

Section 32 Evaluation Report

Part 2: General Rural Zone

Contents

Table of acronyms	4
1.0 Overview and Purpose	5
1.1 Introduction to the resource management issue/s	5
2.0 Reference to other evaluation reports	5
3.0 Strategic Direction.....	6
4.0 Regulatory and policy direction	7
4.1 Section 6.....	8
4.2 Section 7.....	8
4.3 Section 8.....	8
4.4 National Direction	9
4.4.1 National Policy Statements	9
4.4.2 Proposed National Policy Statements	9
4.4.3 National Environmental Standards.....	9
4.4.4 National Planning Standards.....	11
4.5 National Guidance Documents	11
4.6 Regional Policy and Plans	11
4.7 Iwi Management Plan(s)	14
4.8 Relevant plans or strategies.....	14
4.9 Other relevant legislation or regulations	15
5.0 Resource Management Issues Analysis.....	15
5.1 Background.....	15
5.2 Evidence Base - Research, Consultation, Information and Analysis undertaken...	16
5.2.1 Analysis of Operative District Plan provisions relevant to this topic.....	16
5.2.2 Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira	17
5.2.3 Consultation undertaken to date	18
5.3 Summary of Relevant Resource Management Issues.....	18
6.0 Evaluation of the Proposal	20
6.1 Scale and Significance.....	20
6.2 Quantification of Benefits and Costs	22
7.0 Zone Framework.....	22
8.0 Overview of Proposal.....	23
9.0 Evaluation of Proposed Objective/s.....	24
9.1 Introduction	24
9.2 Evaluation of Objectives GRUZ-O1 – GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-PREC01-O1 - GRUZ- PREC01-O2	25
10.0 Evaluation of Reasonably Practicable Options and Associated Provisions	30

10.1	Introduction	30
10.2	Evaluation method	30
10.3	Provisions to achieve Objective/s.....	30
11.0	Conclusion.....	36

Table of acronyms

Abbreviation	Full term
CC	Capital City
GRUZ	General Rural Zone
GRUZ-PREC01	Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct
NES	National Environmental Standards
NES-CS	National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
NES-FW	National Environmental Standards for Freshwater 2020
NES-PF	National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry 2017
NPS	National Policy Statements
ODP	Operative District Plan
ONFL	Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes
PDP	Proposed District Plan
PNRP	Proposed Natural Resources Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act
RPS	Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013
SALs	Special Amenity Landscapes
SNAs	Significant Natural Areas
UFD	Urban Form and Development

1.0 Overview and Purpose

1.1 Introduction to the resource management issue/s

This section 32 evaluation report is focussed on the General Rural Zone (GRUZ). Containing two thirds of Wellington's land area the zone is characteristically open in nature, with pastoral farming and regenerating indigenous bush interspersed with buildings and structures of a low density and scale.

The main purpose of the GRUZ is to provide for agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, and forestry activities and associated ancillary activities, including activity related buildings and structures and accessory dwellings. Further facility is also made for a range of complementary activities, including outdoor recreation and activities that support the primary productive use of the zone or that have a functional need for a rural location.

To support the intensification outcomes sought by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and Wellington's compact urban form objectives, residential development opportunities are primarily restricted to the existing Makara Beach and Makara Village settlements, with limitations also placed on rural lifestyle development through the introduction of a Large Lot Residential Zone.

2.0 Reference to other evaluation reports

This report should also be read in conjunction with the following evaluation reports:

Report	Relationship to this topic
<i>Transport</i>	Contains provisions relating to transport matters, including traffic generation, parking and site access.
<i>Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</i>	Contains provisions relating to archaeological sites and sites and areas of significance to Māori, noting in particular the concentration of Māori sites and areas along the western and southern coastal margins of the zone.
<i>Subdivision</i>	Contains provisions relating to the subdivision process including lot sizes, infrastructure requirements, and esplanade reserves.
<i>Earthworks</i>	Contains provisions relating to earthworks including zone specific area quantities, cut heights and fill depths.
<i>Natural Environment</i>	Contains provisions relating to development within areas of high ecological and/or landscape value, noting that the zone comprises the majority of those areas identified as outstanding natural features and landscape (ONFL), special amenity landscapes (SALs) and significant natural areas (SNAs). The GRUZ also includes a large proportion of the city's coastal environment as well as many of its identified ridgelines and hilltops.
<i>Natural Hazards</i>	Contains provisions relating to the avoidance/mitigation of natural hazards, noting that the Wellington Fault line runs through the zone and that the area around the Makara and Makara Beach settlements is subject to coastal inundation.
<i>Renewable Energy Generation</i>	Contains provisions relating to renewable energy generation, noting that the GRUZ is the most likely location for any future large scale renewable energy proposals such as windfarms.

Report	Relationship to this topic
<i>Infrastructure</i>	Contains provisions relating to the protection and management of significant infrastructure assets in the GRUZ including natural gas, bulk water supply, electricity distribution, and the national grid.
<i>Noise</i>	Contains specific controls in relation to noise, including effects standards.
<i>Signs</i>	Contains specific provisions relating to the scale, number, illumination, motion and placement of signs in the GRUZ to ensure they are compatible with their location.

3.0 Strategic Direction

The following objectives in the Strategic Direction chapter of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) that are relevant to this issue/topic are:

CC-O2	<i>Capital City</i>
Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A wide range of activities that have local, regional and national significance are able to establish. 2. Current and future residents can meet their social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing. 3. Mana whenua values and aspirations are visible, celebrated and an integral part of the City's identity. 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that supports future generations to meet their needs. 5. Innovation and technology advances that support the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of existing and future residents are promoted. 6. Values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place are identified and protected. 	
CC-O3	<i>Capital City</i>
Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the following strategic City goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compact: Wellington builds on its existing urban form with quality development in the right locations. 2. Resilient: Wellington's natural and built environments are healthy and robust, and we build physical and social resilience through good design. 3. Vibrant and Prosperous: Wellington builds on its reputation as an economic hub and creative centre of excellence by welcoming and supporting innovation and investing strategically to maintain our thriving economy. 4. Inclusive and Connected: Wellington recognises and fosters its identity by supporting social cohesion and cultural diversity, and has world-class movement systems with attractive and accessible public spaces and streets. 5. Greener: Wellington is sustainable, and its natural environment is protected, enhanced and integrated into the urban environment. 6. Partnership with mana whenua: Wellington recognises the unique role of mana whenua within the city and advances a relationship based on active partnership. 	

NE-01	Natural Environment
The natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute to the City's identity and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected, and, where possible, enhanced.	
NE-04	Natural Environment
Mana whenua are able to exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua and kaitiaki with their own mātauranga Māori in the protection and management of the natural environment.	
SCA-02	Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure
New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development, and 2. Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City. 	
SCA-06	Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure
Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	
SRCC-01	Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change
The City's built environment supports: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions by 2050; 2. More energy efficient buildings; and 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources; and 4. Healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes. 	
UFD-01	Urban Form and Development
Wellington's compact urban form is maintained with the majority of urban development located within the City Centre, in and around Centres, and along major public transport corridors.	

An evaluation of these objectives is contained in the companion Section 32 Evaluation Overview Report.

4.0 Regulatory and policy direction

In carrying out a s32 analysis, an evaluation is required of how the proposal achieves the purpose and principles contained in Part 2 of the RMA.

Section 5 sets out the purpose of the RMA, which is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Sustainable management '*means 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, 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, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment’.*

In achieving this purpose, all persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA also need to:

- Recognise and provide for the matters of national importance identified in s6
- Have particular regard to the range of other matters referred to in s7
- Take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi in s8.

4.1 Section 6

Although there are no s6 matters directly related to this topic, matters of relevance such as natural coastal character, significant natural areas, outstanding natural features and landscapes, sites and areas of significance to Māori, natural hazards and historic heritage are addressed in related topic chapters of the PDP.

4.2 Section 7

The s7 matters that are relevant to this topic are:

Section	Relevant Matter
Section 7(b)	<i>The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources</i> Relates to ensuring that natural and physical resources in the GRUZ are used and developed in a manner that recognises the predominantly rural nature of the zone
Section 7(c)	<i>The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values</i> Relates to the need to consider both rural amenity values and those of adjacent zones, particularly in relation to inappropriate use or development that could potentially adversely affect recognised values in the GRUZ
Section 7(f)	<i>Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment</i> Relates to a general recognition that the quality of the rural environment in the GRUZ can be potentially compromised by inappropriate use or development
Section 7(g)	<i>Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources</i> Relates to the finite quality and extent of the land contained within the GRUZ and the need for it to be managed in a way that recognises and reflects these considerations

4.3 Section 8

Section 8 requires that in managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi are taken into account. In developing the GRUZ provisions the Council has worked in partnership with Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika and Ngāti Toa Rangatira to actively protect their interests, particularly in relation to the recognition and protection of sites and areas of significance in the area.

4.4 National Direction

4.4.1 National Policy Statements

There are five National Policy Statements (NPS) currently in force:

- NPS for Electricity Transmission 2008
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
- NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
- NPS for Freshwater Management 2020
- NPS on Urban Development 2020

The instrument/s of particular relevance to this topic are outlined below, noting that those with district-wide implications are covered in more detail in related s32 evaluation reports (e.g. NPS for Electricity Generation – Infrastructure Chapter s32 report; New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement – Coastal Environment s32 report):

NPS	Relevant Provisions
<i>NPS for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM)</i>	<p>The NPS-FM came into force on 3 September 2020 and applies to the management of freshwater through a framework that considers and recognises Te Mana o te Wai as an integral part of freshwater management. It directs the content that regional councils, in consultation with their communities, must include in their regional plans, including that it must be managed in a way that improves degraded water bodies, and maintains or improves all others in accordance with national bottom lines.</p> <p>While primary responsibility for implementing the NPS-FM rests with regional councils, implementation directive 3.5(4) requires territorial authorities to ‘include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments’.</p>

4.4.2 Proposed National Policy Statements

In addition to the five NPSs currently in force there are also two proposed NPSs under development, noting that these are yet to be issued and have no legal effect:

- Proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land
- Proposed NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity

Although these are yet to be issued and have no legal effect, the indicative policy direction outlined in the discussion document released in 2019 on a Proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land was considered in preparing the PDP.¹

4.4.3 National Environmental Standards

In addition to the NPSs there are nine National Environmental Standards (NES) currently in force:

¹ Ministry for Primary Industries (2019), Valuing highly productive land: A discussion document on a proposed national policy statement for highly productive land

- NES for Air Quality 2004
- NES for Sources of Human Drinking Water 2007
- NES for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009
- NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
- NES for Telecommunication Facilities 2016
- NES for Plantation Forestry 2017
- NES for Freshwater 2020
- NES for Marine Aquaculture 2020
- NES for Storing Tyres Outdoors 2021

The standard/s of particular relevance to this topic are:

NES	Relevant Regulations
<i>NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011 (NES-CS)</i>	<p>The NES-CS came into force on 1 January 2012 and contains a nationally consistent set of planning controls and associated soil contaminant values applying to land identified on the Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) administered by the Ministry for the Environment. It ensures that land affected by contaminants in soil is appropriately identified and assessed before it is developed and, if necessary, remediated or the contaminants contained to ensure it is safe for human use.</p> <p>Five activities relating to land on the HAIL list are controlled by the standard (e.g. earthworks, subdivision, change of use), with resource consent required where associated permitted activity standards cannot be met.</p>
<i>NES for Plantation Forestry 2017 (NES-PF)</i>	<p>The NES-PF came into force on 1 May 2018 and provides a nationally consistent set of standards to manage commercial plantation forestry activities on forests 1ha in area or greater. It covers 8 core activities (e.g. afforestation, earthworks, harvesting), allowing these to be carried out as permitted activities subject to conditions to manage potential effects on the environment. A resource consent is required where relevant conditions cannot be met or more stringent regional or district plan provisions apply to such activities within significant natural areas and outstanding natural features and landscapes or a unique or sensitive environment.</p>
<i>NES for Freshwater 2020 (NES-FW)</i>	<p>The NES-FW came into force on 3 September 2020. It sets out requirements for carrying out certain activities that pose risks to freshwater and freshwater ecosystems (e.g. agricultural intensification, intensive winter grazing, vegetation clearance adjacent to natural wetlands, wetland drainage), the aim of which is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect existing inland and coastal wetlands • protect urban and rural streams from in-filling • ensure connectivity of fish habitat (fish passage) • set minimum requirements for feedlots and other stockholding areas • improve poor practice intensive winter grazing of forage crops • restrict further agricultural intensification until the end of 2024

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limit the discharge of synthetic nitrogen fertiliser to land, and require reporting of fertiliser use <p>In carrying out any of these regulated activities minimum conditions apply, with resource consent from the regional council required if relevant conditions cannot be met.</p>
--	---

4.4.4 National Planning Standards

The National Planning Standards provide for a range of zone options to be included in Part 3 – Area Specific Matters of the District Plan. This includes the following of relevance to this topic:

Zone	Description
General Rural Zone	Areas used predominantly for primary production activities, including intensive indoor primary production. The zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.
Rural Production Zone	Areas used predominantly for primary production activities that rely on the productive nature of the land and intensive indoor primary production. The zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.
Rural Lifestyle Zone	Areas used predominantly for a residential lifestyle within a rural environment on lots smaller than those of the General rural and Rural production zones, while still enabling primary production to occur.
Settlement Zone	Areas used predominantly for a cluster of residential, commercial, light industrial and/or community activities that are located in rural areas or coastal environments.

4.5 National Guidance Documents

There is no specific national guidance relevant to this topic.

4.6 Regional Policy and Plans

Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region 2013 (RPS)

The table below identifies objectives and policies of particular relevance to the GRUZ in the RPS.

3.1 Air Quality	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective 1	Discharges of odour, smoke and dust to air do not adversely affect amenity values and people's wellbeing.
Policy 1 (R)	Odour, smoke and dust – district plans

	<p>District plans shall include policies and/or rules that discourage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) new sensitive activities locating near land uses or activities that emit odour, smoke or dust, which can affect the health of people and lower the amenity values of the surrounding area; and (b) new land uses or activities that emit odour, smoke or dust and which can affect the health of people and lower the amenity value of the surrounding areas, locating near sensitive activities.
3.9 Regional form, design and function	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective 22	<p>A compact well designed and sustainable regional form that has an integrated, safe and responsive transport network and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (e) urban development in existing urban areas, or when beyond urban areas, development that reinforces the region's existing urban form; and (f) strategically planned rural development.
Policy 55 (R)	<p>Maintaining a compact, well designed and sustainable regional form – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, or a change, variation or review of a district plan for urban development beyond the region's urban areas (as at March 2009), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the proposed development is the most appropriate option to achieve Objective 22; and (b) the proposed development is consistent with the Council's growth and/or development framework or strategy that describes where and how future urban development should occur in that district
Policy 56 (R)	<p>Managing development in rural areas – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent or a change, variation or review of a district plan, in rural areas (as at March 2009), particular regard shall be given to whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the proposal will result in a loss of productive capability of the rural area, including cumulative impacts that would reduce the potential for food and other primary production and reverse sensitivity issues for existing production activities, including extraction and distribution of aggregate minerals; (b) the proposal will reduce aesthetic and open space values in rural areas between and around settlements; (c) the proposal's location, design or density will minimise demand for non-renewable energy resources; and (d) the proposal is consistent with the relevant city or district council growth and/or development framework or strategy that addresses future rural development
3.11 Soil and minerals	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective 30	<p>Soils maintain those desirable physical, chemical and biological characteristics that enable them to retain their ecosystem function and range of uses.</p>
Policy 59 (R)	<p>Retaining highly productive agricultural land (Class I and II land) – consideration</p> <p>When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district plan, particular regard shall be given to safeguarding productive capability on Class I and II land.</p>

Objective 31	The demand for mineral resources is met from resources located in close proximity to the areas of demand.
Policy 60 (R)	Utilising the region's mineral resources – consideration When considering an application for a resource consent, notice of requirement, or a change, variation or review of a district or regional plan, particular regard shall be given to: (d) the social, economic, and environmental benefits from utilising mineral resources within the region; and (e) protecting significant mineral resources from incompatible or inappropriate land uses alongside.

M = policies which must be implemented in accordance with stated methods in the RPS

R = policies to which particular regard must be had when varying a district plan

Regional Plans

There are currently five operative regional plans and one proposed regional plan for the Wellington region:

- Regional Freshwater Plan for the Wellington Region, 1999
- Regional Coastal Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Air Quality Management Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Soil Plan for the Wellington Region, 2000
- Regional Plan for discharges to the land, 1999
- Proposed Natural Resources Plan, appeals version 2021

The proposed Natural Resources Plan (PNRP) replaces the five operative regional plans, with provisions in this plan now largely operative with the exception of those that are subject to appeal.

The table below identifies objectives and policies of particular relevance to the GRUZ in the PNRP.

Ki uta ki tai: mountains to the sea	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective O2	The importance and contribution of air, land, and water and ecosystems to the social, economic and cultural well-being and health of people and the community are recognised in the management of those resources.
Policy P1	Ki uta ki tai and integrated catchment management Air, land, freshwater bodies and the coastal marine area will be managed recognising ki uta ki tai by using the principles of integrated catchment management. These principles include: (a) decision-making using the catchment as the spatial unit, and (b) applying an adaptive management approach to take into account the dynamic nature and processes of catchments, and

	<p>(c) coordinated management, with decisions based on best available information and improvements in technology and science, and</p> <p>(d) taking into account the connected nature of resources and natural processes within a catchment, and</p> <p>(e) recognising links between environmental, social, cultural and economic sustainability of the catchment.</p>
Policy P7	<p>Uses of land and water</p> <p>The cultural, social and economic benefits of using land and water for:</p> <p>(d) food production and harvesting (including aquaculture)</p> <p>(f) irrigation and stock water</p> <p>shall be recognised.</p>
Policy P8	<p>Beneficial activities</p> <p>The following activities are recognised as beneficial and generally appropriate:</p> <p>(e) the establishment of river crossings (culverts and bridges) or fences and fence structures that will result in the exclusion of regular livestock access from a water body</p> <p>(g) the retirement of erosion prone land from livestock access.</p>
Air Quality	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective O41	The adverse effects of odour, smoke and dust on amenity values and people's well-being are minimised.
Policy P55	<p>Managing air amenity</p> <p>Air quality amenity in urban, rural and the coastal marine areas shall be managed to minimise offensive or objectionable odour, smoke and dust, particulate matter, fumes, ash and visible emissions.</p>
Soil	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective O42	Soils are healthy, and retain a range of uses, and accelerated soil erosion is reduced.
Land Use	
Section	Relevant matters
Objective O44	The adverse effects on soil and water from land use activities are minimised.

4.7 Iwi Management Plan(s)

There are no Iwi Management Plans relevant to this topic.

4.8 Relevant plans or strategies

The following plans / strategies are relevant to this topic:

Plan / Strategy	Organisation	Relevant Provisions
-----------------	--------------	---------------------

<p>Our City Tomorrow – He Mahere Mokowā mō Pōneke - A Spatial Plan for Wellington City 2021</p>	<p>Wellington City Council</p>	<p>The key aim of the Spatial Plan is to provide a clear direction for the city that supports and enables managed growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five key goals emerged for the development of Wellington, including that it should be: Compact, Resilient, Greener, Vibrant and Prosperous, and Inclusive and Connected. • Two of the key areas related to the GRUZ are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intensification in the City Centre and in and around suburban centres ○ No or limited greenfield growth over and above areas already planned for greenfield (i.e. Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings Valley/Marshall Ridge) <p>Together, additional development in the city and suburban centres is expected to cater for future residential growth without the need for further expansion into the rural area either through additional greenfield or rural residential development.</p>
<p>Te Atakura - First to Zero 2019</p>	<p>Wellington City Council</p>	<p>Te Atakura – First to Zero is Wellington’s blueprint for a Zero carbon Capital by 2027. The strategy sets out seven ‘big moves’ for a zero carbon Wellington. The first of these “<i>Shaping our plan for a growing city</i>” reinforces the need for compact form, growing up not out.</p>

4.9 Other relevant legislation or regulations

Legislation/ Regulation	Relevant Provisions
<p><i>Resource Management (Stock Exclusion) Regulations 2020</i></p>	<p>The regulations came into force on 3 September 2020 and require persons owning or controlling stock (i.e. beef/dairy cattle, deer, pigs) to, amongst other matters, exclude them from specified wetlands, lakes, and rivers more than 1m wide and from waterbodies regardless of the terrain.</p>

5.0 Resource Management Issues Analysis

5.1 Background

The Operative District Plan (ODP) has largely been successful in managing development within the Rural Area with an average of 34 consents granted per year over the period January 2013 to March 2019.² This is similar to the rate of applications for the period 2002 to 2014, with an average of 42 consents per year.³

The feedback to date and analysis of the monitoring data indicates that on the whole the rural provisions are working as intended. The rate of residential development and subdivision has been low, and is consistent with the intention to allow a limited and slow rate of change and

² Wellington City Council (2019), Rural Area - Background and Monitoring Report

³ Wellington City Council (2014), District Plan Monitoring programme, Analysis of Rural Area provisions

maintain the character and amenity of the rural area and compact city form. Feedback on the Rural Area Design Guide is that it is generally working well and in conjunction with the rules provides sufficient flexibility to enable good environmental outcomes in terms of maintaining rural character and amenity.

5.2 Evidence Base - Research, Consultation, Information and Analysis undertaken

The Council has reviewed the ODP, commissioned technical advice and assistance from internal and external experts and utilised this, along with internal workshops and community feedback to assist with setting the plan framework. This work has been used to inform the identification and assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions. Key advice includes the following:

Title	Author	Brief synopsis
<i>Rural Area - Background and Monitoring Report</i>	Judy Ryan	This report contains an analysis of resource consents granted in Rural zoned areas identified in the ODP over the period of January 2013 to March 2019.
<i>Rural Area - Issues & Options Report</i>	Louise Miles	This report contains an analysis of the effectiveness of current provisions relating to Rural zoned areas in the and ODP and identifies associated issues and options to inform the development of new or revised chapter content as part of the District Plan review process.

5.2.1 Analysis of Operative District Plan provisions relevant to this topic

The Rural Area chapter of the ODP currently comprises 11 objectives, 39 policies and 25 rules supplemented by a range of associated standards. Aside from provisions relating to typical use and development within rural areas (e.g. primary production activities and supporting rural/residential development) additional provisions are included covering related topics such as tangata whenua, renewable energy generation, natural features and landscapes, the coastal environment, subdivision, natural hazards, hazardous substances, utilities, transport, temporary activities, noise and signs.

However, to align with the structure and format directives contained in the National Planning Standards most of these related topics and associated provisions are now housed within topic specific chapters of the PDP (e.g. tangata whenua, energy, infrastructure and transport, subdivision, natural features and landscapes) and subject to a separate, targeted section 32 evaluation. This also applies to the Rural Area Design Guide which is included in a supporting appendix to the proposed plan.

Consequently, for the purposes of this report the provisions of the operative plan summarised below solely relate to those that are of specific relevance to the GRUZ topic.

Topic	Summary of relevant provisions
Rural Area	<p>The zone chapter has 3 relevant objectives which broadly seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources • Maintain and enhance rural character and amenity by managing the scale, location and rate and design of new development <p>These objectives are implemented by 6 supporting policies that seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage new urban development to locate within established urban areas • Allow work-from-home activities • Control the number, location and design of new building developments and activities • Ensure that activities located within the area do not have harmful effects on urban areas • Control non-rural activities • Encourage retention of existing vegetation <p>Rules and standards relating to rural and residential land use activities, working from home, cleanfills, goat farming, non-rural activities and buildings are located in the chapter. Typically, any activity identified in the associated rule table that complies with the permitted activity conditions is permitted, with exceptions to this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goat farming (controlled activity) • Rural and residential, working from home and building activities that are non-compliant with conditions (restricted discretionary activity) • Non-rural activities, buildings and structures and factory farming not provided for as permitted or controlled activities (discretionary activity) <p>Key activity and building and structure standards include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of household units • Number of workers • Building/fence height • Gross floor area • Yards • Septic tank design location

5.2.2 Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira

The District Plan Review has included significant engagement with our mana whenua partners - Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika and Ngāti Toa Rangatira. This has included over 100 hui and wānanga attended by Council officers over the last 12 months. This has provided a much greater understanding of mana whenua values and aspirations as they relate to the PDP.

The PDP elevates the consideration of mana whenua values in resource management processes, including:

- A new Tangata Whenua chapter which provides context and clarity about who mana whenua are and what environmental outcomes they are seeking.
- A new Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter that provides greater protection for sites and areas of significance than the current District Plan.
- Integrating mana whenua values across the remainder of the plan where relevant.

This is consistent with both the City Goal of ‘Partnership with mana whenua’ in the Spatial Plan; and the recently signed Tākai Here (2022), which is the new partnership agreement between the Council and our mana whenua partners, Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira, Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika and Te Rūnanganui o Te Āti Awa.

A full copy of the advice received is attached as an addendum to the complete suite of Section 32 reports as Addendum A – Advice received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira. No specific advice has been received from Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa.

5.2.3 Consultation undertaken to date

The following is a summary of the primary consultation undertaken in respect of this topic:

Who	What	When	Relevant Issues Raised
Councillor Working Group	Draft Plan Workshop/ Briefing	June 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific issues raised, with feedback generally supportive of the approach to managing activities and development in the GRUZ, including proposed provisions
Makara-Ohariu Community Board	Draft District Plan update presentation to community board members	September 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific issues raised, with feedback generally supportive of the approach to managing activities and development in the GRUZ
General Public	Public engagement on Draft District Plan, including an associated submissions process and programme of roadshow events	November-December 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning of specific sites from GRUZ to an alternative zoning Fence heights to manage pests such as goats and deer

A summary of specific feedback on this topic received during consultation on the Draft District Plan is contained in Appendix 1, including how it has been responded to in the PDP. Additional detail concerning the wider consultation undertaken in preparing the PDP is contained in the companion Section 32 Evaluation Overview Report.

In summary, the key finding arising from the consultation undertaken on this topic is that there appears to be a general level of support for the proposed approach to managing the GRUZ outlined in the draft District Plan.

5.3 Summary of Relevant Resource Management Issues

Based on the research, analysis and consultation outlined above the following key issues have been identified:

Issue	Comment	Response
<p>Issue 1: Appropriateness of the existing policy approach</p>	<p>There appear to be some mixed views within the rural community regarding the need for a greater degree of rural residential development to be accommodated in the Rural Area than that currently provided for in the ODP.</p> <p>The maintenance and enhancement of rural character and amenity, and minimising land fragmentation to maintain a compact city (a long held Council policy), are central to the current policy framework, with associated rules tailored to reflect these objectives by restricting the rate of rural residential development that occurs.</p>	<p>Retain the current policy direction as enabling a greater degree of rural residential development to occur would be inconsistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 22 and Policy 55 of the RPS which encourage a compact, well designed and sustainable urban form, along with Policy 56 which requires particular regard to the aesthetic and open space values in rural areas • The goal of a compact urban form contained in the Spatial Plan and the supporting strategic objectives in the PDP (i.e. UFD-01, CC-03)
<p>Issue 2: Effectiveness of the Single Rural Zone</p>	<p>The ODP currently has a single Rural zone, with this blanket zoning ineffectively reflecting the diverse characteristics of the range of environments located within the zone (e.g. large blocks of isolated and rugged land in the Makara / Ohariu Valley and South Karori areas, the Makara Beach and Village settlements, existing rural lifestyle areas around lower Takapu Valley and Hillcroft Road in Horokiwi).</p> <p>To accommodate these variations different rules applying to subdivision and residential buildings within these areas have been incorporated into the District Plan over time, with the primary way of identifying where these rules apply is through spatial delineation on maps included as appendices to the zone chapter. This has effectively created 'pseudo zones' and generated a corresponding lack of clarity and certainty as the Appendix areas for the rural zone are not</p>	<p>To recognise the variation between these areas, including their characteristics and associated amenity values, apply a more bespoke approach to managing the rural area comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a GRUZ as the primary zone for rural activities and activities requiring a rural setting such as rural industries, intensive indoor primary production and quarries. • Provision for the distinct character and amenity of the existing Makara Beach and Village settlements through the introduction of a specific precinct applying to these areas within the GRUZ. • Provision for existing rural lifestyle living in identified areas through the introduction of a specific Large Lot Residential Zone. • A targeted policy framework supported by associated rules and standards that reinforce the role and function of the GRUZ and that manage activities that may have an adverse impact on the character and amenity values of the zone.

	specifically identified as a spatial layer in the ePlan.	
Issue 3: Provision for Goat Farming	Feral goats have been identified as a major environmental issue within the rural area, particularly in relation to their impact on areas of indigenous vegetation.	Retain the current approach of requiring a controlled activity resource consent for the keeping of 10 or more goats, supplemented by the expansion of the associated matters of control and the introduction of a targeted fencing standard.

6.0 Evaluation of the Proposal

This section of the report evaluates the objectives of the proposal to determine whether they are the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the RMA, as well as the associated policies, rules and standards relative to these objectives. It also assesses the level of detail required for the purposes of this evaluation, including the nature and extent to which the benefits and costs of the proposal have been quantified.

6.1 Scale and Significance

Section 32(1)(c) of the RMA requires that this report contain a level of detail that corresponds with the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

The level of detail undertaken for this evaluation has been determined by assessing the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects anticipated through introducing and implementing the proposed provisions (i.e. objectives, policies and rules) relative to a series of key criteria.

Based on this the scale and significance of anticipated effects associated with this proposal are identified below:

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
Basis for change		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal forms part of the full review of the ODP, the purpose of which is to ensure that resource management issues affecting the rural area are appropriately addressed. Although the current provisions are generally working as intended, further adjustments have been introduced to comply with the National Planning Standards and to improve their effectiveness relative to issues identified.
Addresses a resource management issue	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the area covered by the GRUZ includes s6 RMA matters that present issues from a resource management perspective (e.g. significant natural areas, outstanding natural features and landscapes, coastal environment) these are recognised and provided for in other chapters of the PDP.

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is largely centred on issues relating to maintaining and enhancing the quality and amenity of the rural environment and minimising land fragmentation to maintain a compact city.
Degree of shift from the status quo	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal represents a minor-moderate departure from the ODP, with the most noticeable change being the introduction of a specific precinct applying to the existing Makara Beach and Village settlements and provision for existing rural lifestyle living in identified areas through the introduction of a specific Large Lot Residential Zone.
Who and how many will be affected/ geographical scale of effect/s		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the rural area has a relatively small population base (approximately 1% of the city's total population) it geographically comprises approximately two-thirds of Wellington's land area.
Degree of impact on or interest from iwi/ Māori	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific advice has been received from Taranaki Whānui or Ngāti Toa Rangatira regarding this proposal. Although the area covered by the GRUZ contains matters of interest to Taranaki Whānui and Ngāti Toa Rangatira (eg sites and areas of significance to Māori, and the coastal environment) these are recognised and provided for in other chapters of the PDP.
Timing and duration of effect/s		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the impact of the proposal will be ongoing from the time it takes effect, the nature of associated effects is likely to be intermittent given the historical levels of development experienced in the rural area.
Type of effect/s	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is primarily centred around managing effects relating to land use and building activities, with those associated with such matters as subdivision, earthworks, transport, natural hazards and hazardous substances managed through complementary chapters in the PDP.
Degree of risk and uncertainty	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is largely a 'roll over' of relevant provisions in the ODP, with feedback to date and analysis of monitoring data indicating that the

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
				<p>current rural provisions are generally working as intended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement on the draft District Plan attracted a relatively small number of submissions (9), with most of these focussed on site specific zoning concerns.

Overall, the scale and significance of the proposed provisions are considered to be low for the following reasons:

- They do not materially concern any s6 RMA matters, with those aspects associated with rural use and development that could have a bearing on ss6(a) - (f) and (h) already recognised and provided for in complementary chapters of the PDP.
- The proposed provisions will assist the Council in achieving its obligations under s7 (b), (c), (f) and (g) of the RMA by contributing to amenity values in the city and maintaining the quality of the environment through appropriate management and development of the rural area.
- They have been introduced to comply with the National Planning Standards and to improve their effectiveness relative to the resource management issues identified.
- They will give effect to the RPS by encouraging a more compact and sustainable urban form and recognising and managing activities that may have an adverse impact on the aesthetic values of the zone.
- They provide clear direction on the outcomes sought in relation to amenity and the quality of the rural environment and therefore greater certainty for landowners and plan users.
- They present a low level risk as they are largely a 'roll over' of the current approach applied to managing activities in the rural area in the ODP, particularly at a rule/standards level.

Consequently, a high level evaluation of these provisions has been identified as appropriate for the purposes of this report.

6.2 Quantification of Benefits and Costs

Section 32(2)(b) requires that, where practicable, the benefits and costs of a proposal are to be quantified.

Based on the assessment of the scale and significance of the proposed provisions in section 6.1, specific quantification of the benefits and costs in this report is considered neither necessary, beneficial nor practicable in relation to this topic. Instead, this report identifies more generally where any additional costs or cost may lie.

7.0 Zone Framework

Based on the issues analysis in section 5.3 of this report and the National Planning Standard zone options set out in section 4.4.4 the following zone framework has been selected in relation to this topic:

Zone	Reason/s
<i>General Rural Zone (supplemented by a precinct applying to the existing Makara Beach and Village settlements)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option has been selected as it represents the most applicable zone category to cover rural activities within this area of the city, along with other activities requiring a rural setting such as rural industries, intensive indoor primary production and quarries. • The Rural Production Zone option was discounted as the rural area does not have any areas with highly productive soils suitable for arable use with few limitations. • The option of applying a specific precinct to the existing Makara Beach and Village settlements has been selected as it represents the most applicable approach to managing the distinct character and amenity of these areas relative to the introduction of a separate Settlement Zone. • The Rural Lifestyle Zone option was also discounted as application of a Large Lot Residential zoning to existing rural lifestyle areas around lower Takapu Valley and Hillcroft Road in Horokiwi was considered a more effective fit relative to their location and physical characteristics.

8.0 Overview of Proposal

The proposed provisions relevant to this topic are set out in detail in the ePlan and should be referenced in conjunction with this evaluation report.

In summary, the proposed provisions include:⁴

- Definitions
 - A set of relevant definitions, including:
 - Cleanfill areas
 - Conservation activities
 - Home business
 - Intensive indoor primary production
 - Quarrying activities
 - Rural activities
 - Rural industry
- Five objectives that address:
 - The purpose of the GRUZ and Makara Beach and Makara Village precinct.
 - The character and amenity values to be protected within the zone, including the Makara Beach and Makara Village precinct.
 - The management of adverse effects in the zone and at the zone interfaces, including reverse sensitivity effects and those associated with incompatible activities.
- Twelve policies that:
 - Enable a range of key activities anticipated in the zone.
 - Only allow potentially compatible activities where specified criteria can be satisfied.
 - Avoid incompatible activities.
 - Provide for the keeping of goats in certain circumstances.
 - Enable small scale residential visitor accommodation and home business.

⁴ Note: These are further supplemented by a supporting Rural Design Guide which, along with a range of other complementary design guidance appended to the PDP (e.g. Centres and Mixed Use, Residential, Character Precincts, Subdivision), is assessed in a separate, design guide specific evaluation report

- Require new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use on existing quarry or mining sites to demonstrate how the site will be rehabilitated.
- Restrict new residential buildings to one per allotment.
- Recognise and provide for a range of rural buildings and structures, alterations and additions to existing residential buildings and residential related accessory buildings and structures.
- Encourage the retention of existing on-site vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees.
- A rule framework that manages land use and building and structure activities as follows:
 - Land use activities
 - Permits key activities anticipated in the zone (e.g. rural activities, residential activity, recreation activity, conservation activity, home business, visitor accommodation) subject to meeting specified conditions.
 - Provides for potentially compatible activities (e.g. rural industry, intensive indoor primary production, quarrying and mining activities) as a discretionary activity.
 - Building and structure activities
 - Permits the repair, maintenance, demolition or removal of a building or structure.
 - Permits the construction, alteration or addition of rural and residential related buildings and structures subject to compliance with specified effects standards.
- A complementary set of effects standards that address:
 - Maximum height, maximum gross floor area, building coverage, setbacks, height in relation to boundary and fencing requirements.
- Application of a precinct approach to managing the distinct character and amenity associated with the existing Makara Beach and Makara Village settlements.

9.0 Evaluation of Proposed Objective/s

9.1 Introduction

Section 32(1)(a) of the RMA requires that the evaluation report examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

An examination of the proposed objectives along with reasonable alternatives is included below, with the relative extent of their appropriateness based on an assessment against the following criteria:

1. Relevance (i.e. Is the objective related to addressing resource management issues and will it achieve one or more aspects of the purpose and principles of the RMA?)
2. Usefulness (i.e. Will the objective guide decision-making? Does it meet sound principles for writing objectives (i.e. does it clearly state the anticipated outcome?))
3. Reasonableness (i.e. What is the extent of the regulatory impact imposed on individuals, businesses or the wider community? Is it consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes?)
4. Achievability (i.e. Can the objective be achieved with tools and resources available, or likely to be available, to the Council?)

9.2 Evaluation of Objectives GRUZ-O1 – GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-PREC01-O1 - GRUZ-PREC01-O2

While not specifically required under s32, it is appropriate to also consider alternative objectives to those currently included in the PDP so as to ensure that the proposed objectives are the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

For the purposes of this evaluation, the Council has considered two suites of potential objectives:

1. The proposed objectives
2. The current most relevant objectives - the status quo

Proposed objectives:

General Rural Zone

GRUZ-O1 – Purpose

The General Rural Zone predominately provides for rural activities, complemented by a range of outdoor recreation and other activities that have a functional need for a rural location.

GRUZ-O2 – Character and amenity values

Activities and development maintain or enhance the predominant character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, including the prevalence of natural features over man-made features, a low density and scale of buildings and structures, and a general absence of urban infrastructure.

GRUZ-O3 – Managing effects

Adverse effects from activities and development in the General Rural Zone are managed effectively within the zone and at the zone interface, and rural activities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and/or reverse sensitivity effects.

Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct

GRUZ-PREC01-O1 – Purpose

The Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct provides for the range of residential activities that predominate in the Makara Beach and Village settlements.

GRUZ-PREC01-O2 - Character and amenity values

Activities and development maintain or enhance the predominant character and amenity values of the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct, including:

1. The low density nature and scale of residential development (standalone and primarily 1 or 2 storeys in height); and
2. The coastal character of the Makara Beach settlement.

General intent:

- To articulate the intended purpose of the GRUZ and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct
- To highlight the respective character and amenity values of the GRUZ and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct
- To articulate what is anticipated within the GRUZ regarding the management of adverse effects

Other potential objectives

Status quo – Three directly relevant objectives in the ODP:

14.2.1 To promote the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources in the Rural Area.

14.2.2 To maintain and enhance the character of the Rural Area by managing the scale, location and rate and design of new building development.

14.2.3 To maintain and enhance the amenity values and rural character of Rural Areas.

	Preferred objectives	Status quo
<i>Relevance:</i>		
Addresses a relevant resource management issue	<p>The preferred objectives directly address two clear issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognising the variation in the types of environment that exist within the rural area by delineating and distinguishing the distinct, affiliated purposes of the GRUZ and Makara Beach and Village settlements Identifying the predominant character and amenity values associated with these areas that need to be maintained or enhanced 	Although touching on the issue of rural character and amenity the objectives lack clarity and direction concerning the outcomes sought. There is also a lack of recognition regarding the variation in the types of environment that exist within the rural area.
Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 RMA	The proposed objectives will assist the Council to undertake its functions under s31 of the RMA, particularly the integrated management of resources through controlling any actual or potential effects of the use and development of land in the GRUZ and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct.	Although the objectives provide some direction to assist Council to undertake its integrated management function under s31 of the RMA, they lack sufficient clarity regarding the purpose of the GRUZ and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct and the character and amenity outcomes anticipated within these areas.
Gives effect to higher level documents	The proposed objectives give effect to higher level documents, particularly Objectives 22, 30 and 31 and associated Policies 55, 56, 59 and 60 of the RPS. They are also consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA, particularly ss7(b), (c) and (f), reflect the relevant directions in the National Planning Standards and align with the Compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City.	Although the objectives give effect to the RPS they are less aligned with relevant directions in the National Planning Standards and Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City.
<i>Usefulness:</i>		
Guides decision-making	In conjunction with the proposed policies the proposed objectives will effectively guide decisions on resource consent applications as	In conjunction with the policies the objectives in the ODP guide decisions on resource consent applications, but provide less clarity and direction regarding the

	<p>they provide clear direction regarding the purpose of the GRUZ, and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct and the character and amenity outcomes anticipated within these areas.</p> <p>These are further supported by accompanying rules that clearly delineate those activities identified as compatible/incompatible with the purpose and/or character and amenity values of the rural area.</p>	<p>purpose of the GRUZ and Makara Beach and Village settlements and the character and amenity outcomes anticipated within these areas.</p>
Meets best practice for objectives	<p>Identifying the purpose of the GRUZ and associated Makara Beach and Village Precinct, along with their associated character and amenity values aligns with current best practice.</p>	<p>Although similar provisions were common in a number of 'first generation' district plans, these have generally been replaced in subsequent plan reviews or specific plan changes with clearer and more instructive provisions.</p>
<i>Reasonableness:</i>		
Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community/parts of the community	<p>As the proposed objectives do not represent a radical departure from the current direction in the ODP it is unlikely that significant additional compliance costs will be incurred by landowners/ developers to achieve the outcomes sought.</p>	<p>The existing objectives do not appear to have resulted in significant compliance costs being incurred by landowners/developers.</p>
Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk	<p>There is a high level of certainty around the proposal and its effects as the proposed objectives provide greater clarity of intent regarding the outcomes sought in the rural area while not radically departing from the current direction.</p>	<p>There is a lesser degree of certainty around the existing objectives given their lack of clear direction as to the anticipated character and amenity outcomes sought in the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements.</p>
<i>Achievability:</i>		
Consistent with identified tāngata whenua and community outcomes	<p>No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.</p>	<p>No specific tāngata whenua or community outcomes have been identified.</p>
Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources	<p>The objectives are realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources, with any additional skills or resources required able to be sourced either in-house or on a contract basis.</p>	<p>The status quo objectives are currently being implemented within the Council's powers, skills and resources.</p>

Summary

Proposed Objectives GRUZ-O1 to GRUZ-O3 and GRUZ-PREC01-O1 and GRUZ-PREC01-O2 provide clear direction regarding the respective roles that the GRUZ and Makara Beach and Village settlements assume in the context of the PDP and the city more generally. They also set out the Council's expectations concerning the anticipated nature of activities, and the form and scale of development, within the zone that is consistent with its role, the standard of amenity sought and management of adverse effects of activities and built development, particularly within the zone and at zone interfaces or where reverse sensitivity issues are anticipated to arise.

The above analysis indicates that the preferred objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act and the Council's functions under s31 RMA, give the greatest effect to the higher-level planning instruments, as well as providing greater certainty for decision-makers and Plan users. They are also unlikely to result in significant additional administrative or compliance costs being incurred.

10.0 Evaluation of Reasonably Practicable Options and Associated Provisions

10.1 Introduction

Under s32(1)(b) of the RMA, reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective/s associated with this proposal need to be identified and examined. This section of the report evaluates the proposed policies and rules, as they relate to the associated objectives.

Along with the proposed provisions, the Council has also identified through the research, consultation, information gathering, and analysis undertaken in relation to this topic two reasonably practicable alternative options to achieve the objectives.

The technical and consultation input used to inform this process is outlined in section 5 of this report.

10.2 Evaluation method

For each potential approach an evaluation has been undertaken relating to the costs, benefits and the certainty and sufficiency of information (as informed by section 5 of this report) in order to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the approach, and whether it is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives.

Where practicable, benefits and costs have been quantified. Additionally, any obvious opportunities for economic growth and employment arising from the proposed provisions have also been identified and assessed.

This evaluation is contained in the following sections.

10.3 Provisions to achieve Objective/s

For the purpose of this evaluation, the Council has considered the following potential options:

1. The proposed provisions.
2. The status quo.
3. A reasonable alternative/s – a more permissive approach to residential land use and development in the rural area.

Objectives:

General Rural Zone

GRUZ-O1 – Purpose

The General Rural Zone predominately provides for rural activities, complemented by a range of outdoor recreation and other activities that have a functional need for a rural location.

GRUZ-O2 – Character and amenity values

Activities and development maintain or enhance the predominant character and amenity values of the General Rural Zone, including the prevalence of natural features over man-made features, a low density and scale of buildings and structures, and a general absence of urban infrastructure.

GRUZ-O3 – Managing effects

Adverse effects from activities and development in the General Rural Zone are managed effectively within the zone and at the zone interface, and rural activities are not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and/or reverse sensitivity effects.

Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct

GRUZ-PREC01-O1 – Purpose

The Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct provides for the range of residential activities that predominate in the Makara Beach and Village settlements.

GRUZ-PREC01-O2 - Character and amenity values

Activities and development maintain or enhance the predominant character and amenity values of the Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct, including:

1. The low density nature and scale of residential development (standalone and primarily 1 or 2 storeys in height); and
2. The coastal character of the Makara Beach settlement.

Option 1: Proposed approach to provisions (recommended)⁵	Costs	Benefits	Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions
<p>Policies:</p> <p>Twelve policies are proposed that seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clear direction as to the range of activities that are compatible/ incompatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone and associated Makara Beach and Makara Village Precinct • Provide for the keeping of goats in certain circumstances • Enable small scale residential visitor accommodation and home business • Require new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use on existing quarry or mining sites to demonstrate how the site will be rehabilitated • Restrict new residential buildings to one per allotment • Recognise and provide for a range of rural buildings and structures, alterations and 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of the rules/standards to anticipate and effectively manage the effects of the full range of rural activities enabled. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative and compliance costs associated with activities/development that do not meet the relevant effects standards. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits the exercise of residential locational choice within the city, particularly residential lifestyle opportunities within the rural environment and opportunities for denser residential development in the Makara Beach and Village settlements. <p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct or indirect costs have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives heightened effect to the policy intent articulated in policies 55 and 56 of the RPS through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clearly aligning with and reflecting the urban growth direction set out in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City ○ Providing clearer direction concerning the aesthetic values that characterise the rural area, including the Makara Beach and Village settlements • Aligns with the Compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City. • Supports continuation of the productive use of the rural land resource. • Provides a clearer policy framework to enable compatible activities to locate and operate in the rural area with certainty, and for Council to determine the appropriateness of less compatible activities or development and whether it has the potential to undermine the intent of the zone. • Provides greater clarity and certainty regarding the character and amenity values associated with rural area and associated Makara Beach and Village settlements. • Provides an appropriate level of control over built form and scale of development relative to the role and purpose of the zone, along with a level intensification that is consistent with its predominant character and amenity values. 	<p>It is considered that there is certain and sufficient information on which to base the proposed provisions as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions are broadly based on those in the ODP and are an approach that is already well understood. • Feedback on the draft provisions generally supported the proposed approach and no fundamental issues were raised.

⁵ Note: These are further supplemented by a supporting Rural Design Guide which, along with a range of other complementary design guidance appended to the PDP (e.g. Centres and Mixed Use, Residential, Character Precincts, Subdivision), is assessed in a separate, design guide specific evaluation report

<p>additions to existing residential buildings and residential related accessory buildings and structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the retention of existing on-site vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees. <p>Rules/Standards:</p> <p>A framework of rules and standards that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permits key activities anticipated in the zone subject to meeting specified conditions. Provides for potentially compatible activities as a controlled or discretionary activity. Permits the repair, maintenance, demolition or removal of a building or structure. Permits the construction, alteration or addition of rural and residential related buildings and structures subject to compliance with specified effects standards. Provides a complementary set of effects standards that address: maximum height, maximum gross floor area, building coverage, setbacks, height in relation to boundary and fencing requirements. <p>Precinct Spatial Layer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of a precinct approach to managing the distinct character and amenity of the existing Makara Beach and Makara Village settlements 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising from ad hoc, sporadic and incompatible development. Reduces pressure on rural land development by controlling the nature and extent of non-rural related activities locating in the zone (e.g. residential). Provides an effective response to managing the feral goat issue in the rural area. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides clarity and certainty concerning the range of compatible activities permitted within the zone. Potential reduction in administrative and compliance costs as there is greater clarity concerning the range of permitted activities and most areas of non-compliance are proposed to be treated as a restricted vs full discretionary activity. Permits a wide range of compatible activities such as primary production, home business and visitor accommodation, thereby creating opportunities for increased economic growth and employment related benefits to be realised. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides clarity and certainty to the community regarding the outcomes and likely nature and level of development anticipated. Simple and clear plan structure that will be easier for people to understand and apply. <p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct or indirect benefits have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP. 	
<p>Effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>It is considered that the provisions will effectively achieve the proposed objectives because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They align with and support the intended purpose of the GRUZ and Makara Beach and Village settlements. They enable the zone to be effectively managed, recognising the distinctive amenity and character of both the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements. The rule framework reflects the character and amenity anticipated by controlling the scale of development that can be built as of right. 	<p>Efficiency</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed approach is the most efficient means of achieving the relevant objectives.</p> <p>The approach is efficient in terms of the level of certainty provided to landowners and District Plan users generally. It is also efficient from the point of view of broadly enabling rural activities and related development as of right, supplemented by land use consent where baseline effects standards are exceeded, or non-rural or more intensive activities are proposed.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The standards are aligned with the anticipated built development and amenity outcomes sought within the zone 	Overall, the costs of complying with the provisions are considered minor compared to the benefits of this proposal.	
Overall evaluation	<p>Overall, this approach is the most appropriate means of achieving the proposed objectives as it provides an appropriate balance between enabling opportunities for growth and development to occur in the rural area while ensuring that its distinctive amenity and character, along with that of the associated Makara Beach and Village settlements, is not intentionally compromised. It also satisfies relevant policy directives in the RPS and reflects relevant directions in the National Planning Standards.</p> <p>Additionally, the benefits of the approach outweigh the costs, there are considerable efficiencies to be gained from adopting the proposed provisions and there is sufficient information on which to act.</p>		
Option 1a: Alternative approach to provisions - More permissive approach to residential land use and development	Costs	Benefits	Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions
<p>Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include policies to supplement the proposed provisions that provide increased opportunity for more intensive residential activity and development to occur in the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements (e.g. residential lifestyle, higher density residential) <p>Rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce associated rules that support a more permissive policy approach to residential activities and development while ensuring that the character and amenity values of the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements are not undermined. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to give full effect to the policy intent articulated in policies 55 and 56 of the RPS. Misaligns with the Compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City. Has the potential to undermine the proposed purpose of the GRUZ along with the character and amenity values that predominate in the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements. Could add an unnecessary and more complex level of regulation to the zone, particularly given the lack of evidence that suggests there is a need to diverge from the current and proposed policy direction. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the potential to result in additional administrative and compliance costs associated with satisfying additional character and amenity related requirements introduced to ensure that character and amenity values are not unintentionally undermined. Could create a greater degree of uncertainty for landowners/developers/community depending on the framework of rules/standards applied, including the eventual outcome of any associated consenting process. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to result in changes over time to the character and amenity values of the rural area and Makara Beach and Village settlements that were unintended or contrary to expectations within the rural community. Significantly reduces the level of certainty for neighbours and the community generally regarding the nature and extent of residential development that could occur throughout the zone. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could facilitate better utilisation and rationalisation of land parcels, particularly in areas with less productive capability <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially enables more economic and innovative use of land within the zone. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases residential locational choice within the city, particularly residential lifestyle opportunities within the rural environment and opportunities for denser residential development in the Makara Beach and Village settlements. <p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct or indirect benefits have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP. 	<p>It is considered that there is insufficient information concerning the manner in which this approach might be implemented or the nature of any unanticipated consequences that might result.</p> <p>A key risk of acting on these provisions is that there is a clear lack of evidence that suggests and supports the need to diverge from the proposed policy direction.</p>

	<p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct or indirect costs have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the PDP. 		
Effectiveness and efficiency	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Although this approach provides opportunities to increase residential activity and development opportunities in the GRUZ it is likely to be of limited effectiveness in achieving the outcomes articulated in the proposed objectives and runs the risk of undermining their intent in the absence of introducing consequential changes that would be more enabling of residential activity and development in the zone.</p>	<p>Efficiency</p> <p>This approach offers an efficient means by which the latent residential use and development potential of land within the rural area could be optimised. Regardless, overall, it is considered that this approach, relative to the proposed provisions, is not an efficient method of meeting the proposed objectives given the relative costs versus benefits outlined above.</p>	
Overall evaluation	<p>This option is not considered an appropriate means to achieve the proposed objectives as it would act to undermine the proposed purpose of the GRUZ along with the character and amenity values that predominate in the rural area and Makara Beach and Makara Village settlements. Depending on the associated rule/standard framework introduced it could also result in the creation of an unnecessary and complex level of regulation. The approach would also be ineffective in delivering on the relevant objective and policies in the RPS and the compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City.</p>		
Option 2: Status Quo	Costs	Benefits	Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions
<p>Policies:</p> <p>Six policies that seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage new urban development to locate within established urban areas such as Makara Beach and Village. Allow work-from-home activities Control the number, location and design of new building developments and activities. Ensure that activities located within the area do not have harmful effects on urban areas. Control non-rural activities Encourage retention of existing vegetation. <p>Rules/Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permits key activities anticipated in the zone subject to meeting specified conditions. Provides for potentially compatible activities as a discretionary activity. Permits the repair, maintenance, demolition or removal of a building or structure. Permits the construction, alteration or addition of rural and residential related buildings and structures subject to 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives only partial effect to the policy intent articulated in policies 55 and 56 of the RPS. Less effectively supports the outcomes sought in the proposed objectives. Offers reduced clarity and certainty regarding the character and amenity values associated with rural area and associated Makara Beach and Village settlements. Reliance on the use of appendices to spatially delineate areas where targeted rules apply lacks sufficient clarity and certainty to offer an effective approach to managing these areas, particularly as these areas are not specifically identified as a spatial layer in the ePlan. Adequacy of the rules/standards to anticipate and effectively manage the effects of the full range of rural activities enabled. Offers a less effective approach to managing the feral goat issue in the rural area. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative and compliance costs associated with activities/development that do not meet the relevant effects standards. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limits the exercise of residential locational choice within the city, particularly residential lifestyle opportunities within the rural environment and opportunities for denser residential development in the Makara Beach and Village settlements. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with the Compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City. Affords a similar level of control over built form and scale of development relative to the proposed provisions. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively cost effective to implement as limited drafting required and landowners, developers and the rural community are already familiar with the provisions. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers familiarity and a satisfactory level of certainty to the community regarding the likely development outcomes anticipated in the rural area. <p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct or indirect benefits have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under a separate chapter of the ODP 	<p>It is considered that there is certain and sufficient information on which to base the proposed policies and methods as the existing provisions and associated implications/issues are well documented and understood.</p> <p>A key risk of acting on the status quo provisions is that the current policy framework lacks detail and clear direction on the purpose of the zone, the character and amenity values attributable to the zone and associated Makara Beach and Village settlements and matters to inform the determination of compatible/incompatible activities and development within the zone.</p>

<p>compliance with specified effects standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a complementary set of effects standards that address: maximum building/ fencing height, maximum gross floor area, yards, number of household units, number of workers. <p>Other Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendices to the plan that spatially indicate areas of Makara Beach, Makara Village and Horokiwi where specified rules apply Rural Design Guide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More difficult to understand and apply given the relatively complex and less integrative structure and construction of provisions. <p>Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No direct or indirect costs have been identified, noting that cultural and historic heritage values are subject to consideration under separate chapters of the ODP. 		
<p>Effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>The current policy framework has limited effectiveness as it is somewhat ambiguous and lacks clear direction, particularly in relation to character and amenity outcomes relevant to the rural area and associated Makara Beach and Village settlements. Consequently, it is open to interpretation and could inadvertently compromise the outcomes sought by the proposed objectives.</p>	<p>Efficiency</p> <p>The status quo is efficient from the perspective that it reflects a similar level of permissiveness relative to the proposed provisions. Regardless, overall it is considered that the status quo, relative to the proposed provisions, is not an efficient method of meeting the proposed objectives given the relative costs versus benefits outlined above.</p>	
<p>Overall evaluation</p>	<p>This approach is not an appropriate means to achieve the proposed objectives as the current policies are somewhat ambiguous regarding the purpose of the GRUZ, its predominant character and amenity values and factors to help inform what constitutes compatible/incompatible activities and development within the zone. Consequently, they lend themselves to more open interpretation and are less likely relative to the proposed provisions to constructively assist the Council in determining the appropriateness of activities or development that could undermine the intent of the zone. The approach would also be less effective in delivering on the relevant objective and policies in the RPS.</p>		

11.0 Conclusion

This evaluation has been undertaken in accordance with section 32 of the RMA in order to identify the need, benefits and costs and the appropriateness of the proposal having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency relative to other means in achieving the purpose of the RMA. The evaluation demonstrates that this proposal is the most appropriate option as:

- It gives effect to the higher order requirements of the RPS.
- It aligns with the relevant directions in the National Planning Standards and the Compact goal and related directions in Our City Tomorrow: A Spatial Plan for Wellington City.
- It enables a wide range of activities that are compatible with the existing use and nature of development prevalent in the rural area and associated Makara Beach and Village settlements.
- The objectives and policies provide certainty and clear direction regarding the purpose, character and level of amenity anticipated within the zone, supported by a framework of rules and standards that align with the built development and amenity outcomes sought.

Appendix 1: Feedback on Draft District Plan 2021

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
1131	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	1131.18	Supports retention of full suite of draft GRUZ provisions.			N/A	Support noted.
1129	Ministry of Education Te Tahuhu o Te Matauranga	1129.11(34) – (38)	Supports retention of GRUZ-O3, GRUZ-P4, GRUZ- P10, GRUZ-R13 and GRUZ-R14.			N/A	Support noted.
		1129.3 + 1129.11(39)	<p>Although there are no current plans to establish new schools in the GRUZ the Ministry notes that should the functional need to alter or add to existing schools arise in future that status of these activities is unclear in the provisions as currently drafted.</p> <p>Seeks new provision for ensuring educational facilities can operate in a way that positively contributes to the rural community.</p>			<p>Add new rule as follows: <u>GRUZ-Rx – Construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with activities not otherwise listed.</u> 1. Activity status: Discretionary</p>	<p>The absence of a general 'catch all' rule relating to the status of construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with activities not covered by rules GRUZ-R16, GRUZ-17 and GRUZ-PREC01-R1 in the draft District Plan is noted. Consequently, an application for any such activity would default to being considered as a discretionary activity under s.87B RMA.</p> <p>To redress this situation, it is recommended that a further rule be included in the GRUZ along the lines of the suggested wording as this would provide greater interpretive clarity and certainty to the GRUZ provisions relating to building and structures.</p>
		1129.11(40)	<p>Supports in part GRUZ-S1 – Maximum height.</p> <p>Seeks the inclusion of an additional maximum height limit for buildings and structures associated with other activities, noting that this supports the proposed rule sought relating to the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.</p>			<p>Amend GRUZ-S1 as follows: <u>4. Buildings and structures associated with other activities – 8m</u></p>	<p>Not required if 'construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with activities not otherwise listed' is included in the District Plan as a discretionary activity. This, in turn, would enable the Council to consider the activity 'in the round' under s.104 RMA and to exercise full discretion regarding whether or not to grant consent and what conditions to impose on the consent if granted.</p> <p>For the above reasons the requested change is not recommended.</p>
		1129.11(41)	<p>Supports in part GRUZ-S2 – Maximum gross floor area.</p> <p>Seeks the inclusion of an additional maximum gross floor area limit for buildings and structures associated with other activities, noting that this supports the proposed rule sought relating to the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.</p>			<p>Amend GRUZ-S2 as follows: <u>3. Buildings and structures associated with other activities</u></p>	Refer above response.
		1129.11(42)	<p>Supports in part GRUZ-S5 – Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings.</p> <p>Seeks extension of the setback requirements to also apply to buildings and structures associated with other activities, noting that this supports the proposed rule</p>			<p>Amend GRUZ-S2 header as follows: GRUZ-S5 Minimum boundary setbacks for rural buildings <u>and non- residential buildings</u></p> <p>Amend GRUZ-S2 as follows: Rural <u>Building</u> or structure</p>	Refer above response.

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
			sought relating to the construction, addition or alteration to buildings and structures associated with potentially compatible activities.				
972	Jon Thompson	972.1	<p>Notes that site at 200 Parkvale Road, Karori is proposed to be zoned GRUZ and requests that portions of the site be rezoned General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ) as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located adjacent to established residential sites zoned General Residential Resource consent is currently held for 5 new dwellings on that portion of the site requested to be rezoned General Residential, but rezoning this land would provide greater certainty and significantly improved efficiencies It will contribute to the city's housing yield in a location that is well connected to an existing urban area 			<p>Rezoned identified portions of 200 Parkvale Road, Karori from GRUZ to General Residential Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone</p>	<p>Subdivision and residential development of the land identified for proposed rezoning to GRZ is currently enabled via subdivision and land use consents approved in 2018. This included approval to undertake a six-lot fee simple subdivision and construct five associated residential dwellings, the latter of which was subject to a Consent Notice restricting the location of building(s) and structures along with compliance with a number of other development related requirements (e.g. maximum building height, roof forms, external cladding).</p> <p>Due to the intensification requirements recently introduced into the RMA through the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill the ability to rely on the continued use of GRZ as a zoning option in the District Plan is no longer realistically available. The requirement to now incorporate in relevant residential zones the Medium Density Residential Standards specified in Schedule 3A of the RMA means Tier 1 councils such as Wellington City will instead need to resort to applying a medium density residential zoning (MRZ) to current GRZ areas as a minimum. This includes enabling up to 3, 3-storey residential units on a site as a permitted activity, subject to satisfying identified density standards.</p> <p>As a result the land identified for proposed rezoning to GRZ would instead default to MRZ, thus enabling a greater level of development to potentially occur than that currently consented and contrary to the consent conditions that apply. This situation is further complicated by existing 3-waters and transport infrastructure issues prevalent in Karori, with the Spatial Plan signalling deferral of further intensification in the suburb beyond that currently enabled by the District Plan pending investment and delivery of necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>In terms of the request to rezone a further identified area of land to LLRZ it is noted that Council's intent in relation to the use of this zoning is to restrict its application primarily to those sites already approved for rural residential purposes. This reinforces strategic objective UFD-O1 which seeks to maintain Wellington's compact urban form, particularly within the City Centre, in and around Centres and along major public transport corridors, and objective SUB-O1 which seeks to achieve a development pattern that maintains or enhances the city's compact urban form, supported by necessary development infrastructure.</p> <p>For the above reasons retention of the GRUZ over the areas proposed for rezoning to GRZ and LLRZ is recommended.</p>

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
920	Jim Hartshorne	920.2	Notes the provision in GRUZ-P2 for the keeping of goats where these can be contained and managed but given the number of feral goats in the Makara/Ohariu Valley area considers that these also need to be managed to prevent property damage.			N/A	<p>The need for additional management of feral goats noted, with the issue addressed in part in the draft District Plan via rules GRUZ-R2 – Keeping of goats and GRUZ-S8 – Fencing requirements for the keeping of goats.</p> <p>These provisions are further supported by non-regulatory measures including implementation of the Greater Wellington Regional Council Regional Pest Management Plan 2019-2039 and culling of feral goats by professional hunters contracted by Wellington City Council.</p> <p>For the above reasons no further change to GRUZ-P2 is recommended.</p>
817	Aggregate and Quarry Association	817.6	Supports retention of GRUZ-P4, GRUZ-P5 and GRUZ-R12.			N/A	Support noted.
742	Lincolnshire Farm Ltd / Hunters Hill Ltd / Best Farm Ltd / Ohau Land and Cattle Ltd / Stebbings Farmlands Ltd	742.1	Opposes the proposed zoning of the site at 28 Westchester Drive, Glenside as GRUZ, noting that the site was a former HASHA - SHA and has an approved resource consent for earthworks and subdivision under SR420623 (Stage 1) and SR416389 (Stage 2) with earthworks now completed and over 80 titles issued.			Rezone 28 Westchester Drive, Glenside from GRUZ to General Residential Zone (GRZ) or Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ)	<p>Subdivision and development of 99 residential lots on the land identified for proposed rezoning to GRZ or MRZ is currently enabled via subdivision and land use consents approved under ss.36-38 of the HASHAA in 2019. It is also noted that titles have now been issued over a large proportion of these lots.</p> <p>Given that approval has already been granted to develop the site for residential purposes and that site works have largely been completed it appears both reasonable and sensible to support a rezoning of the site under the circumstances. However, due to the intensification requirements recently introduced into the RMA through the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill the ability of Tier 1 councils such as Wellington City to rely on the continued use of GRZ as a zoning option in the District Plan is no longer realistically available.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is recommended that consideration is given to rezoning the site to MRZ.</p>

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
628	Steven Zhao	628.2	<p>Notes that site at 24 Grumman Lane, Newlands is proposed to be zoned GRUZ and requests it be rezoned General Residential Zone as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site cannot support rural activities The context of the site has changed significantly in the last 10 years and is no longer in a rural context The visual and ecological values of the site will continue to be protected The site provides a good opportunity for new housing in an establishing residential area with reasonable public transport access 			<p>Rezone 24 Grumman Lane, Newlands from GRUZ to General Residential Zone (GRZ)</p>	<p>The subdivision and development of this lot was enabled via subdivision and land use consents approved in 2006. It is also subject to a Consent Notice issued in 2008 restricting building development to a single household unit at all times and further subdivision except for minor boundary adjustments where no additional lots are created.</p> <p>Due to the intensification requirements recently introduced into the RMA through the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill the ability to rely on the continued use of GRZ as a zoning option in the District Plan is no longer realistically available. The requirement to now incorporate in relevant residential zones the Medium Density Residential Standards specified in Schedule 3A of the RMA means Tier 1 councils such as Wellington City will instead need to resort to applying a medium density residential zoning (MRZ) to current GRZ areas as a minimum. This includes enabling up to 3, 3-storey residential units on a site as a permitted activity, subject to satisfying identified density standards.</p> <p>As a result the requested zoning of this site would instead default to MRZ as opposed to GRZ, thus enabling a greater level of development to potentially occur than that currently consented and contrary to the consent conditions that apply to the site.</p> <p>Additionally, it is noted that any further development of the site would be constrained by a proposed Significant Natural Area overlay that covers approximately half of the site area. It is also understood that the capacity of the roading network to absorb higher levels of intensification in this locale is a further constraining factor.</p> <p>For the above reasons retention of the GRUZ over this site is recommended.</p>
284	Briony Ellis	284.1	Notes that provision has been made for goats and the impact they have on Wellington's ecology and biodiversity in GRUZ-P2 but is concerned that there seems to be totally inadequate provision for management of deer which are also an increasing threat to the city's biodiversity in Wellington.			Amend GRUZ-P2 to include recognition and provision for deer management.	<p>The management of deer has not been identified as a key resource management issue in the context of the GRUZ (refer GRUZ Issues and Options Report, July 2020). In the absence of this being an identified problem amending policy GRUZ-P2 and standard GRUZ-S8 to incorporate provision for the management/keeping of deer would constitute an unsubstantiated and unjustifiable response.</p> <p>For the above reasons no further change to GRUZ-P2 is recommended.</p>
		284.3	Notes that GRUZ-S8 sets out fencing requirements for the keeping of goats but is concerned about the lack of similar provisions applying to deer given their increasing threat to Wellington's biodiversity.			Amend GRUZ-S8 to also apply to the keeping of deer.	Refer above response.

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
241	Whispering Pines Estate Ltd	241.2	Opposes the proposed zoning of 81 and 101 Collins Avenue, Tawa as GRUZ and considers that there is potential for an additional "Development Area" in this general location as it has good access to facilities and public transport by way of Collins Avenue and adjoins the Large Lot Residential Zone along Bing Lucas Drive to the south.			Establish a joint Council and landowner project to determine an appropriate zoning of these sites that reflects the feasible development potential of this location.	<p>Although the proposed zoning of 81 Collins Avenue is GRUZ it is noted that the adjacent site at 101 Collins Avenue is proposed to be General Industrial, a zoning that reflects its apparent primary use for the storage and distribution of packaging products.</p> <p>Given the size and characteristics of the 81 Collins Avenue site relative to proposed Development Areas such as Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings/Glenside West (e.g. relatively steep topography bisected by a proposed Significant Natural Area overlay), and that this site/area has not been identified as a candidate for more intensive urban development in the Spatial Plan, rezoning this site as a further development area is not recommended.</p> <p>However, it is noted that the site is bounded to the west and south by sites that are zoned Large Lot Residential (LLRZ) and to the north by the city boundary. As the site characteristics of 81 Collins Avenue appear to mirror those on the adjoining LLRZ land to the west (e.g. Rangatira Road) a reasonable and practical option would be to rezone this site to enable future large lot residential development to occur once the existing pine plantation has been harvested. This would also affect a more consistent zoning pattern in this area as the proposed general rural zoning of the site appears to be something of an anomaly and likely to have been applied to reflect its current use as a pine plantation.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is recommended that consideration is given to rezoning the site to LLRZ.</p>
44	Esther Newman	44.17	Notes the direction in GRUZ-P8 on restricting the number of residential units per site in the GRUZ and considers that property owners should have the option to build one additional residential unit (eg tiny home for dependent) as long as it meets design guidance.			Amend GRUZ-P8 as follows: Maintain the rural character and amenity of the General Rural Zone by restricting the number of residential units to one per allotment, and by requiring that the design, external appearance, siting and site landscaping is consistent with the Rural Area Design Guide.	<p>The primary purpose of the GRUZ is to accommodate rural activities with concession made for other activities that have a functional need for a rural location. Provision for residential activities and buildings to support rural activities consistent with the zone purpose is reflected in policy GRUZ-P8 and rules GRUZ-R4 and GRUZ-R17.</p> <p>Restricting further development in the zone to that which is necessary and sufficient to meet its purpose is further reinforced by policy GRUZ-P6. This policy contains a clear direction that activities and development resulting in urbanisation inconsistent with the compact city urban growth objective are to be avoided, with emphasis instead on the City Centre, in and around Centres, and along major public transport corridors as the main focus of future urban development (refer strategic objective UFD-O1).</p> <p>For the above reasons no further change to GRUZ-P8 is recommended.</p>

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
1088	Bruce White	1088.1	Urges consideration of both enabling intensification within the existing city footprint and opening-up the sizeable areas of land within Wellington currently zoned rural as this will increase housing supply and bring increased competition to the Wellington housing development market.	Y	N	Consider the further rezoning of areas proposed as GRUZ to an alternative zoning that would enable opportunities for increased housing supply.	<p>The need to adopt a more enabling approach to increasing the delivery of future housing supply in Wellington by opening-up areas of rurally zoned land is noted.</p> <p>Although such an approach could create development opportunities that offer affordable housing choice it is contrary to the growth path directed/articulated in a key policies and plans that have been instrumental in informing the approach applied to growth management in the draft District Plan. These include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPSUD), which includes policy directives centred on enabling as much development capacity as possible in city centres, at least 6 storeys in metropolitan centres and at least 6 storeys within the walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops and on the edge of city and metropolitan centres • Our City Tomorrow: Spatial Plan for Wellington City, which reflects the directives in the NPSUD by enabling increased intensification in the central city and inner suburbs and in and around key suburban centres and existing/planned rapid transit stops, supported by provision for 'greenfield' development at Upper and Lower Stebbings Valley and Lincolnshire Farm • The Wellington Regional Growth Framework, which identifies future development centred around 'urban renewal areas' such as central Wellington and Newtown and 'future urban areas' such as Lincolnshire Farm and Upper Stebbings • Te Atakura – First to Zero, which sets out a 'blueprint' to guide Wellington to become carbon neutral by 2050 including through further capitalising on its compact and accessible urban form to help reduce carbon emissions <p>Additionally, given the challenges posed to both fund and deliver the necessary infrastructure to the support the growth path identified in the Spatial Plan and effected through the draft District Plan it would be irresponsible to open up further areas to indiscriminate development. Instead, careful sequencing of growth and development will be crucial given the substantive scale of infrastructure investment required to address current network issues and to support growth over the next 30 years.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is recommended that the GRUZ zoning pattern illustrated on the draft District Plan planning maps be retained.</p>

Draft General Rural Zone (GRUZ) Chapter – Submission Response Report

Submission #	Submitter	Submission Point/s#	Submission Summary	Change/s Sought		Proposed Change/s (Note: specific text changes sought are either <u>underlined</u> or struck through)	Response
				Y	N		
19	Miao Gong	19.1	<p>Notes that site at 283 Middleton Road, Glenside is proposed to be zoned GRUZ and requests it be rezoned General Residential Zone as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site cannot meet the purpose or objectives set out in GRUZ-O1 to GRUC-O3, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unsuitable for rural activities as it is not large enough to accommodate such uses and is currently used for residential purposes It does not have a rural character Negative impacts on neighbouring residential activities could occur if it was used for rural purposes The site provides an excellent opportunity for housing in an area where people can access shops and services by bike or bus. 			<p>Rezone 283 Middleton Road, Glenside from GRUZ to General Residential Zone</p>	<p>This site is bounded to the north by GRUZ zoned land currently being developed for residential purposes (28 Westchester Drive), GRUZ/GRZ zoned land to the west currently occupied by housing and Middleton Road to the south and east. Given the residential development that is already occurring to the north of site and the recommended rezoning of this area to MRZ it appears both reasonable and sensible for a similar rezoning to be applied to this site as retention of the GRUZ would be anomalous with the predominant nature of the surrounding environment (i.e. residential).</p> <p>Although stream corridor and ponding overlays that apply along the southern boundary of the site are a limiting factor the site is of sufficient size to accommodate future residential development (6090 m2) subject to satisfying relevant hazard requirements. It is also serviced by existing 3 waters infrastructure and offers good accessibility to local services/facilities and public transport.</p> <p>Of further note is that the adjoining site at 281 Westchester Drive is also zoned GRUZ. If the subject site and 28 Westchester Drive are rezoned MRZ this would effectively render this property an 'orphan' rural site bounded by residentially zoned sites to the west, north and east. Like 283 Middleton Road, retention of the proposed rural zoning over this site would be anomalous with the predominant residential nature of the surrounding environment and rezoning to MRZ is recommended. Although it is noted that stream corridor and ponding overlays also apply to this site, potential opportunities exist for future residential development/ redevelopment to occur subject to satisfying relevant hazard requirements.</p> <p>For the above reasons it is recommended that consideration is given to rezoning both 281 and 283 Middleton Road to MRZ.</p>
128	M & P Makara Family Trust	128.1	Supports GRUZ intentions to contain urban development and maintain amenity values in the rural area, and supports new rules intended to limit wild goat populations in order to assist with biodiversity outcomes.			N/A	Support noted.
152	Brent Layton	152.1	Seeks confirmation that the sites at 183, 241 and 249 South Karori Road, Karori are zoned GRUZ.			N/A	Sites confirmed as GRUZ on the draft Wellington City District Plan maps.
530	Ema Maria Bargh	530.1	Seeks confirmation that the site at 169 South Karori Road, Karori is zoned GRUZ.			N/A	Site confirmed as GRUZ on the draft Wellington City District Plan maps.