non-compliance.

A side note was originally included when the rule became part of the plan as part of Plan Change 56. However the side note was not carried over as part of Plan Change 72.

The side note provides important information about how the standard should be interpreted and how it works in practise. The rule can be difficult to understand and therefore the side note is useful. Its removal through Plan Change 72 appears to be an oversight and therefore it should be reinstated.

It is proposed to include the following side note to Standard 5.6.2.9.

*NB: failure to meet the requirements of Standard 5.6.2.9 does not preclude an assessment of the proposed works against s10 of the RMA. Where proposed works fail to meet 5.6.2.9 and section 10 of the RMA, then the proposed works will be assessed against the relevant items of Rule 5.3.4.*

### **3.3.5 Residential Height Standard 5.6.2.5.1**

The district plan does not currently contain a specific height limit for an accessory building. Consequently accessory buildings can be built to the same standards as a dwelling (except in certain circumstances). By contrast, second dwellings have a height limit of 4.5m (single storey). The effects of an 8m high accessory building can potentially have a greater effect than a 4.5m high second dwelling and this has resulted in a permitted baseline argument for two storey second dwellings being put forward. In addition a number of two storey accessory buildings have been applied for with a range of unanticipated adverse effects on adjoining properties and streetscape.

Therefore it is proposed to impose a maximum height of 3.5m on accessory buildings.

- 5.6.2.5.4 Any accessory building erected between the street frontage and an existing residential building on a site in the Inner Residential Areas shown in Appendix 1 shall have a maximum height of 3 metres (measured from the ground level directly in front of the proposed accessory building). In all other residential areas an accessory building shall have a maximum height of 3.5m.

### 3.3.6 Central Area Noise Standard - 13.6.2.1.3

The current wording of standard 13.6.2.1.3 results in a number of noise standards applying only to electronic sound systems operating prior to 8 October 2007. The standard should however apply to all electronic sound systems that can be heard in a public space.

It is proposed to delete the words 'operating prior to 8 October 2007' to make it clear that it applies to all electronic sound systems.

13.6.2.1.3 The Noise Emission Level in any public space (including streets and parks) generated by electronic sound systems ~~(operating prior to 8 October 2007)~~ shall not exceed 75dB LAEQ (15 MIN) when measured over any 2 minute period. In any event the measurements shall be made no closer than 0.6 metres from any part of a loudspeaker and at a height no greater than 1.8 metres (representative of the head of a passer-by).

### 3.3.7 Residential Vehicle Access Standards 5.6.1.4

The residential vehicle access provisions, as presently written, are confusing. There are various exceptions to the principle matter (that there will be one access per property) that appear in different subsections of the standard and appear to contradict each other. In addition, the final matter (5.6.1.4.5) relating to primary and secondary streets is redundant as a result of decisions made on Plan Change 72 (Residential) which consolidated the mapping for these provisions removing reference to primary and secondary streets. The Plan Change 72 decision did not make consequential amendments to Site Access standard 5.6.1.4.

The amended standard will be easier to understand and will remove redundant wording. The following amendments are proposed.

#### 5.6.1.4 Site Access

~~5.6.1.4.1 No Vehicle access is permitted to a site across any restricted road frontage identified on District Plan Maps 43-45~~

5.6.1.4.1 There shall be a maximum of one vehicular access to a site except:

- No vehicle access is permitted to a site across any restricted road frontage identified on District Plan Maps 43 to 45;
- a site with more than one road frontage may have one access per frontage (unless the second frontage is to a State Highway, or a restricted road frontage on Maps 43-45)

5.6.1.4.2 Site access for vehicles must be formalised by a legal right of way instrument where not directly provided from a public road, and must be provided and maintained in accordance with section 3 of the joint Australian and New Zealand Standard 2890.1 – 2004, Parking Facilities, Part I: Off-Street Car Parking.

~~5.6.1.4.3 There shall be a maximum of one vehicular access to a site, except that a site with more than one road frontage may have one access per frontage (unless the second frontage is to a State Highway).~~

5.6.1.4.4 The maximum width of any vehicular access is:

- 3.7 metres in the Inner Residential Area and within the Residential Coastal Edge
- in Medium Density Residential Areas 3.7 metres for sites containing up to 6 units, and 6.0 metres for sites containing 7 or more units.

- 6.0 metres in the Outer Residential Area (excluding the Residential Coastal Edge)

~~5.6.1.4.5 On sites with frontage to a secondary street no access shall be provided to a primary street or state highway.~~

### 3.4. Updates

#### 3.4.1 Reference to Wellington Record Sheets – Section 3.2.3.6

Section 3.2.3.6 outlines the matters that must be included on any site plan submitted with a resource consent application. One of the bullet points states ‘Wellington record sheet numbers’. These record sheets no longer used as reference material by the Council, therefore the requirement to include them has no value and the bullet point should be deleted.

#### 3.4.2 Definition of Noise Emission Level Section 3.10

The definition of Noise Emission Level in Section 3.10 definitions currently refers to the 1984 Construction Noise Standard. This standard has been superseded by the 1991 Construction Noise standard. Overall the 1991 Construction Noise standard provides a better standard to measure and assess the effect of construction noise.

However, the standard does not address the issue of construction work that cannot be done during the day particularly well. In this regard it is considered appropriate to provide exemptions for construction work that cannot be undertaken during the day in the following circumstances:

- work on public highways, railways and the Airport;
- work on domestic roads where construction work will cause traffic congestion;
- in the Central area where construction work will endanger the safety of pedestrians and the footpath cannot be closed during the day
- in the Central area where the best practicable option to reduce noise to a reasonable level requires construction work to be undertaken outside normal working hours.

It is proposed to amend the definition of Noise Emission level to include the above matters

#### 3.4.3 Central Area Noise Standard 13.6.1 – Side note

The side note by Central Area Noise Standard 13.6.2.1 refers to Construction Noise Standard NZS6803P:1984. As outlined above, the definition of Noise Level in Section 3.10 Definitions is to be updated to refer to the 1991 Construction Noise standard and therefore this ‘side note’ should also be updated.

Amend the side note to state:

***For construction noise, maintenance and demolition activities including those associated with the urgent repair of utilities to maintain continuity of service on any site or on any road shall comply with and be measured and assessed using the recommendations of ~~NZS6803P:1984 the Measurement and Assessment of Noise from Construction, maintenance and demolition Work NZS6803:1999 Construction Noise (except as outlined in the definition of Noise Emission Level in Section 3.10).~~***

### **3.5. Zoning Changes**

#### **Council Housing**

Over the years Council has constructed housing in various locations around the City. These houses were built between 1940's to 1980's and form part of the Council housing portfolio managed by City Housing. A number of these houses are on sites that form part of reserve areas that have over time been zoned Open Space and/or Conservation Site in the District Plan.

The Council is proposing to rezone the portion of the sites that are used for residential purposes to Residential to reflect the way in which these sites are being used. Open Space or Conservation zoning of housing presents a number of issues. It makes additions and alterations or redevelopment of the site difficult as any residential development would not be supported by the rules and policies of the District Plan. Rezoning these sites reflects how the sites are currently used as well as providing opportunities for the sites to be managed appropriately.

In all cases the portion of the site proposed to be rezoned is that which is currently used for residential purposes with the remainder of the sites staying Open Space/Conservation Site.

New zone boundaries will follow a surveyed line and the houses may be subdivided from their parent lot at a later stage.

#### **3.5.1 190-209 Darlington Rd, Miramar**

The Council houses at 190-206 Darlington Rd are part of a larger Conservation Site. The houses are elevated above the road with a tarsealed vehicle accessway running behind the houses. The portion of the site containing the houses is managed by City Housing and the Reserve/Conservation Site is managed by Parks and Recreation. The portion of the site managed for housing has no conservation values.

To better reflect the actual use of the site it is proposed to rezone the portion of the site containing the houses to Residential Outer.

#### **3.5.2 49 – 67 Epuni St, Aro Valley**

47 - 67 Epuni Street is 3 lots zoned Open Space B fronting onto Epuni St and backing onto the Town Belt. Council housing is located at 49-59 Epuni St and is managed by City Housing. The remainder of the sites are managed by Parks and Recreation and effectively form part of the Town Belt.<sup>2</sup>

It is proposed to rezone the portion of the site containing the houses from Open Space B to Residential Inner and the remainder of the site (and the other adjoining sites) from Open Space B to Open Space C. These zonings will reflect the way the sites are used and managed by both City Housing and Parks and recreation parts of Council.

#### **3.5.3 150 Cockayne Rd, Khandallah**

Four small Council units are located on Mysore Reserve that extends from Cockayne Rd to Mysore St and is zoned Open Space B. The units are managed as part of Councils Housing portfolio by City Housing.

It is proposed to rezone the portion of the site containing the residential units (and their immediate surrounds) to Residential Outer. This reflects the use of this part of the site. The zoning will follow a surveyed boundary and enable the sites to continue to be used and managed for residential purposes.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Wellington Town Belt Act 2015 has identified these sites for inclusion in the Town Belt Deed.

### **3.5.4 16 Punjab St, Khandallah**

Two Council houses are located on Odell Reserve in Khandallah. Odell Reserve is zoned Open Space B and is large area of bush with walking tracks extending from Khandallah to Old Porirua Rd. The houses are accessed off Punjab St via a formed driveway that also provides access to a water reservoir within the reserve. The houses form part of Council's housing portfolio and are managed by City Housing.

It is proposed to rezone the portion of the site occupied by the houses (and their immediate surrounds) to Residential Outer. A residential zoning reflects how this portion of the site is used and will allow the site to be appropriately managed within the Council's housing portfolio.

The houses are adjacent to other residential sites to the west and south.

## ***Council land***

### **3.5.5 23 Batchelor St, Newlands**

This corner section was taken as local purposes under the Reserves Act for the purpose of providing a Community Centre. Council has since built a Community Centre in the nearby Newlands Town Centre and the reserve has been declared surplus to requirements. The area is well served for reserves and Council has revoked the sites reserve status.

Rezoning of the site will enable the site to be used and developed for residential purposes in accordance with the residential provision of the district plan. The site is close to public transport links and residential use of the site will support the town centre.

## ***Council Reserves***

### **3.5.6 Truby King Park, Melrose**

Truby King Park is made up of the house and gardens of Sir Truby King and is located off Manchester Terrace, Melrose. The park is owned and managed by Wellington City Council and is classified as a Historic Reserve. It is managed through the Botanic Gardens Reserves Management Plan.

The majority of the Park is zoned Open Space B. However, Lot 2 DP43888 at the north end of the park is zoned Residential Outer. It is proposed to rezone this lot Open Space B to be consistent with the remainder of the Park and its management as a Council reserve.

### **3.5.7 Bolton St Memorial Park, Thorndon**

Bolton St Cemetery is a Historic Reserve that is managed through the Botanic Gardens Reserves Management Plan. The cemetery is bisected by the Wellington Urban Motorway. The portion of the cemetery to the west of the motorway is zoned Open Space B and the portion to the east is zoned Open Space A. The entire site should be zoned Open Space B to provide for its consistent management through the Botanic Gardens Reserve Management Plan.

### **3.5.8 Wilf Mexted Reserve, 111 Collins Ave (strip)**

Wilf Mexted Reserve is a Conservation Site at 111 Collins Ave, Tawa. The majority of the site is zoned Conservation Site 5C. However, a small strip along the road frontage is zoned Business 2. This small strip does not follow a cadastral boundary and adjoins an area zoned Business 2 to the north.

It appears that this small area was zoned Business 2 during the Plan Change 73 (Business and Centres Areas) process. However, it has occurred in error as the strip is clearly part of the larger Conservation site.

It is proposed to rezone this portion Conservation Site to correct the error; maintain consistency with the zoning of the remaining reserve and ensure consistent management of the entire reserve.

## **Residential**

### **3.5.9 14 and 16 Kotinga St, Melrose**

Two sites containing residential dwellings at 14 and 16 Kotinga Street are zoned Open Space B. The sites have always been in private ownership and used for residential purposes.

The sites were notified as being zoned Residential in the 1994 Proposed Plan but appeared as Open Space B in the maps of the Operative 2000 District Plan. There were no submissions or decisions relating to the change of zoning as part of that process. The sites are also within the ridgelines and hilltops overlay (introduced by Plan Change 33). The overlay would have been applied as a result of the sites Open Space B zoning.

The zoning appears to have occurred as a mapping error and it is appropriate that Council rectify this mistake. The Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay was never intended to apply to residentially zoned land (except in certain circumstances). The Ridgeline and Hilltops Overlay does not apply to any of the adjoining residentially zoned properties.

It is proposed to rezone these sites to Residential Outer and remove the Ridgelines and Hilltops overlay.

## **4. Section 32 Considerations**

The tables below 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 all cases individually, a cost/benefit and appropriateness assessment has generally been undertaken for each subject group.

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

<b>Table 1: Clarifications</b>		
<b>Description</b>	This relates to the following sections. See relevant aspects of Section 3 for more details. <b>3.1.1 Earthworks rule Reference in Appendix 7 Residential Chapter (Silverstream Rd)</b> <b>3.1.2 Early Childhood Centres (Residential Rule 5.3.3) –car parking provision</b>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Provisions</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Wording and Maps This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs –Low. Sub optimal environmental outcomes may arise if the Plan is not interpreted correctly</li> <li>• Economic costs – Medium. The processing of resource consents may take additional time if the plan is not easily interpreted. Costs would be borne by the developers through consent processing charges</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. Suboptimal social outcomes may arise if the Plan is not interpreted correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Non identified</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change</li> <li>• Social costs – - None identified</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – None identified</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Ensure the environmental objectives of the Plan are correctly interpreted</li> <li>• Economic benefits – Medium. Processing of resource consents may be streamlined due to the Plan being easier to interpret.</li> <li>• Social benefits – Medium. Ensures good planning outcomes for communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan’s objectives would be less efficiently and effectively achieved as the provisions have been identified as being ambiguous and requiring alterations to ensure the overriding objectives can be given effect to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as the changes would clarify how they are meant to be given effect to</li> <li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as the provisions are unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, because the changes allow better and easier decision-making processes that meet Plan objectives.</li> </ul>



<b>Table 2: Corrections</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<p>This relates to the following sections. See relevant aspects of Section 3 for more details.</p> <p><b>3.1.3 Building Height - Fraser Ave Business 1 Area, Glenside Business 1 Area, Ngauranga Business 1 Area (Standard 34.6.2.1 Maximum Height)</b></p> <p><b>3.1.4 Classification of Miramar properties (zoned Centres) as Neighbourhood Centre</b></p> <p><b>3.1.5 Height Standard 5.6.2.5.5 – amendments</b></p> <p><b>3.1.6 Including a Reference to Central Area Policy 12.2.1.2 in Residential Chapter in the explanation to Policy 4.2.7.3</b></p> <p><b>3.1.7 Correction of Ratio - Maximum Height of an Infill Household Unit 5.6.2.7.1 and Alterations and additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance – 5.6.2.9.3</b></p> <p><b>3.1.8 Removing ‘adequate onsite car parking’ as a matter for discretion in Rule 34.3.6 (Buildings for residential purposes)</b></p>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Provisions</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Wording and Maps</b> <b>This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Medium. Sub optimal environmental outcomes may arise if the Plan is not interpreted correctly. Lack of height controls may result in adverse effects on adjoining properties.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Medium. . The processing of resource consents may take additional time if the plan is not easily interpreted. Costs would be borne by the developers through consent processing charges</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. Suboptimal social outcomes may arise if the Plan is not interpreted correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – none identified.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Cost of processing the Plan Change</li> <li>• Social costs – non-identified</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – none identified</li> <li>• Economic benefits – none identified</li> <li>• Social benefits – non-identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Ensures adverse effects on adjoining properties are minimised.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – Low.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social benefits – Low. Ensures consistency with similarly zoned areas around the city</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan's objectives would be less efficiently and effectively achieved as the provisions have been identified as being ambiguous and requiring alterations to ensure the overriding objectives can be given effect to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as it clarifies the standard that applies to the site/area</li> <li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as the provisions are unclear and can not be given effect to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, because the changes clarify the relevant standard that applies, the standard is achievable and can be given effect to.</li> </ul>

<b>Table 3: Mapping Clarification</b>		
<b>Description</b>	This relates to the following sections. See relevant aspects of Section 3 for more details. <b>3.2.1 17 Glover St – zoning of land that was legal road</b>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Provisions</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Wording and Maps This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental costs – Medium. Misinterpretation of provision could lead to unintended environmental outcomes.</li> <li>Economic costs – Medium. . The processing of resource consents may take additional time if the plan is not easily interpreted. Costs would be borne by the developers through consent processing charges</li> <li>Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental costs – none identified</li> <li>Economic costs –Low. Cost of processing the Plan Change</li> <li>Social costs – none identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental benefits – none identified.</li> <li>Economic benefits – none identified.</li> <li>Social benefits –none identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental benefits – Low. Provides clarification but unlikely to change environmental outcome.</li> <li>Economic benefits – Medium. Improves clarity to plan users and will reduce time in interpreting the plan and/or requiring an assessment of effects if plan is incorrect.</li> <li>Social benefits – None identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan’s objectives would be less efficiently and effectively achieved as the provisions have been identified as being ambiguous and requiring alterations to ensure the overriding objectives can be given effect to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as it clarifies the matters that need to be assessed or taken into consideration in a resource consent application and reduces ambiguity</li> <li>Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not considered appropriate, as the provisions are unclear and cannot be given effect to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides clarity and ensures the Plans objectives can be achieved.</li> </ul>

<b>Table 4: Rule Changes</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<p>This relates to the following sections. See relevant aspects of Section 3 for more details.</p> <p><b>3.3.1 Non Notification clause Rule 5.3.4- Yards</b></p> <p><b>3.3.2 Non-notification clause 7.3.7 and 34.3.9– Yards</b></p> <p><b>3.3.3 Residential Rule 5.3.7 Multi Unit Developments – additions and alterations to existing multi units</b></p> <p><b>3.3.4 Residential Standard 5.6.2.9 – Alteration and Additions to buildings with an existing non-compliance</b></p> <p><b>3.3.5 Residential Height Standard 5.6.2.5.1 – Accessory Building Height</b></p> <p><b>3.3.6 Central Area Standard 13.6.2.1 – Noise</b></p> <p><b>3.3.7 Residential Site Access for vehicles Standard 5.6.1.4</b></p>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Provisions</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Wording and Maps</b> <b>This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Medium. Suboptimal environmental outcomes may arise if the Plan is not applied correctly.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Medium. The processing of resource consents may take additional time if the Plan is not easily interpreted. Costs would be borne by developers through consent processing charges.</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. Suboptimal social outcomes may arise if the Plan is not applied correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – None identified.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change.</li> <li>• Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Ensures the environmental objectives of the Plan are correctly applied.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – Medium. Processing of resource consents may be streamlined due to the Plan being easier to interpret.</li> <li>• Social benefits – Medium. Ensures good planning outcomes for communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp;</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan's objectives would be less efficiently and effectively achieved, as the provisions have been identified as being unclear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as the</li> </ul>

<b>Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	and/or incorrect.	changes would clarify how they are meant to be given effect to. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as the provisions are unclear and incorrect, and result in unnecessary resource consents being required and/or adverse effects on adjoining owners/occupiers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, as the changes allow more informed decision-making processes that meet Plan objectives.</li> </ul>

<b>Table 5: Updates</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<p>This relates to the following sections. See relevant aspects of Section 3 for more details.</p> <p><b>3.4.1 Reference to Wellington Record Sheets – Section 3.2.3.6</b></p> <p><b>3.4.2 Definition of Noise Emission Level – Section 3.2</b></p> <p><b>3.4.3 Central Area Noise Standard – 13.6.1 Side Note</b></p>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Provisions</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Wording and Maps</b> <b>This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. Suboptimal environmental outcomes may arise if Plan information is outdated.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. If some Plan information is outdated, Plan users may question whether other information is outdated also. This could increase general time taken when using the Plan, due to the perceived and/or real need to validate information.</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. Suboptimal social outcomes may arise if the Plan information is outdated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – None identified.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Costs of processing the Plan Change.</li> <li>• Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Low.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – Medium. Reduces time finding out of date/irrelevant information. Information in the Plan is up to date and represents best practice and New Zealand Standards (where relevant)</li> <li>• Social benefits – Medium. Keeping the Plan up to date makes it easier for the public to understand and use the Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not relevant as it as matter relating to what information to supply.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving the Plan’s objectives and policies, as the proposed changes would ensure the objectives are kept in focus.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li></ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not considered appropriate, as the provisions are out of date and do not reflect current circumstances.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appropriate, because the changes ensure the Plan is up to date</li></ul>

<b>Table 6: Reserve Rezonings</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>3.5.6 Bolton St Memorial Park</b></p> <p><b>3.5.7 Truby King Park</b></p> <p><b>3.5.8 Wilf Mexted Reserve</b></p>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zoning</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Zoning</b> <b>This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Medium. May inadvertently encourage inappropriate development and the land may not be managed according to community expectations</li> <li>• Economic costs – None identified.</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. Land is in Council ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – None identified</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Cost of processing the plan change</li> <li>• Social costs – none identified.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – None identified</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Better and more consistent outcomes across the entire site.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Social benefits – Low. Consistent provision will apply across the entire site. Providing easier administration under the district plan and Reserves Management Plans</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans objectives and policies may not be met as different rules and policies apply to different parts of the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as the reserve areas can be considered as a single entity in any future assessment.</li> <li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan by requiring assessment under one set of district plan provisions.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as different objectives polices and rules apply to the sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, because the changes allow all parts of the reserve to be considered under the same district plan objectives and policies.</li> </ul>





<b>Table 7: City Housing Rezoning</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>3.5.1 190-206 Darlington Rd, Miramar from Conservations Site to Residential Outer.</b></p> <p><b>3.5.2 49 – 67 Epuni Street From Open Space B to Residential Inner and Open Space C.</b></p> <p><b>3.5.3 150 Cockayne Rd, Khandallah from Open Space B to Residential Outer</b></p> <p><b>3.5.4 16 Punjab St, Khandallah from Open Space B to Residential Outer</b></p>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zoning</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Zoning</b> <b>This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. Sites have existing use rights for residential activity.</li> <li>• Economic costs – High. Renewal of housing stock will be more difficult as existing use rights are limited.</li> <li>• Social costs – High. If hosing stock /residential activity on these sites cannot continue or change to meet future housing needs of the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. The sites are already developed and used for residential purposes.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Cost of processing the plan change</li> <li>• Social costs – Low. The land is not currently available for public use due to the existing residential activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – High (low probability) If land reverts to Open Space there is more reserve land for the community to access.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – Low. Renewal of housing stock may not occur.</li> <li>• Social benefits – Low. Housing stock may become rundown or fail to meet communities' needs if there are significant barriers to ongoing maintenance or redevelopment. .</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Housing stock can be renewed if and when required.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – High. Housing stock can continue to meet needs, be maintained or renewed as is appropriate</li> <li>• Social benefits – Medium. Housing continues to be provided on these sites benefiting local communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives and policies of the Open Space Areas are not being met.</li> <li>• Residential activity cannot be undertaken efficiently as the zoning does not match the sites use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, as the zoning of the site will reflect how the site is used.</li> <li>• Improves the efficient functioning of the District Plan.</li> </ul>

<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not considered appropriate, as the actual use of the sites is not reflected in the sites zoning. The sites are used and managed for residential purposes and contain residential dwellings. sites have been used and developed for residential purposes while the underlying zone, the zoning does not reflect how the</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appropriate, as the zoning reflects the actual use and ensures that that use can continue. Any redevelopment of the existing housing would be assessed against the relevant residential provisions rather than Open Space provisions.</li></ul>
--	--	---

**Table 8 : Rezoning of Council Land**

<b>Table 8 : Rezoning of Council Land</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>3.5.5 23 Batchelor Rd, Newlands from Open Space B to Residential Outer</b>	
	<b>OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zoning</b>	<b>OPTION 2: Amend Zoning This is the RECOMMENDED option.</b>
<b>Costs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. Area is retained as open space.</li> <li>• Economic costs – High. Area was to be used for a community centre which has been provided elsewhere and therefore the reason that this land was taken is no longer relevant. Community has access to open space /reserve land in the immediate vicinity.</li> <li>• Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Medium. Loss of open space to the community.</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Cost of undertaking the Plan Change</li> <li>• Social costs – Medium. Rezoning will result in the loss of open space to the community, but increase residential development close to town centre.</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – High. Community benefits from having access to open space.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Social benefits – High. Community has access to open space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Medium. Provide opportunities for residential development close to town centre.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – High. Additional housing will contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre and community.</li> <li>• Social benefits – High. Added housing will provide support for local business and community services.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness of achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives and policies of the Open Space A Area that provides for active recreation are not being met.</li> <li>• The land is unlikely to be developed as recreation space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, the land was taken as Recreation reserve to provide for a Community centre. The Community Centre has been provided elsewhere in the town centre and is no longer required.</li> </ul>
<b>Most appropriate for achieving Objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as the site is not currently being used for its stated purpose and therefore the objectives of the district plan are not being met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, as residential use of the site will contribute to the overall vitality and vibrancy of the community and town centre.</li> </ul>

**Table 9 : Rezoning of Private Land**

Table 9 : Rezoning of Private Land		
Description	<b>3.5.9 14 -16 Kotinga Street, Melrose</b>	
	OPTION 1: Do Nothing – Retain Existing Zoning	OPTION 2: Amend Zoning This is the RECOMMENDED option.
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. Sites are developed for residential purposes and are in private ownership (and always have been).</li> <li>• Economic costs – High. Ongoing use and development of the sites for residential purposes will be more difficult with an Open Space zoning.</li> <li>• Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental costs – Low. Land has never been available to the public</li> <li>• Economic costs – Low. Cost of undertaking the Plan Change</li> <li>• Social costs – None identified.</li> </ul>
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – Low. There is no access to the public to these sites as they are in private ownership.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental benefits – None identified.</li> <li>• Economic benefits – High. Allows owners to undertake residential development in accordance with the provisions of the Residential Area provisions</li> <li>• Social benefits – None identified</li> </ul>
Efficiency & Effectiveness of achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives and policies of the Open Space B Area that provide for recreation areas for the benefit of the community are not being met.</li> <li>• The land is in private ownership and was developed for residential purposes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most efficient and effective in achieving Plan objectives, the land is in private ownership and has always been used for residential purposes.</li> </ul>
Most appropriate for achieving Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not considered appropriate, as the site is not currently being used for its stated purpose and therefore the objectives of the district plan are not being met.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate, as residential use of the site can continue.</li> </ul>