Plan Change 85C: Rural Villages

Section 32 Evaluation Report

Prior to Notification Part 5

This is Part 5 of the section 32 (s32) evaluation report for the Rural Plan Changes. This part should be read in conjunction with the other Parts 1 – 9. The general introduction, statutory assessment and analysis of higher order policy documents are contained within Part 1. The Rural Area (RA) objectives, policies and performance standards are evaluated in terms of s32 within Part 2.
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 **Overview and background**

1. This is **Part 5** of the section 32 (s32) evaluation report for the Rural Plan Changes. This part should be read in conjunction with the other **Parts 1 – 9**. The general introduction, statutory assessment and analysis of higher order policy documents are contained within **Part 1**. The Rural Area (RA) objectives, policies and performance standards are evaluated in terms of s32 within **Part 2**.

1.2 **The proposed plan change**

2. Plan Change 85C (PC85C) seeks to rezone the district’s rural villages. The existing Living 1 and 3, and Business 2, 3 and 4 Environments are appropriate to be replaced with the Rural Village Environment (RVE). The RVE is comprised of three Sub-Environments: the Rural Village Residential Sub-Environment (RVRE), the Rural Village Centre Sub-Environment (RVCE) and the Rural Village Industry Sub-Environment (RVIE). PC85C includes:

- A new ‘Rural Village Environment’ Chapter – with objectives, policies and rules for the Environment, including land use and subdivision provisions for each Sub-Environment.
- Descriptions of the district’s rural villages and of the proposed Rural Village Sub-Environments to identify the environmental expectations and outcomes sought in the rural villages.
- Changes to the Operative Whangarei District Plan (WDP) Environment maps to denote the RVE.
- Consequential changes to the WDP.
- New definition of Rural Centre Service Activities.

2. **Summary of the resource management issues for Rural Villages**

3. Within the district the following three classifications of rural villages have been identified:

- **Growth villages** – those identified as growth nodes in the Whangarei District Growth Strategy – Sustainable Futures 30/50 (30/50):
  - Hikurangi
  - Parua Bay
  - Waipu

- **Large villages** – established villages with community and commercial services and an identified projected population growth:
  - Maungakaramea
  - Maungatapere
  - Matapouri
  - McLeod Bay/Reotahi
  - Ngunguru
  - Oakura
  - Pataua
  - Taurikura/Urquharts Bay
  - Tutukaka
  - Waipu Cove/Langs Beach
Small villages – established small hamlets with existing zoning of Living 1 Environment, but with low levels of projected growth:

- Bland Bay
- Helena Bay
- Manganese Point
- Mangapai
- Moureeses Bay
- Ocean Beach
- Portland
- Pakotai
- Riverview Place
- Ruatangata West
- Taiharuru
- Tamaterau/Waikaraka
- Te Horo
- Titoki
- Waiotira
- Whananaki

4. The rural villages are currently zoned using the same Living and Business Environments as Whangarei City. The efficiency and effectiveness of these Environments for the rural villages was evaluated under the Rural Development Strategy (RDS) which concluded that their policy direction and provisions do not recognise the importance of the different outcomes required to promote sustainable management, and maintain the sense of community and viability, within rural villages.

5. It is considered that the long term sustainability of the rural villages should be supported through managed growth, consolidated development and opportunities for complementary economic development. However, development pressures should be reduced in areas that are susceptible to natural hazards or that comprise high class versatile soils and productive farmland. Growth should also be managed within the villages to avoid adverse effects on amenity and character values and sporadic development along the coast and transport corridors.

6. Providing for growth in the rural villages includes the potential need to plan for infrastructure extensions and upgrades such as wastewater, water, roading and community facilities such as halls, libraries and open space. Many of the district’s rural villages are located some distance from main centres and also some distance from one another. Often, there can be issues of economic efficiency associated with providing infrastructure upgrades in remote areas and to relatively smaller population bases.

7. In addition to providing for and managing the projected residential growth within the rural villages, opportunities should provided to allow for activities of a commercial or industrial nature that are compatible with existing residential activities and that positively contribute to the local community.

8. 30/50 provides detailed population projections for the rural villages up to 2061 and can be used to indicate where more residential and/or commercial land may be required and where growth is targeted. 30/50 was adopted in 2011 however, and since then the modeling system has been revised as part of the Whangarei District Growth Model (WDGM) to allow for updated projections. However, no population projection system is 100% accurate and therefore utilising the calculations stemming from both 30/50 and the WDGM methodologies can assist in predicting growth trends in the villages identified in 30/50. The projection methods for 30/50 and the WDGM are explained in Part 1 of the s32 report.
3. Proposed Rural Village Environment

3.1 Overview
9. The proposed Rural Village Sub-Environments are intended to complement the Rural Production, Strategic Rural Industries and Rural Living Environments proposed under Plan Changes 85A, 85B and 85D, respectively. The RVE aims to strengthen, consolidate and enhance the existing rural villages by providing for a mix of residential and small scale commercial and industrial activities servicing the surrounding rural hinterland.

10. Within the district’s rural villages historical development patterns have resulted in instances of ‘dishonest zoning’, where areas zoned as Countryside Environment (CE) and Coastal Countryside Environment (CCE) have been subdivided and developed in a manner that more strongly reflects the use and amenity outcomes expected for a residential area. In response to these instances, PC85C proposes to rezone these areas to more accurately reflect the existing development patterns and land uses. This in turn also provides additional residential capacity.

11. Similarly, in the rural villages there are several split-zoned sites, or parcels with multiple zonings. In many instances this has resulted in small areas of CE and CCE that are not feasible for rural production purposes. Where appropriate, PC85C proposes to rezone split-zoned sites to have one consistent Environment zoning that will accurately reflect the scale and nature of the site and provide for more efficient use of the land.

12. In addition, the need for residential and/or commercial expansion has been considered to allow for the managed growth of the rural villages. The need for any proposed expansion has been based on a timeframe of 12 years as PC85 seeks to plan for a period of 10 years after becoming operative. Where a Structure Plan (SP) has been prepared for a village this has been taken into account and used in evaluating any rezoning. SPs have been prepared for: Matapouri, McLeod Bay/Reotahi, Ngunguru, Oakura, Parua Bay, Pataua, Taurikura/Urquharts Bay, Tutukaka, Waipu and Waipu Cove/Langs Beach.

3.2 The Proposed Rural Village Residential Sub-Environment
13. The RVRE provides for residential activities within the rural villages. The rural villages are currently developed to varying densities according to factors including topography, known natural hazard zones and whether they are serviced by Council’s reticulated wastewater system. This pattern is expected to continue, with larger sites being required where on-site disposal of wastewater is proposed.

14. The RVRE generally seeks to replace the existing Living 1 and Living 3 Environments within the rural villages. Additional areas for residential development have been evaluated as potential RVRE based on the RVRE boundary identification process discussed in section 3.5.

3.3 The Proposed Rural Village Centre Sub-Environment
15. The RVCE provides for the commercial centres found in the larger rural villages. The commercial centres are the focal point for local communities and community facilities. Opportunities are
proposed for the development of a mix of residential and commercial development within the RVCE while ensuring the character of each rural village is retained.

16. To clearly identify the range of activities anticipated within the RVCE a new definition is proposed to be introduced to the WDP. A ‘Rural Centre Service Activity’ is proposed to be defined as:

“*Means the use of land and buildings within the Rural Village Centre Sub-Environment for commercial and service activities including the sale or hire of goods, equipment or services, automotive service and repair, post boxes, service stations, shops, markets and takeaways.*”

17. The RVCE generally seeks to replace the Business 2, 3 and 4 Environments within the rural villages where the current land use is not industrial (except for Rural Centre Service Activities). Limited commercial expansion is proposed based on the RVCE boundary identification process discussed in section 3.5.

3.4 The Proposed Rural Village Industry Sub-Environment

18. The areas proposed as RVIE are those existing industrial land uses located within the growth villages. These industrial activities contribute to the self-sufficiency of the villages and benefit the wider community through provision of employment and support to local economic, social and recreational activities.

19. It is proposed that the RVIE will only recognise existing land use activities and will not provide additional industrial zoning. The only locations proposed to be zoned RVIE are an area comprising some 9.8ha in Hikurangi being used as a pallet/timber factory and an area comprising some 5.7ha in Waipu being used as a building supplies factory.

20. As the proposed RVIE areas are located in close proximity to existing residential development there is potential for land use conflicts such as noise, odour, vibration and vehicle movements. The scale of activities within the RVIE is proposed to be managed and residential development is proposed to be restricted within the RVIE to limit further reverse sensitivity effects.

3.5 Existing Environment and proposed RVE zoning

21. A summary of the growth projections and demand is provided for each growth and large village in Appendix 3. Appendix 4 details the existing land supply and residential density within these villages. The existing environments within each of these villages are discussed in Appendices 5 - 17 along with a background of any previous plan changes or structure planning undertaken within the village and an overview of infrastructure capacity, natural hazards risks and existing land uses. Comments received during pre-notification consultation are also discussed.

22. Sections 3.6 and 3.7 below show the proposed location of the RVE boundaries within the growth and large villages. Section 3.8 below discusses the existing environment and the proposed location of the RVE boundaries for the small villages.

23. The proposed RVE boundaries have been identified through a two stage process. The first stage was to rezone the existing Living and Business Environments within the rural villages, and to more
accurately zone sites that have been ‘dishonestly zoned’ or that are split-zoned. For this stage the criteria outlined in Appendix 1 were used.

24. The second stage of identifying the proposed RVE boundaries was based around an assessment of the supply and demand of residential and commercial land within the growth villages and large villages over the next 12 years. Residential in this instance refers to dwellings located in a Living Environment rather than a CE or CCE. The small villages are projected to have minimal growth over the medium term (10-20 years) and are therefore excluded from this stage of rezoning. 30/50 was primarily used to determine if there was an identified shortage of residential and/or commercial land over the next 12 years. The WDGM was also used to verify the capacity projections based on the best available updated information. The results are discussed below with more detailed information pertaining to each village contained within Appendices 5 – 17.

25. 30/50 calculated the residential development potential of the growth villages and large villages as at 2011 to determine when residential land supply would likely be exhausted within each village. Two types of estimates, or scenarios, for capacity are given which calculate the approximate year that the residential land supply will be exhausted. The first estimate is the theoretical maximum based upon all available land (by land area) being utilised. Lots that were too small to subdivide based on the WDP provisions were excluded from this calculation, as were any designated sites. The second estimate takes into account biophysical constraints that may reduce potential capacity. In this calculation the factors of flood susceptibility, significant natural habitat and land instability were applied, in addition to the exclusion of small and designated sites. The actual capacity is likely to be between these two estimates, shown in Table 1, as no constraint is absolute.

26. As shown in Table 1, under the maximum scenario over the next 12 years 30/50 estimates that all villages have sufficient residential land supply. However, under the constrained scenario a potential shortage of residential land was identified in Pataua, Oakura, Hikurangi, Maungakaramea and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Maximum Scenario</th>
<th>Constrained Scenario</th>
<th>Median of Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>2085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura / Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>2111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>2093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay / Reotahi</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove / Langs Beach</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>2079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>2149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parua Bay. Based on the median between the two scenarios Pataua is the only village where the residential land supply is estimated to shortfall by 2028.

27. As shown in Appendix 3 the long term population projections for Hikurangi, Parua Bay and Oakura were significantly overestimated under 30/50 when compared to the WDGM projections. Hikurangi and Parua Bay were identified as growth nodes under 30/50; therefore, the 30/50 future population growth is a target rather than an estimated projection. While Oakura is not identified as a growth node, the future population is also partially based on a target needed to meet the 30/50 preferred settlement pattern. These high population figures based on targets instead of projections are taken into account when considering the likelihood that the residential development capacity will be exhausted by the 30/50 constrained scenario projection. If the actual population in these areas significantly exceeds the WDGM projections and is similar to the 30/50 target populations then residential land can be released in a future district planning cycle.

28. As discussed in Appendices 5 and 8, respectively, Hikurangi and Maungakaramea have not had SPs prepared, and while there is a potential residential shortage identified within these villages, it is appropriate to first prepare a SP to better plan any expansion.

29. As discussed in Appendix 14, Pataua is considered to have sufficient development capacity.

30. 30/50 also provides estimates of projected urban residential land area required to meet population growth. Table 2 shows the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments within each village compared to the projected required urban residential land area by 2028. Appendix 4 details the average household sizes and average Living Environment lot sizes within each growth and large village which were used (along with population projections and land supply) to determine this projection.

### TABLE 2: 30/50 PROJECTED URBAN RESIDENTIAL LAND REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Approximate Area of Living 1 and 3 land (ha)</th>
<th>Projected urban residential land required by 2028 (ha)</th>
<th>Projected additional urban residential land required (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maunganatapere</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. As shown in Table 2, 30/50 estimates that all villages have sufficient residential land supply for the next 12 years except for Parua Bay village. However, as discussed in paragraph 7 the WDGM
projected future population of Parua Bay village is likely to be significantly less than the 30/50 target population.

32. Given the above, it is not considered that there is an identified need for residential expansion in any growth village or large village based on 30/50 projections over the next 12 years. In villages such as the growth villages, where very high growth is projected under 30/50, it is considered appropriate to defer residential expansion to a future district planning cycle if growth does increase to the point where it is on track to meet the 30/50 targets.

33. To verify the 30/50 residential land requirement estimates, the WDGM was also considered. To determine residential demand under the WDGM, the estimated number of additional total dwellings (occupied and holiday homes) required by 2028 was multiplied by the identified percentage of residential dwellings within each village as at 2013 (see Appendix 3 Table 2). To determine if there was a shortage of residential land supply under the WDGM, the number of vacant Living 1 and 3 Environment properties was then subtracted. The number of vacant Living 1 and 3 Environment properties was calculated in January 2016 based on Quotable Value data less 10% to account for potential inaccuracies due to recent development.

34. Table 3 shows the estimated residential dwelling shortage for each village in the far right column based on the WDGM projections. Where the shortage is a negative number it is estimated that there will be a surplus of residential dwellings to that amount by 2028. Where there are no estimated new residential dwellings required by 2028 within a village this is because the village is not projected to grow over the next 12 years under the WDGM.

### Table 3: WDGM Projected Surplus or Deficit of Dwellings within Rural Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Estimated new residential dwellings by 2028</th>
<th>Living 1 &amp; 3 Environment vacant properties as at January 2016 less 10%</th>
<th>Estimated residential dwelling shortage by 2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay / Reotahi</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Table 3 indicates that there may be a potential shortage of residential land within Waipu, McLeod Bay/Reotahi, Maungatapere, Parua Bay and Matapouri. However, Table 3 and the WDGM
estimates do not factor in the development potential within any of the villages where existing sites can be further subdivided to accommodate more growth. As discussed in Appendices 5-17, within some villages there are large, generally undeveloped areas zoned for residential purposes which could potentially be developed to a much higher density.

36. Table 1 above and 30/50 provide an indication as to the development potential within each growth and large village. Based on Table 1 Matapouri, McLeod Bay/Reotahi and Maungatapere villages are considered to have sufficient capacity to meet the WDGM projections. The capacities of the growth villages are further discussed in Appendices 5 – 7. Overall, the development potential within Wai, McLeod Bay/Reotahi, Maungatapere and Matapouri villages is considered to be great enough to accommodate the projected growth. Within these villages there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion under the WDGM.

37. Many villages (Maungakaramea, Pataua, Oakura, Ngunguru, Taurikura/Urquharts Bay, Waipu Cove/Langs Beach and Tutukaka) are estimated to have a surplus of residential land over the next 12 years. These villages also have additional development potential to accommodate for growth beyond that projected under the WDGM.

38. Parua Bay presents a unique circumstance as both 30/50 and the WDGM identify that there may be a potential shortage of residential land over the next 12 years. It is noted that the projected population within Parua Bay under 30/50 is quite high to account for the fact that the village is identified as a growth node under 30/50. It is important to enable this potential growth; therefore, several options were considered, as discussed in Appendix 4. Overall it is not considered appropriate to allow for significant residential expansion of Parua Bay village at this time.

39. Given the above, there is not considered to be an identified need for additional residential expansion within any of the villages based on stage 2 of the RVE zoning criteria.

40. With regard to commercial land, over the next 12 years 30/50:

- Identifies a shortage within Parua Bay and Tutukaka.
- Recommends expanding the existing commercial zoning in Ngunguru village. However, the expansion would require replacing Open Space Environment with RVCE. At this time it is appropriate to retain the Open Space Environment and to further review the matter under Plan Change 115 – Open Space.
- Identifies that there may be a need for more commercial land in Waipu village. However, as the Waipu SP was implemented through Plan Change 69 (PC69) and there are constraints on the capacity of services, including electricity, it is not considered appropriate to allow for commercial expansion at this time.

41. To verify 30/50 commercial land requirement estimates, the estimated number of additional employees by workplace address in 2028, as calculated under the WDGM (see Appendix 3), was used to determine if further commercial land was required. Many of the villages are estimated to experience limited or no growth in the number of employees working within the villages by 2028. No commercial expansion is necessary in these instances.
Significant commercial growth was considered to be a projected increase of over 30 employees working within the village by 2028 (3 per year). The only villages estimated to experience significant commercial growth are Waipu and Parua Bay. As discussed above, PC69 provided sufficient commercial land in Waipu to meet the projected demand over the next 12 years. However, in Parua Bay there is limited commercial land currently available. In Tutukaka, while significant commercial growth is not projected, as at 2013 there were 176 employees working within the village and there is currently no land zoned for commercial purposes.

It is therefore considered that there is an identified need for commercial expansion in Tutukaka and Parua Bay. In these villages, where an area is proposed as Business 3 Environment under a SP, it is proposed to be zoned to RVCE based on an assessment of the criteria identified in Appendix 2.

One zoning option evaluated was to rezone all land identified for potential residential or commercial use under a SP to RVRE and RVCE, respectively. However, it is acknowledged that SPs are non-statutory documents and can be more conceptual than practical. Therefore, it was considered appropriate to use additional criteria to assess SP proposals and to only allow for expansion where a potential capacity shortage is identified or the rezoning criteria outlined in Appendix 1 are met.

Overall, it is considered that the approach taken to determine the proposed RVE boundaries reflects existing Environments, land uses and development patters and aims to consolidate development in the most appropriate areas while allowing for sufficient residential and commercial land over the next 12 years.

3.6 Growth villages

Hikurangi - Within Hikurangi village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 1 be rezoned from CE to RVRE:

Figure 1: Areas within Hikurangi proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE
47. PC85C also proposes to replace the existing Business 2 and 3 Environments with RVCE (indicated by green hatching in Figure 2). However, some of the existing Business 2 Environment (indicated by blue hatching in Figure 2) is to be rezoned to RVIE as the current land use is Industrial:

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2: Areas within Hikurangi proposed for rezoning from Business Environment to RVCE and RVIE*

48. **Parua Bay** - Within Parua Bay village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figures 3 and 4 be rezoned to RVRE:

![Figure 3](image)

*Figure 3: Areas within Parua Bay proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE*

![Figure 4](image)

*Figure 4: Areas within Parua Bay proposed for rezoning from CCE to RVRE*
49. PC85C also proposes to replace the existing Business 2 Environment with RVCE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by green hatching in Figure 5 be rezoned from CE and CCE to RVCE:

![Figure 5: Areas within Parua Bay proposed for rezoning from CE and CCE to RVCE](image)

50. **Waipu** - Within Waipu village PC85C proposes the following:
   - Rezone all of the existing Living Environments to RVRE
   - Rezone the existing Business 3 Environment to RVCE
   - Rezone the existing Business 4 Environment to RVIE

51. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 6 be rezoned from CE to RVRE:

![Figure 6: Areas within Waipu proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE](image)
3.7 Large villages

52. **Maungakaramea** - Within Maungakaramea village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 7 be rezoned from CE to RVRE:

![Figure 7: Areas within Maungakaramea proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE](image)

53. **Maungatapere** - Within Maungatapere village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living Environments to RVRE and to rezone the existing Business Environments to RVCE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 8 be rezoned from CE to RVRE:

![Figure 8: Areas within Maungatapere proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE](image)

54. **Matapouri** - Within Matapouri village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living Environment to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figures 9 and 10 be rezoned from CCE to RVRE:

![Figure 9 and 10](image)
55. **McLeod Bay/Reotahi** - Within McLeod Bay/Reotahi village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE and to rezone the existing Business 3 Environment to RVCE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 11 be rezoned from CCE to RVRE:
56. **Ngunguru** - Within Ngunguru village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE and to rezone the existing Business 3 Environment to RVCE. No expansion to the spatial extent of the existing Living and Business Environments is proposed.

57. **Oakura** - Within Oakura village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 Environment to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 12 be rezoned from CE and CCE to RVRE:

![Figure 12: Areas within Oakura proposed for rezoning from CE and CCE to RVRE](image)

58. **Pataua** - Within Pataua village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 13 be rezoned from CE and CCE to RVRE:

![Figure 13: Areas within Pataua proposed for rezoning from CE and CCE to RVRE](image)
59. **Taurikura/Urquharts Bay** - Within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figures 14 and 15 be rezoned from CCE to RVRE:

![Figure 14: Areas within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay proposed for rezoning from CCE to RVRE](image1)

![Figure 15: Area within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay proposed for rezoning from CCE to RVRE](image2)

60. **Tutukaka** - Within Tutukaka village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figure 16 be rezoned from CCE to RVRE:
Figure 16: Areas within Tutukaka proposed for rezoning from CE and CCE to RVRE

61. PC85C also proposes to rezone two areas of Living 1 and 3 Environment (shown in green hatching in Figure 17) to RVCE to accommodate the existing commercial activities.

Figure 17: Areas within Tutukaka proposed for rezoning from Living 1 and 3 Environment to RVCE

62. Waipu Cove/Langs Beach - Within Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village PC85C proposes to rezone all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments to RVRE. In addition, it is proposed that the areas indicated by red hatching in Figures 18 and 19 be rezoned from CCE to RVRE:
3.8 Small villages

63. The small villages, or hamlets, are defined in 30/50 as established communities containing residential zoned land (i.e. Living 1 or 3) with low levels of projected growth. The coastal hamlets are traditionally holiday destinations, containing holiday homes or baches, while the rural hamlets historically were the service centres for rural districts, often with a post office, general store and a railway station. These hamlets are often a legacy of the past and have either declined in population or grown very slowly over time. Under 30/50 it is anticipated that the hamlets will experience minimal population growth over the medium term.

64. Given the population projection and minimal growth pressures within the hamlets, there is considered to be limited need to zone more residential land. Accordingly, within the hamlets PC85C proposes to replace all of the Living 1 and Living 3 Environments with RVRE while allowing for minimal residential expansion to reflect existing patterns of development and uses where ‘dishonest zoning’ has occurred. Figures 20-31 indicate the areas (shown in red hatching) currently zoned as CE and CCE within the hamlets that are proposed to be rezoned to RVRE. Within the small villages that are not shown below there is no expansion proposed but the existing Living 1 and 3 Environments are proposed to be replaced by the RVRE.
Bland Bay

Figure 20: Areas within Bland Bay proposed for rezoning from CCE to RVRE

Helena Bay

Figure 21: Area within Helena Bay proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Manganese Point

Figure 22: Areas within Manganese Point proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE
Ocean Beach

Figure 23: Areas within Ocean Beach proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Pakotai

Figure 24: Area within Pakotai proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Portland

Figure 25: Areas within Portland proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE
Riverview Place

Figure 26: Areas within Riverview Place proposed for rezoning from CE and CCE to RVRE

Ruatangata West

Figure 27: Areas within Ruatangata West proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Tamaterau/Waikaraka

Figure 28: Areas within Tamaterau/Waikaraka proposed for rezoning from CCE to RVRE
Te Horo

Figure 29: Areas within Te Horo proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Titoki

Figure 30: Areas within Titoki proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE

Waiotira

Figure 31: Areas within Waiotira proposed for rezoning from CE to RVRE
4. **Section 32 analysis**

4.1 **Appropriateness in terms of purpose of the RMA**

65. Council must evaluate in accordance with s32 of the RMA the extent to which each objective proposed in PC85C is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. To confirm the appropriateness of the proposed objectives, sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of this report assess whether the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA as well as other higher order documents and objectives in the WDP and those proposed under the RA. The level of analysis undertaken in this report is considered appropriate to the scale of the proposal.

66. PC85C proposes the following objectives, the reasons for which are detailed in Table 4:
TABLE 4: REASONING FOR PROPOSED RVE OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed RVE Objectives</th>
<th>Reason/Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 Provide for the managed growth of rural villages.</td>
<td>Development pressures must be managed in areas that are susceptible to natural hazards or that comprise high class versatile soils. Growth must be managed within the villages to avoid sprawl and to encourage the sustainable provision of infrastructure. This objective aims to allow for managed growth that recognises these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.2 Protect and enhance the individual amenity and character values of each rural village.</td>
<td>Growth and development can have significant effects on character and amenity values. This objective recognises the importance of amenity and character values in accordance with s7(c) of the RMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.3 Acknowledge the role of community facilities; including halls, sports fields, churches and schools as focal points for rural villages.</td>
<td>This objective recognises the importance of community facilities within rural villages to enable communities to provide for their social and economic wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.4 Consolidate residential activities in rural villages.</td>
<td>The long term sustainability of villages must be supported through incremental growth and consolidated development. This objective aims to encourage residential activities in appropriate places within the villages to sustainably manage development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.5 Enable a mix of residential and commercial activities to occur in rural village centres.</td>
<td>This objective encourages a compact pattern of development within rural villages and provides flexibility in co-locating activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVE.1.2.6 Enable a range of business activities that fulfil local service functions in rural villages.</td>
<td>Small businesses play a vital role in rural villages, especially ones in which growth is projected. The functionality and wellbeing of the community may depend on the availability of commercial opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Part 2 of the RMA outlines the purpose and principles of the RMA. Table 5 demonstrates that the proposed RVE Objectives achieve the purpose of the RMA. Many sections within Part 2 of the RMA are not relevant to PC85C or are specifically addressed by the Resource Area provisions within the WDP. Additionally, with regard to s8, consultation with Tangata Whenua has been undertaken and no matters have been identified that would indicate that PC85C is inconsistent with s8.

TABLE 5: LINKAGE OF PROPOSED RVE OBJECTIVES WITH PART 2 OF THE RMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Rural Village Environment Objectives</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.1</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.2</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.3</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.4</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.5</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management RMA Part 2 Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(2)(a)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(2)(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(2)(c)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(a)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(c)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(f)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68. Having assessed the proposed objectives against Part 2 of the RMA it is considered that they achieve the purpose of the RMA and promote sustainable management.

69. In Part 2 of the s32 evaluation report package, the overarching RA objectives have been assessed as achieving the purpose of the RMA. Table 6 demonstrates how the proposed objectives of the RVE are linked to the overall objectives and policies of the RA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed RA Objective</th>
<th>Proposed RA Policy</th>
<th>Proposed RVE Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.1 Protect productive functions</td>
<td>RA.1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.10 &amp; 1.3.11</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.2 Avoid, remedy, mitigate reverse sensitivity</td>
<td>RA.1.3.4, 1.3.9, 1.3.10 &amp; 1.3.11</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; RVE.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.3 Avoid cumulative impacts/unplanned development</td>
<td>RA.1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.6</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; RVE.1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.4 Avoid hazards</td>
<td>RA.1.3.7</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.5 Recognise amenity values and character</td>
<td>RA.1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.5, 1.3.6,1.3.9 and 1.3.10</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.6 Consolidate rural living</td>
<td>RA.1.3.3, 1.3.5 &amp; 1.3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.7 Provide for areas of rural-residential development</td>
<td>RA.1.3.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.8 Provide range of land uses</td>
<td>RA.1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, 1.3.9, 1.3.10 &amp; 1.3.11</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, RVE.1.2.3, RVE.1.2.4, RVE.1.2.5 &amp; RVE.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.9 Provide for managed growth</td>
<td>RA.1.3.5, 1.3.8, 1.3.10 &amp; 1.3.12</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, RVE.1.2.3, RVE.1.2.4, RVE.1.2.5 &amp; RVE.1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA.1.2.10 Sustainable infrastructure</td>
<td>RA.1.3.8, 1.3.12 &amp; 1.3.13</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. The proposed objectives for the RVE are considered to represent the most appropriate way to achieve Part 2 of the RMA and are effectively linked to the proposed RA objectives.

4.2 Appropriateness in relation to higher order documents

71. The provisions of higher order documents were considered in the formulation of the objectives and policies in PC85C. Of particular relevance to PC85C are the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS), the Northland Regional Policy Statement (RPS), the Long Term Plan 2015 – 2025 (LTP), 30/50, the RDS, the Coastal Management Strategy (CMS) and SPs. Part 1 of the s32 evaluation report provides a comprehensive evaluation of the consistency of PC85 in relation to relevant higher order documents. Table 7 provides an overview of the proposed RVE objectives’ consistency with the more relevant higher order documents.
4.3 Appropriateness in relation to the WDP

72. The proposed RVE objectives are subservient to the higher order district wide objectives set out in Part C of the WDP, which being settled are deemed to achieve the purpose of the RMA. Using the rationale set out on the Long Bay decision¹, the proposed objectives set out in PC85C need to be examined as to whether they appropriately achieve the purpose of the settled higher order objectives. The objectives proposed for the RVE are considered to directly relate to and appropriately achieve the following Anticipated Environmental Results identified in the WDP², as shown in Table 8:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Order Documents</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.1</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.2</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.3</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.4</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.5</th>
<th>RVE.1.2.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZCPS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

¹ Long Bay-Okura Great Park Society Inc v North Shore City Council (A078/08)
² Refer Amenity Chapter 5, Built Form and Development Chapter 6, Subdivision & Development Chapter 8 and The Coast Chapter 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Anticipated Environmental Results in the WDP</th>
<th>Proposed RVE Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use and development is consistent with the preservation and/or enhancement of amenity values appropriate to each particular Environment</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.2 &amp; 1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict between incompatible activities in regard to amenity values (particularly on Environment boundaries) is avoided, remedied or mitigated</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.4 &amp; 1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amenity values of the Living Environments are maintained and/or enhanced, including community coherence and neighbourhood aesthetics.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5 &amp; 1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following effects of land use and development are appropriate to the relevant Environment and do not create a nuisance to other land users: noise, odour, dust, smoke, light spill, glare, shading, traffic, privacy, visual, spray drift, radio frequency fields and electromagnetic radiation.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, 1.2.2 &amp; 1.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of consolidated urban development and increased infill development in areas appropriately serviced.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporadic, sprawling or ribbon development patterns of coastal development are avoided.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced amenity values and identity of urban and coastal communities.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of natural values, cultural and historic heritage, and avoidance of development in environmentally sensitive areas.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of loss of productive farmland.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of land use and development complementary to the character of the locality, whilst at the same time avoiding conflicts between incompatible land use activities.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5 &amp; 1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of consolidated land use and development that allows for the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources, avoids sporadic subdivision and ribbon development, particularly along the coast, and ensures a density of development appropriate to the location.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The avoidance of subdivision and development in areas of high risk from noise levels and from natural hazards</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The protection of the district’s versatile soils, water quality, natural features, landscapes, open spaces, significant ecological areas, biodiversity, public access to coast, lakes and rivers, heritage, cultural and amenity values from inappropriate subdivision and development</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preservation and/or enhancement of the natural character of the coastal environment, and its protection from inappropriate subdivision, inappropriate use and inappropriate development. Included here are landscapes, seascapes and landforms; significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; air, water and soil quality; the intrinsic values of ecosystems, including biodiversity along with other ecological values.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A settlement and development pattern in the coastal environment that does not adversely affect natural and cultural/historic heritage values, is able to be serviced efficiently, and does not result in sporadic, sprawling or ribbon development. Future intensive development is largely confined to existing settlements where the above values are already compromised.</td>
<td>RVE.1.2.1 &amp; 1.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Effectiveness and efficiency of proposed policies and methods
73. A s32 assessment must determine whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the proposed objectives by undertaking a cost benefit analysis of the economic, social, environmental and cultural effects of the provisions, including whether opportunities for economic
growth and employment are reduced or increased. The risk of acting or not acting where uncertain information exists must also be considered. Below is an assessment of the proposed provisions.

**Proposed policies**

74. With the introduction of a new Environment, two different approaches to the policies were considered. One option was to develop new policies that specifically aimed to achieve the purpose of the proposed RVE objectives. An alternative option was to rely on the existing higher order policies in Part C of the WDP, which currently manage land use and subdivision activities within the existing Living and Business Environments.

75. The current policy direction has not effectively promoted the sustainable management within the district’s rural villages. Therefore, maintaining the status quo is not an appropriate response when compared to the proposed new policies. Tables 9 – 11 demonstrate that the proposed RVE policies are a more appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives than the status quo.

### TABLE 9: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED POLICIES RVE.1.3.1 AND 1.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness/Efficiency</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost</th>
<th>Risk Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk of not acting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These policies directly address growth and the provision of a range of activities within rural villages. They will help achieve a compact form of residential development within rural villages while fulfilling the service related functions.</td>
<td>• The wellbeing of people and communities is enhanced.</td>
<td>If Council does not clarify and strengthen its strategic planning framework then uncoordinated growth may occur. Failure to consolidate residential development may result in continued uncoordinated residential expansion, with associated adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current Living and Business Environments do not recognise the unique characteristics and issues of rural villages. Policy RVE.1.3.1 seeks to provide for a range of activities within rural villages in order to maintain the sense of community and viability of these areas.</td>
<td>• The reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations are provided for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy RVE.1.3.2 encourages growth to occur in a consolidated and efficient manner. The policy also seeks to provide for growth and expansion of rural villages where this can be undertaken without generating adverse environmental or economic effects associated with the provision of infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Adverse effects of sprawling, sporadic development in village areas are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These policies are efficient in achieving the RVE objectives because costs associated with the regulatory regime will be reduced through there being a clear strategic framework within which applications will be assessed.</td>
<td>• Benefits associated with compact development are maximised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the long term, social and economic costs associated with uncoordinated growth will be reduced and the benefits associated with coordinated growth will be realised. For the above reasons, these policies are an efficient way of managing growth within rural villages and are therefore appropriate policies to achieve the RVE objectives.</td>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restrictions are imposed on some developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 10: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED POLICIES RVE 1.3.3 – 1.3.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness/Efficiency</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost</th>
<th>Risk Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk of not acting</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The existing character and amenity values of a settlement play a vital role in giving the district its character and in determining the environmental qualities enjoyed by the resident population, which in turn contributes to wellbeing. It is therefore important to ensure these values are carefully managed. Nevertheless, when substantial growth occurs the character of a settlement inevitably changes. The proposed policies recognise these factors and are therefore an effective way of managing character and amenity values and appropriately achieve the objective. | • Amenity and character values are preserved and/or enhanced.  
• Conflicting land uses are separated to minimise adverse effects and reverse sensitivity effects.  
• A range of activities is provided for within rural villages. | Failure to manage character and amenity values will mean that those values will be compromised or lost completely in areas where there is demand for residential and/or commercial expansion. |
| **Efficiency** | **Costs** | **Risk of acting** |
| The proposed policies clarify the regulatory framework and give greater certainty to consent applicants. Therefore they are an efficient and appropriate method of achieving the RVE objectives. | • Restrictions are imposed on some developments. | If the projected population trends greatly alter over the next 12 years then the proposed provisions may not prove suitable for the rural villages. |

TABLE 11: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED POLICY RVE.1.3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness/Efficiency</th>
<th>Benefit/Cost</th>
<th>Risk Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk of not acting</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To date, subdivisions in rural villages have been managed via the overarching objectives and policies within Chapters 5, 6 and 8 of the WDP. The unique character and amenity values within the villages as well as the mixed use potential within some villages have been progressively compromised. New, more targeted policies are required. Land use changes associated with subdivision can have a significant impact on the surrounding environmental values. Proposed Policy RVE.1.3.12(a) is intended to avoid and minimise these potential adverse effects. Proposed Policy RVE.1.3.12(b) – (e) is intended to clarify what the RVE character is made up of and hence clarify how to protect and maintain it. The components of RVE character are strongly dependant upon varied land uses and development that is consistent with the existing topography. When subdivision occurs, care must be taken to ensure that it is designed to respond to the land being developed and that allotments are large enough to support a mix of land use activities. | • Rural village character is more clearly defined.  
• Rural village character is preserved or enhanced through subdivision design.  
• Adverse effects of subdivision on environmental values are managed. | Failure to ensure that rural village allotments are large enough to support a mix of land use activities may result in continued compromising of rural village character and environmental values. |
| **Efficiency** | **Costs** | **Risk of acting** |
| These policies clarify the regulatory framework and give greater certainty to consent applicants. Therefore the policies are an efficient way of managing subdivisions in terms of their effect on services, character and built form and are the most appropriate policies to achieve the objectives. | • Restrictions will be imposed on some development, but some development will be facilitated. | May result in additional consenting and development costs. |

Proposed RVE Boundaries

76. Spatial mapping is an appropriate method of achieving the objectives of the RVE as it identifies where the proposed new objectives and provisions do and do not apply. In order to assess the
appropriateness of the proposed spatial extent of the RVE in achieving the objectives of the RVE the following three options were evaluated:

**Option 1:** Status Quo: Retain the current spatial extent of the Living and Business Environments within the rural villages and rezone these areas to RVE.

**Option 2:** Map the RVE based on the criteria identified in section 3 above. (Plan change option)

**Option 3:** Map the RVE to include all land proposed for expansion under a SP and any developable land adjacent to any existing Living or Business Environment within a rural village.

Evaluation of these alternative options have been summarised in Table 12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF MAPPING OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1: Status Quo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not allow for appropriate zoning of some sites leading to inefficient use of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing consenting costs associated with additional assessment and hearings as a result of uncertain and ‘dishonest zoning’. Would not allow for sufficient growth in areas where population is projected to increase and capacity is not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would undermine the commitments made between Council and the community in preparing SPs for the villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential and commercial growth is restricted within rural, rural residential and hazard prone land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially reduces present and future infrastructure costs. Avoids some costs to both Council and the public associated with the plan change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes in zoning to adjust to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Option 2: Map RVE based on criteria in section 3** |
| **Costs**                                            |
| Environmental                                    |
| Additional development opportunities will be provided for within rural villages. The spatial extent of some of the rural villages may expand enabling development. |
| Economic                                         |
| Costs associated with assessment and additional mapping. Additional infrastructure costs. |
| Social                                           |
| None identified.                                 |
| Cultural                                         |
| None identified.                                 |
| **Benefits**                                      |
| Environmental                                    |
| Achieves the outcomes of the RDS. Implements the consolidated growth pattern of 30/50 while taking account of the updated population projections under the WDGM. Limits sprawl along coastal and transport corridors. Residential and commercial growth is restricted within rural, rural residential and hazard prone land. |
| Economic                                         |
| Avoids the necessity to undertake expensive technical investigations to support further residential expansion on land that may potentially comprise high quality soils or be susceptible to natural hazards. Provides for more accurate zoning to reflect the current land uses and patterns of development to allow more efficient use of resources. Reduces costs of hearings related to ‘dishonest zoning’ when compared to Option 1. Reduces costs of significantly expanding infrastructure networks when compared to Option 3. |
### Option 3: Map RVE based on SP proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not give effect to the consolidation direction of 30/50.</td>
<td>Significant costs associated with identifying and mapping the spatial extent. In the absence of technical information costs may be transferred to applicants resulting in additional consenting requirements and costs.</td>
<td>Lack of strong criteria could lead to zoning conflict and confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for sprawl along coastal and transport corridors.</td>
<td>Significant costs required to expand/upgrade infrastructure.</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly increased on-site servicing within rural villages may adversely affect the environment, particularly in coastal villages.</td>
<td>Costs associated with preparing plan change and associated mapping.</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not appropriately account for updated population projections under the WDGM.</td>
<td>Limits future development opportunities as once land is developed residentially it can be difficult to repurpose.</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not maximise available land and resources when compared to Options 1 &amp; 2.</td>
<td>May saturate the residential market which in turn can impact land pricing.</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency

- **Option 1**: This option is inefficient as the economic costs outweigh the environmental benefits and the status quo will lead to long-term costs resulting from ‘dishonest zoning’ and additional consenting costs.
- **Option 2**: This option will achieve the objectives of the RVE at a low cost by utilising the available information (such as SPs and hazard mapping) and by minimising further expansion until additional capacity is required and additional research is undertaken to inform decision making.

### Effectiveness

- **Option 1**: This option will consolidate growth and will avoid additional development in unsuitable areas. However, Option 1 will not allow for commercial or residential growth where needed.
- **Option 2**: This option achieves the objectives of the RVE by providing for and managing growth in the form of residential, commercial and industrial development. Additionally, the limited nature of expansion within the rural villages will encourage compact village communities by directing growth to infill and revitalisation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>This option does not efficiently contribute towards achieving the objectives of the RVE due to the high costs associated with providing for significant expansion and the potentially adverse environmental effects.</th>
<th>This option partially contributes towards achieving the objectives of the RVE; however, overall Option 3 is not effective in achieving the objectives of the RVE as the growth of rural villages would not be managed and the amenity levels of the villages may not be protected or enhanced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

| Option 1 | This option has a moderate negative impact in terms of economic growth and employment as no further land would be released for residential or commercial purposes. This would restrict the growth potential of the district’s rural villages where there is an identified shortage of residential or commercial land. Spatial mapping and locations for the zones control what provisions apply. If the spatial extent of zoning is unclear or incorrect then inappropriate rules will apply. ‘Dishonest zoning’ has the potential to result in considerable consenting cost to landowners and developers. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option 2 | This option has a moderate positive impact in terms of economic growth and employment. Option 2 will give effect to the RVRE objectives and in doing so will support future economic growth of the rural villages by seeking to provide sufficient residential, commercial and industrial land for at least the next 12 years allowing for economic growth and employment opportunities in areas where commercial growth is projected. |
| Option 3 | This option has a moderate to high positive impact in terms of economic growth and employment as significant expansion within the rural villages would be provided for and a significant amount of development opportunities would be created. However, the expansion of the RVE into potentially productive rural land may adversely affect rural production activities. Additionally, significant residential and commercial expansion may saturate the market. Allowing for significant expansion within the villages may also compromise the intention identified in 30/50 of consolidating growth in the urban area of Whangarei. |

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

| Option 1 | The risk associated with not acting and acting is moderate in the instance of Option 1 as retaining the current spatial extent of the zoning could restrict further growth in rural villages. Consequently, this could negatively affect the long term viability and sustainability of these areas. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option 2 | The risk associated with not acting is moderate as the stats quo would be maintained. The risk associated with acting is low as the proposed rezoning would reflect existing patterns of development and land use and will allow for growth where required. Natural hazard risks would be taken into account in formulating the proposed spatial extent of the RVE. |
| Option 3 | The risk associated with not acting is moderate as the stats quo would be maintained. The risk associated with acting is moderate to high in the instance of Option 3 for the following reasons:  
- With regard to some of the land adjacent to the existing settlements within the villages, insufficient information is available at this point as to its suitability for residential and/or commercial development. Rezoning this land for residential or commercial uses could significantly increase the consequences of a natural hazard occurrence and could reduce the availability of high quality, productive soils.  
- Releasing a significant amount of land for residential and/or commercial development could lead to an oversupply within rural villages which could in turn generate adverse economic and social effects. Overall this approach can lead to an unclear understanding of future development patterns and is difficult to plan for.  
- Without growth planning occurring in a comprehensive and holistic way there may be high environmental, social and economic costs associated with environmental degradation, loss of biodiversity, reverse sensitivity impacts, reduced landscape and amenity values and infrastructure provision in a reactive manner.  
- In more isolated rural villages an oversupply of residential land may exacerbate any imbalances between residential and employment opportunities.  
- Significant growth in rural villages may compromise the intended consolidation of Whangarei’s urban area. |
78. As shown in Table 12, Option 2 (the proposed plan change) is considered to be the most appropriate method of achieving the objectives of the RVE as it will best reflect patterns of existing land use and development while also allowing for managed growth within the rural villages. Option 2 seeks to avoid risks and generate additional employment opportunities and economic growth where these are projected to occur over the next 12 years.

4.5 Proposed RVE Provisions

79. The proposed provisions in the RVE and each Rural Village Sub-Environment are assessed below. The proposed provisions are grouped by topic and effects. The evaluation of the provisions includes the identification of alternative options and an assessment of the costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed provisions and the risks of acting and not acting.

**Notification Rules**

80. It is proposed to impose notification rules within the RVE. Proposed Rules RVE.2.2 and RVE.3.2 and their appropriateness in achieving the RVE objectives are evaluated below.

81. In accordance with s95 of the RMA, an application for any type of activity must be publicly notified if the activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor. S77D of the RMA allows local authorities to make rules specifying the activities for which the authority must give public notification of an application for resource consent.

82. The proposed provisions will provide for an efficient and effective way of ensuring that applications for resource consent are appropriately assessed. Within each Sub-Environment the activities proposed to require public notification are those considered to have more than minor adverse effects on the environment. Implementing the proposed provisions will help streamline the application process and provide more certainty for all parties involved. Additionally, the notification process is beneficial in coming to a decision on resource consent applications and can help improve environmental outcomes.

**Alternatives considered**

83. The option of having no notification rules and relying on the notification test of the RMA was evaluated. As discussed in Part 1 of the s32 evaluation report, it is appropriate to use the notification process as a substitute for more traditional hierarchy of activity status given the extent to which applicants are motivated by notification rather than by activity status.

84. Another option evaluated was to impose more notification rules requiring public notification for additional activities. However, many smaller scale activities are likely to have less than minor or minor adverse effects or may only have effects on adjacent property owners. Requiring public notification for these activities is considered inappropriate and inefficient due to the costs associated with notification and the fact that notification may not be necessary or beneficial in making a decision.
Conclusion

85. The proposed provisions are considered to be effective and efficient in achieving the objectives of the RVE and seek to avoid risks as larger scale activities will be appropriately assessed and notified.

Eligibility Rules

Subdivision of Minor Residential Unit

86. The proposed RVE aims to concentrate development where reticulated services are currently available. One of the proposed methods for achieving this is that subdivision of a Minor Residential Unit (MRU) from a Residential Unit (RU) that is not serviced by a public reticulated wastewater system is proposed to be a prohibited activity. Proposed Rule RVE.3.1.2 is an appropriate method of concentrating development near existing reticulated services and restricting opportunities for sprawling unserviced development.

87. An alternative is to provide for the subdivision of a MRU from a RU where reticulated wastewater is not available as a discretionary or non-complying activity. However, this activity would be contrary to the RA objectives and policies and the resulting effects would be more than minor. Sprawling unserviced development can lead to additional demand for the extension of services in an inefficient and costly manner.

88. The proposed provision is appropriate as it efficiently establishes the activity status and aims to avoid risks.

Mineral Extraction and Intensive Livestock farming

89. Proposed Rule RVE.2.1.6 prohibits mineral extraction and intensive livestock farming within the RVE. These activities are of a scale and nature that is considered to be incompatible with the anticipated character of the rural villages.

90. Consideration was given to providing for these activities as permitted or discretionary based on certain performance standards; however, the potential adverse effects of establishing these activities within rural villages are considered to be unacceptable and difficult to mitigate. It is considered more appropriate to avoid these activities within the RVE and encourage them in more appropriate locations such as the Rural Production Environment (RPE).

4.6 RVRE provisions

Non Residential Activities

91. Proposed Rules RVE.2.1.1, RVE.2.1.2, RVE2.1.3, RVE.2.3.2(c), RVE.2.3.2(g) and RVE.2.3.2(h) implement proposed policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.3, 1.3.4, 1.3.5, 1.3.6 and 1.3.9 relating to protecting character and amenity values and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects within the RVRE by regulating non residential activities.
92. Ad-hoc commercial and industrial development within residential areas has the potential to adversely impact on amenity values, particularly in terms of increased traffic and noise, signage, and loss of residential character and sense of community. Whangarei City has large areas of land zoned specifically for commercial and industrial activities. The rural villages also have certain areas zoned as Business Environment. Consolidation of non residential activities to these Business zones is frequently not occurring because the current Living Environment rules are too permissive with regards to commercial and industrial activities.

93. The Living Environment provisions currently provide for commercial and industrial activities as permitted activities provided that the activity controls under WDP Rule 36.3.1 are met. In instances where the controls under WDP Rule 36.3.1 are not met, commercial and industrial activities are provided for as discretionary activities.

94. Within the RVRE the benefits associated with allowing commercial and industrial activities have been balanced against potential effects on residential amenity. Methods for the avoidance of commercial sprawl, and maintenance and enhancement of existing residential amenity, include the classification of industrial activities (except for rural centre service activities) as prohibited activities, and commercial activities as non-complying activities.

Home Occupations

95. The Living Environment provisions do not contain any provisions specifically relating to home occupations. Instead, the effects of home occupations are regulated primarily through the activity controls within WDP Rule 36.3.1.

96. It is proposed to manage home occupations in the RVRE. Home occupations have the potential to generate external effects related to traffic movements, signage, hours of operation and residential amenity and character. The proposed rules relating to home occupations are intended to provide an opportunity for people who wish to operate a small business from their home while ensuring that the amenity values of the surrounding areas are maintained.

97. A range of activity status is proposed for home occupations (permitted, discretionary and non-complying) with the latter applied to home occupations exceeding 3 of the 6 discretionary criteria. The rationale for this was that potential effects related to this type of home occupation would render the activity more akin to a ‘commercial’ activity, which is a non-complying activity under proposed Rule RVE.2.1.1. The discretionary criteria contained in proposed Rule RVE.2.3.2(g)(i – vii) are consistent with the standards in the Kamo Medium and Low Density Living Precincts and are considered appropriate for the RVRE.

Places of Assembly

98. The Living Environment provisions currently provide for places of assembly as a permitted activity provided that they do not operate or open for visitors, clients or deliveries before 0800 or after 2200 on any day. Religious observances outside the permitted hours of operation are provided for as a permitted activity on no more than 4 days per year.
99. To further manage non residential activities, it is proposed to introduce provisions relating to places of assembly. Places of assembly are considered suitable for the RVRE and are consistent with the expectations for the Environment depending on the scale and nature of the activity. The proposed hours of operation (status quo) and area of operation restrictions are intended to ensure that the expected characteristics of the RVRE are retained.

Emergency Services

100. Emergency services are a vital component of rural villages but can have a range of adverse effects including noise, traffic movements and signage. Currently, emergency services are not specifically managed in the Living 1 Environment, but are controlled through effects provisions. Specifically classifying emergency services as discretionary activities will improve the efficiency of the provisions and allow for assessment in accordance with the objectives and policies. Alternatively a requiring authority may apply for a designation.

Alternatives

101. One option evaluated as an alternative to the proposed provisions was to maintain the status quo which lightly regulates commercial and industrial activities in the Living Environments. Council’s 5 Year Review of the District Plan Efficiency and Effectiveness (August 2012) identified that the amenity of the Living Environments has been compromised by the sprawl of commercial activities. This confirms that the status quo is not the most appropriate method to achieve the proposed objectives as the provisions are too permissive.

102. Another alternative method of managing non residential activities (including home occupations) is to avoid them via prohibited activity status. While this would help protect amenity levels within the RVRE it would not allow for the necessary range of activities and services within rural villages and would not accurately reflect many existing land uses. The avoidance of non residential activities altogether is not considered an appropriate method of achieving the RVE objectives. This alternative method would greatly restrict the growth potential of rural villages and would negatively affect their viability.

103. A final option evaluated was to promote a market-led approach to the location of non residential activities based on land prices. This option is considered inappropriate as this can lead to the sprawl of commercial activities. Within the Whangarei CBD ‘business creep’ has become a significant issue as commercial activities have opted for cheaper land outside of the city centre. Allowing this to occur in the rural villages could be detrimental to the consolidated and managed growth of rural villages.

Conclusion

104. The proposed provisions relating to non residential activities within the RVRE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 13 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions:
The restriction of commercial and industrial activities within the RVRE and direction to appropriately zoned RVCE and RVIE areas assists in maintaining amenity of the RVRE and reduce the potential for land use conflicts. Sends a clear message that commercial and industrial activities should be consolidated into Business Environments, RVCE and RVIE. Gives effect to 30/50 consolidated growth pattern. Traffic movement controls may result in reduction in the scale of home occupations, protecting amenity levels. The ‘home occupations’ provisions are expected to have social and economic benefits to individuals and wider economic benefits to the local community by enabling home occupations of an appropriate scale. Consolidation of commercial and industrial activities to the RVCE improving economic viability of villages. Reduces the potential for increased pressure on road capacity resulting from traffic movements associated with home occupations. The proposed non-residential activity provision more clearly identify the nature and scale of activity appropriate to the RVRE. It is anticipated that the rules will provide for more clarity in interpretation. Maintains amenity levels anticipated within residential areas better than less restrictive provisions would. The proposed home occupation provisions maintain consistency with the Kamo Walkability Environment. None identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces the opportunity for people to maximise their land for potential non residential activities more than less restrictive provisions would.</td>
<td>The restriction of commercial and industrial activities within the RVRE and direction to appropriately zoned RVCE and RVIE areas assists in maintaining amenity of the RVRE and reduce the potential for land use conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-complying test is relatively high making it difficult for applicants to gain approval to undertake commercial activities.</td>
<td>Sends a clear message that commercial and industrial activities should be consolidated into Business Environments, RVCE and RVIE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of commercial activities (other than home occupations) will require notified resource consent with associated costs.</td>
<td>Gives effect to 30/50 consolidated growth pattern. Traffic movement controls may result in reduction in the scale of home occupations, protecting amenity levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial activity is a prohibited activity in the RVRE hence no resource consent application can be made.</td>
<td>The ‘home occupations’ provisions are expected to have social and economic benefits to individuals and wider economic benefits to the local community by enabling home occupations of an appropriate scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of assembly and home occupations may require a discretionary consent with associated costs.</td>
<td>Consolidation of commercial and industrial activities to the RVCE improving economic viability of villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often local businesses (including commercial and industrial) support local causes. The limitation of these activities may result a reduction in social support.</td>
<td>Reduces the potential for increased pressure on road capacity resulting from traffic movements associated with home occupations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in commercial and industrial activities may lead to a reduction in the ability of people and the community to provide for their social and economic well-being. However, PC85C intends to direct these activities to the RVCE and RVIE.</td>
<td>The proposed non-residential activity provision more clearly identify the nature and scale of activity appropriate to the RVRE. It is anticipated that the rules will provide for more clarity in interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of assembly may require resource consent, possibly impacting religious, cultural and social groups.</td>
<td>Maintains amenity levels anticipated within residential areas better than less restrictive provisions would.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed provisions more clearly identify the nature and scale of activity appropriate to the RVRE and allow for activities of a suitable scale as a permitted activity. Specification of activity status provides efficient method of assessing activities against strong policies.</td>
<td>The proposed provisions provide clear activity status for non residential activities and, in conjunction with strong corresponding policy, will effectively contribute towards achieving the objectives of the RVE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The home occupation provisions are expected to have economic benefits to individuals and wider economic benefits to the community by clearly providing for home occupations that are of a nature and scale suitable for the RVRE. The restrictions on non residential activities within the RVRE will reduce opportunities for non residential activities, but are intended to direct the activities to more appropriately zoned areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The risk of not acting is moderate as the status quo would be maintained and the current provisions may prove to be too permissive with regards to non residential activities within the RVRE. The risk of acting is low as non residential activities within the RVRE would be managed and assessed in order to protect and enhance the character and amenity values anticipated within the RVRE. This approach seeks to avoid risks such as reverse sensitivity and incompatible land uses being located within the RVRE.
Building Bulk and Location Controls

105. Proposed Rules RVE.2.3.2(d) – RVE.2.3.2(f) implement policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.3, 1.3.6, 1.3.9 and 1.3.10 relating to promoting residential growth, protecting character and amenity values and avoiding reverse sensitivity effects within the RVRE by regulating building bulk and location.

Building Height

106. The proposed building height of 8m is consistent with the current Living 1 Environment provisions, rather than the 10m height in the CE. 8m is considered more appropriate for the RVRE as it provides a suitable height for residential development and higher buildings could cause shading and outlook problems. Alternatives include increasing or decreasing the height limit. The height limit is not proposed to be more restrictive as the scale is considered appropriate relative to existing development and as consolidation is encouraged in the RVRE. A more restrictive height limit would increase the consenting costs for development.

Height in Relation to Boundary

107. In conjunction with the maximum building height provision, it is proposed to impose a height in relation to boundary rule (RVE.2.3.2(d)(vi)) to further protect amenity values within the RVRE. High buildings close to common boundaries can have significant adverse effects on neighbouring sites, including being overbearing and restricting the admission of daylight. This proposed provision requires higher buildings to be located further from the site boundaries. The WDP currently imposes rules relating to daylight angles within Living Environments (WDP Rule 36.4.9). However, there has been a lack of clarity regarding this rule and the proposed height in relation to boundary rule will provide more clarity in interpretation and implementation and is therefore considered to be more effective and efficient than the status quo.

Setbacks

108. Yards or building setbacks allow for open space between buildings for site access, building maintenance, privacy, noise reduction and the like. The proposed location provisions for the RVRE include a 4.5m setback from any road boundary and a 3m setback from other boundaries with one setback of 1.5m. This is consistent with the status quo of the Living 1 Environment.

109. More restrictive and less restrictive setback provisions were evaluated. The current provisions have operated efficiently and effectively and are considered appropriate to retain as they more accurately reflect the existing environment and the proposed RVRE and provide familiarity for plan users.

110. The proposed 27m setback from MHWS and rivers over 3m in width is consistent with the current Living 1 Environment provisions that aim to ensure that land is available for esplanade reserves/strips and that those areas are protected for conservation, ecological, recreational, access and hazard mitigation purposes. This distance was arrived at through Environment Court mediation on the WDP.
Other Controls

111. Currently under the WDP the construction or alteration of a fence over 2m in height is a restricted discretionary activity. High fences detract from living amenity and reduce the feeling of open space and therefore it is considered appropriate to maintaining a 2m height limit. More restrictive and less restrictive provisions were evaluated. However, higher fences can lead to shading effects where as lower fences can reduce privacy levels. Overall, the current provisions have operated efficiently and effectively and are considered appropriate to retain.

112. The proposed impervious area limit of 65% aims to ensure sufficient land is available for landscaping and to mitigate the potential effects of stormwater runoff. This provision also encourages the protection of areas of land where future services can be developed. Currently, there are no impervious area limits within the Living Environments. It is considered appropriate to manage stormwater within the rural villages where Council’s stormwater network is limited and stormwater is often managed on-site by developers. The status quo is not considered an appropriate method of stormwater management as the proposed 65% limit is consistent with the recommendation under the EES.

Alternatives

113. An alternative to the proposed bulk and location provisions was to provide no bulk and location provisions and instead to rely on minimum site size and engineering standards. However, in the absence of rules, built development can occur ad-hoc resulting in potential for significant land use conflicts, adverse effects on amenity values and health risks. Therefore, this approach is not considered appropriate as the associated risks are too high.

Conclusion

114. Given the above, the proposed provisions relating to building bulk and location within the RVRE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 14 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased opportunities for people to maximise their land value through development when compared to the less restrictive alternative.</td>
<td>The proposed height and setback restrictions will limit adverse effects onto neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Reduces the risk of potential adverse effects on shading, privacy, outlook, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for resource consents with associated cost to applicant if provisions are not met.</td>
<td>The proposed impervious area limit will help to manage the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff better than the status quo. Additionally, the impervious area limit will manage the amount of open space within a site and control the perceived development density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased restrictions on development when compared to the less restrictive alternative.</td>
<td>Maintains a similar level of amenity as the status quo while giving effect to the consolidated growth pattern adopted by 30/50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social costs remain consistent, proximity to neighbours, maintenance of privacy, maintenance of rural outlook and health remains the same.</td>
<td>The proposed setbacks and impervious area limit will allow for the efficient provision of future services by retaining areas free from buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Well-being of landowners is protected through the bulk and location controls as they are similar to the existing provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Maintains amenity levels anticipated within residential areas better than a less restrictive alternative would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a low impact in terms of economic growth and employment associated with the proposed provisions. Bulk and location provisions have a direct relationship to the amenity and sense of place of an area, these controls have the ability to increase or decrease development costs associated with built development. Building costs do have an effect on overall economic growth; however, the provisions are considered to present reasonable mitigation with a low cost implication.</td>
<td>Streamlined rules for ease of use and more clarity for interpretation and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provisions efficiently administer building bulk and location provisions without being overly prescriptive and by providing more clarity for the public.</td>
<td>The proposed provisions provide clear methods of managing bulk and location in a manner which will contribute towards achieving the objectives of the RVE by maintaining amenity values within the RVRE. The proposed impervious area limit aims to reduce the potential risks associated with stormwater runoff and is more effective than the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information</strong></td>
<td>The proposed provisions are similar to the existing provisions and therefore present minimal risks as they are aimed at protecting existing amenity values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Density

115. Proposed Rules RVE.2.1.5, RVE.2.3.2(a) and RVE.2.3.2(b) implement policies RVE.1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.6 and 1.3.9 relating to promoting residential growth and protecting character and amenity values within the RVRE by regulating residential density.

116. Intensity of development in the Living 1 and 3 Environments under the WDP is limited to one RU per 500m$^2$ and 2,000m$^2$ of net site area, respectively. In any Living Environment on a site not connected to a reticulated sewerage system the intensity of development is limited to one RU per 2,000m$^2$ of net site area.

117. The proposed RVRE provides for one RU per 500m$^2$ as a permitted activity. Applying the more restrictive Living 3 Environment controls would not address the goals of 30/50 and the RDS of shifting to a more compact growth model, nor would the controls be consistent with the scale of existing development. The proposed provisions are considered to be a more appropriate way of achieving and promoting managed growth where reticulated services are available.

118. Providing for higher density residential development was evaluated. Permitting densities of more than one RU per 500m$^2$ is considered inappropriate for protecting the amenity values anticipated within the RVRE and would not achieve the RVE objectives.

119. One option evaluated was to include MRUs in the 500m$^2$ density limit, which would maintain the status quo. This option would restrict the development potential of allotments and would not achieve the consolidated growth pattern in accordance with 30/50. The proposed 750m$^2$ minimum net site area for a MRU allows for more consolidated development while also protecting amenity and character values by not permitting a density of development that is significantly greater than the status quo. The proposed provision is also more consistent with proposed Rule RVE.2.3.2(f) (impervious areas) in terms of the scale of activity that will trigger consent requirement.

120. Proposed Rule RVE.2.1.5 aims to concentrate development where reticulated services are currently available. The provision is considered to be an appropriate method of concentrating development near existing reticulated services and restricting opportunities for sprawling unserviced development.

121. Proposed Rule RVE.2.3.2(a)(ii) is intended to avoid inappropriate development on any legacy lots where connection to Council's reticulated wastewater system is unavailable and on-site servicing cannot be provided in accordance with the EES.

Conclusion

122. The proposed provisions relating to residential density within the RVRE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 15 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.
### TABLE 15: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVRE RESIDENTIAL DENSITY PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong>&lt;br&gt;Increases the density of the current Living 3 Environments within the district’s rural villages where connection to Council’s reticulated wastewater system is available.&lt;br&gt;Decreased opportunities for people to maximise their land value through construction of a MRU that is not able to connect to a public reticulated wastewater system</td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong>&lt;br&gt;The development intensity provided for in the RVRE seeks to concentrate residential development within the RVRE and stops it spreading throughout the surrounding areas of the rural villages.&lt;br&gt;Provisions enable present and future generations to provide for their social, cultural and economic wellbeing by providing for residential land use within the villages and allowing for MRUs where site sizes are appropriate.&lt;br&gt;Gives effect to the consolidated growth pattern adopted by 30/50 better than the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong>&lt;br&gt;Potential for increased compliance costs as a result of the stricter control of MRUs where reticulated services are unavailable.</td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong>&lt;br&gt;Increases opportunities for construction of MRUs where services are available.&lt;br&gt;Encourages a consolidated growth pattern to reduce costs of providing services and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reduces the opportunities for families to provide for accommodation of extended family via the provision for MRUs when compared to more permissive options.</td>
<td><strong>Social</strong>&lt;br&gt;Limited change to the current provisions for landowners, investors and residents to encourage ease of use of the WDP.&lt;br&gt;Maintains the amenity levels anticipated within residential areas better than a less restrictive alternative would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong>&lt;br&gt;None identified.</td>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong>&lt;br&gt;None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows for the efficient provision of services to future areas and provides more clarity with regards to MRUs.</td>
<td>The proposed provisions are effective in achieving a balance between promoting intensification and maintaining the status quo and existing amenity values. The proposed provisions specifically aim to achieve the RVE objectives by encouraging growth where reticulated services are available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option allows for development at higher levels than the current Living 3 Environment, but restricts it to targeted RVRE areas. Overall, the provisions could encourage economic growth and provide employment opportunities by providing a supply of developable land within the rural village settlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The risk of not acting is low as the status quo would be maintained and the patterns of existing development and density would largely be upheld.&lt;br&gt;The risk of acting is low as the proposed provisions are similar to existing provisions and are clearer with regard to the management of MRUs. If the density were to increase there would be a risk of oversupply and adverse effects on existing amenity and character values of rural villages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subdivision

123. Proposed Rule RVE.3.3.2 implements policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.6, 1.3.9, 1.3.10 and 1.3.12 relating to promoting residential growth and protecting character and amenity values within the RVRE.

124. The WDP provides for subdivision in the Living 1 and 3 Environments as a controlled activity where the net site area of an allotment is at least 500m$^2$ and 2,000m$^2$, respectively. In any Living Environment on a site not connected to a reticulated sewerage system subdivision is a controlled activity if the allotment has a net site area of at least 2,000m$^2$.

125. 30/50 adopts a consolidated approach to population growth, encouraging more residential development rather than rural residential development. The alternative of increasing the minimum lot size was evaluated; however, this is not consistent with the existing environment in the Living 1 Environment and would not achieve the preferred consolidated growth pattern under 30/50. A decreased minimum lot size was also evaluated. This may have potential adverse effects on character and amenity values within rural villages.

126. Therefore, maintaining the status quo of a minimum lot size of 500m$^2$ is considered to be the most appropriate method of achieving the objectives of the RVE.

127. Proposed Rule RVE.3.3.2(c) maintains the status quo within the Living Environments. This rule protects amenity values and ensures compliance with other rules in the WDP. It also provides for consideration of natural hazards. This rule has operated effectively and efficiently and is considered appropriate to retain.

Conclusion

128. The proposed provisions relating to subdivision within the RVRE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 16 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases the density of the current Living 3 Environment zones within the district’s rural villages where connection to Council’s reticulated wastewater system is available.</td>
<td>The development intensity provided for in the RVRE allows residential development to be contained within the RVRE and stops it spreading throughout the surrounding areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing demand for services in un-serviced areas with implications for Council infrastructure funding and development.</td>
<td>The provisions enable present and future generations to provide for their social, cultural and economic wellbeing by providing for residential land use within the villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>The proposed density seeks to achieve the consolidated growth pattern under 30/50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Opportunities for residential development are retained and enhanced within Living 3 Environments that area connected to a public reticulated wastewater system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiently achieves the objectives of the RVE by requiring limited changes to the existing provisions and by allowing for the efficient provision of services to future residential areas.</td>
<td>The proposed provisions are consistent with the objectives of the RVE by aiming to provide for the managed growth of rural villages while protecting amenity values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option allows for development at higher levels than the current Living 3 Environment, but restricts it to targeted RVRE areas. Overall, it could encourage economic growth and provide employment opportunities by providing a supply of developable land within the rural village settlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information | The proposed provisions are similar to the existing provisions and there is sufficient information to reduce the risk of acting or not acting. |

4.7 RVCE provisions

**Building Bulk and Location Controls**

129. Proposed Rules RVE.2.3.1(a) and RVE.2.3.1(d) implement policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.3, 1.3.6, 1.3.7 and 1.3.8 relating to promoting a range of activities and protecting character and amenity values within the RVCE by regulating building bulk and location.

**Residential Density**

130. Proposed Rule RVE.2.3.1(a)(i), providing for two or more RUs per site as a discretionary activity differs from the status quo. The existing Business 3 Environment provisions do not have any
equivalent density limits on residential activities. These provisions have been proposed to allow assessment of larger scale type developments, while permitting smaller scale development to proceed as permitted activities. The option to continue without any density provisions was evaluated but discarded as larger scale developments may have more than minor adverse effects and should be assessed in line with the objectives and policies of the RVE.

Outdoor Living Courts

131. The living area requirements for RUs are an appropriate way to ensure on-site amenity values are protected within the RVCE. The proposed outdoor living area provision is similar to the Business 3 Environment provisions which require an outdoor living court capable of containing a circle 5m in diameter for ground floor units. Private open space plays an important part in providing room for the planting of trees, stormwater drainage, and ensuring high levels of amenity and privacy on residential sites.

132. A different minimum area requirement (instead of requiring a 5m diameter circle) is proposed for living courts to afford more flexibility for RUs in providing outdoor living courts, as a specific shape of outdoor living court is not suitable for all sites. The proposed provision is intended to ensure that sufficient open space is provided on-sites in a form that is useable and practicable.

Setbacks

133. The proposed 27m setback from MHWS and rivers over 3m in width is consistent with the current Business 3 Environment provisions that aim to ensure that land is available for esplanade reserves/strips and that those areas are protected for conservation, ecological, recreational, access and hazard mitigation purposes. This distance was arrived at through Environment Court mediation on the WDP.

134. The Business 3 Environment provisions in the WDP currently have no building setback requirement from roads (except on Bank, Dent and Donald Streets). The proposed 2m setback within the RVCE is intended to retain amenity values and encourage a range of land use activities so that residential and commercial activities can be established within the RVCE. The alternative of having no minimum setbacks from roads is not considered appropriate for residential uses. In the interest of not compromising sites for future residential use it is therefore considered appropriate to implement the proposed 2m road boundary setback.

Building Height

135. The proposed building height of 8m is consistent with the current Living 1 Environment provisions, rather than the 11m height in the Business 3 Environment. Within rural villages the commercial centres generally have a different character and amenity values than the business zones within Whangarei City. Therefore, 8m is considered more suitable for the RVCE as it provides sufficient height for commercial and residential use, and higher buildings could cause shading and outlook problems. The height limit has not been proposed to be more restrictive as it would not be consistent with existing development and would not encourage consolidation in the RVCE.
Conclusion

136. The proposed provisions relating to bulk and location within the RVCE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE Objectives. Table 17 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.

| TABLE 17: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVCE BUILDING BULK AND LOCATION PROVISIONS |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Costs**                        | **Benefits**                     |
| **Environmental**                | **Environmental**                |
| Decreased opportunities for people to maximise their land value through development compared to status quo. | Will limit adverse effects on neighbouring properties and allow for consideration of reverse sensitivity and provision of mitigation where possible. |
| **Economic**                     | **Economic**                     |
| Requirement for resource consents with associated cost to applicant if provisions are not met. | Reduces the risk of potential adverse effects due to shading, privacy, outlook, etc. |
| Increased restrictions on development compared to status quo. | Maintains a similar level of amenity as the status quo while giving effect to 30/50 consolidated growth pattern. |
| **Social**                       | **Social**                       |
| None identified.                 | Maintains amenity levels anticipated within residential areas better than a less restrictive alternative would. |
| **Cultural**                     | **Cultural**                     |
| None identified.                 | None identified.                 |

| **Efficiency**                   | **Effectiveness**                |
| The proposed provisions efficiently address density, bulk and location provisions without being overly prescriptive and by providing clarity for the public. | The simplicity of the proposed provisions provides easy reference for the public and is largely similar to the current provisions. The proposed provisions will contribute towards achieving the objectives of the RVE by maintaining amenity values within the RVE. |

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

There is a low impact in terms of economic growth and employment. Bulk and location provisions have a direct relationship to the amenity and sense of place of an area. These controls have the ability to increase or decrease development costs associated with built development. Building costs do have an effect on overall economic growth; however, the provisions are considered to present reasonable mitigation with a low cost implication.

The proposed provisions are similar to the status quo but impose a density limit on residential activities, thereby potentially restricting the scale of residential development but potentially encouraging more commercial activities.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The risk of not acting is moderate as the status quo would be maintained and the current provisions may permit activities and development that could adversely affect amenity values within the RVE.

The risk of acting is low as the proposed provisions are similar to existing provisions, with additional restrictions proposed, and new development is anticipated to be gradual.
Non Residential Activities

137. Proposed Rules RVE.2.1.3, RVE.2.3.1(b) and RVE.2.3.1(c) implement policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.6 and 1.3.7 relating to promoting a range of activities and protecting character and amenity values within the RVCE by regulating non-residential activities.

Traffic Movements

138. The proposed 200 traffic movements per day limit is consistent with the current Business 3 Environment and the proposed RVIE provisions. It is considered appropriate to retain a limit for traffic movements to trigger an assessment of potential effects on amenity and the efficiency of the RVCE road network. For this reason this provision is also linked to public notification. A consistent approach throughout the WDP is considered more appropriate than proposing different limits.

139. During pre-notification consultation, feedback was received requesting that emergency services such as fire stations be exempted from the traffic movement limit. Emergency services are a necessary part of rural village communities and provide an invaluable service. Exempting emergency services from the traffic movement limit was evaluated. Any activity generating more than 200 traffic movements per site per day can potentially have more than minor adverse effects on the surrounding environment. On balance it is considered appropriate to require assessment of emergency services as a discretionary activity where the traffic movement limit is exceeded.

Commercial Density

140. Proposed Rule RVE.2.3.1(b)(ii), identifying three or more commercial activities per site as a discretionary activity, is a new provision. The WDP Business 3 Environment provisions do not have any equivalent commercial activity density limits. This provision is proposed to allow assessment of larger scale type developments while permitting smaller scale development.

141. The option to not implement any commercial activity density provisions was evaluated. In rural villages, larger scale developments are considered to require assessment in line with the objectives and policies. Providing for them as permitted activities may result in adverse effects that outweigh the benefits. The option to further restrict the density of commercial activities was also evaluated but discarded as commercial developments will be important to the future of the rural villages and providing for none or only one commercial activity per site was considered to be overly restrictive.

Commercial Scale

142. The provisions proposed include a maximum of 300m$^2$ GFA for commercial and rural centre service activities. This provision is proposed as the inclusion of very large buildings within the RVCE has the potential to compromise the vibrancy of the RVE. Consideration was given to permitting buildings with a GFA of 6,500m$^2$ in line with the supermarket definition in Chapter 6 of the WDP. However, 300m$^2$ is considered to better reflect the scale of the existing commercial activities within rural villages. The 300m$^2$ area is consistent with the GFA limit currently in the Business 2 Environment. 500m$^2$ was also considered as a GFA limit. However, 500m$^2$ is not considered to accurately reflect the existing or desired environment of the RVCE as well as 300m$^2$ does.
Industrial Activities

143. Industrial activities are proposed to be classified as prohibited activities within the RVCE to maintain and enhance the existing amenity and character values and to require industrial activities to be located in appropriate zones (i.e. Business Environments or RVIE).

Conclusion

144. The proposed provisions relating to non residential activities within the RVCE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 18 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 18: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF RVCE NON RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES PROVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased opportunities for people to maximise their land value through development compared to status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for resource consents with associated cost to applicant if provisions are not met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased restrictions on development compared to status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to the current provisions for landowners, investors and residents. Reduced flexibility for landowners and investors in terms of land use and development options compared to status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will focus assessment on larger scale development without being overly prescriptive as smaller scale development will be permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly signals the scale of development Council wants to assess further and contributes towards achieving the RVE objectives by enabling a range of activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

Provides for appropriate commercial and rural centre service activities as permitted activities and enables larger scale development that is consistent with the RVE objectives and policies.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The risk of not acting is low to moderate as the status quo would be maintained and the current provisions may provide for activities that would have adverse effects on the amenity values of the RVE.

The risk of acting is low as the proposed provisions are similar to existing provisions, with additional restrictions proposed, and new development is anticipated to be gradual.
145. Proposed Rule RVE.3.3.1 implements policies RVE.1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, 1.3.6, 1.3.7 and 1.3.12 relating to promoting and managing growth and protecting character and amenity values within the RVCE by regulating subdivision.

146. The WDP provides for subdivision in the Business 3 Environment as a controlled activity where the net site area of an allotment is at least 100m$^2$.

147. A number of alternatives have been evaluated in relation to subdivision in the RVCE. The first option is to have no provisions, with all subdivision being permitted. This option is considered inappropriate as access and servicing arrangements would not be evaluated by Council and lots could potentially be created that could not be built on.

148. Another option is to provide for subdivision as a permitted activity where there is compliance with the EES. Servicing and access arrangements could then be evaluated by Council. However, as the EES are standards it is difficult to try to administer compliance with them without consent being required. Therefore, this option could not be administered effectively. Additionally, it is considered appropriate to impose a minimum allotment size to ensure that lots created are an appropriate size for development.

149. Alternative minimum lot sizes were considered for the proposed RVCE. Smaller lot sizes would increase the difficulty of complying with the proposed outdoor living court requirement and the 2m setback from any road boundary. Larger lot sizes may encourage larger scale commercial activities which may not comply with proposed Rule RVE.2.3.1(b) and which may have adverse effects on surrounding residential properties. Therefore, the proposed minimum lot size is considered appropriate and is consistent with the WDP provisions.

Conclusion

150. The proposed provision relating to subdivision within the RVCE is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE objectives. Table 19 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provision.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains the density of the current Business 3 Environment zones within the district's rural villages where connection to Council's reticulated wastewater system is available.</td>
<td>The minimum lot size within the RVCE encourages business activities to be located within the RVCE rather than spreading throughout the surrounding areas of the rural villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not allow for as much development as a less restrictive provision would.</td>
<td>Opportunities for a range of activities and development are retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Limited change to the current provisions for landowners, investors and residents to encourage ease of use of the WDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Maintains the amenity levels anticipated within the RVE better than a less restrictive alternative would.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows for the efficient provision of services to future residential areas and requires limited changes to the current provisions.</td>
<td>The proposed provisions are consistent with the objectives of the RVE by effectively providing for the managed growth of rural villages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

The proposed provisions promote the concentration of commercial activities within a compact RVCE which could encourage economic growth and provide employment opportunities by consolidating commercial centres.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The proposed provision maintains the status quo and there is sufficient information to reduce the risk of acting or not acting.

---

4.8 RVIE provisions

**Building Bulk and Location Controls**

151. Proposed Rules RVE.2.3.3(a) and RVE.2.3.3(b) implement policies RVE.1.3.3, 1.3.6 and 1.3.11 relating to protecting character and amenity values within the RVIE and surrounding RVE by regulating building bulk and location.

**Setbacks**

152. The proposed 27m setback from MHWS and rivers over 3m in width is consistent with the current Business 2 and 4 Environment provisions that aim to ensure that land is available for esplanade reserves/strips and that those areas are protected for conservation, ecological, recreational, access and hazard mitigation purposes. This distance was arrived at through Environment Court mediation on the WDP.

153. The Business 4 Environment provisions in the WDP currently require a 4.5m setback from road boundaries for permitted activities, while the Business 2 Environment provisions require a 2.5m setback from road boundaries. The proposed 4.5m setback within the RVIE is consistent with the
status quo of the Business 4 Environment (the heavy industrial zone) and will protect streetscape and spaciousness better than a 2.5m setback without being overly restrictive. An option of having no minimum setback from roads was evaluated. This is not considered appropriate as no minimum setback from roads could result in adverse effects to overall amenity and could increase the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.

Building Height and Height in Relation to Boundary

154. The proposed building height of 20m is consistent with the current Business 4 Environment provisions, rather than the 15m height in the Business 2 Environment. The areas that are proposed to be rezoned to RVIE are industrial in scale and therefore, 20m is more suitable for the RVIE as it provides a sufficient height for heavy industrial activities and higher buildings could generate adverse effects with regards to amenity values, shading and outlook. The height limit is not made more restrictive as the scale is appropriate relative to existing development.

155. In conjunction with the maximum building height provision it is proposed to impose a height in relation to boundary rule (RVE.2.3.3(a)(v)) to further protect amenity values within the RVIE. The WDP currently imposes rules relating to daylight angles within Living Environments (Rule 36.4.9). There has been a lack of clarity regarding this rule and the proposed height in relation boundary provision will allow for more clarity in interpretation and implementation.

Impervious Surfaces

156. The impervious area provision aims to control the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. Currently there are no impervious area limits within the Business 2 and 4 Environments. It is considered appropriate to manage stormwater within the rural villages where Council’s stormwater network is limited and stormwater is often managed on-site by developers. Accordingly, the status quo is not considered an appropriate method of stormwater management.

Conclusion

157. The proposed provisions relating to bulk and location within the RVIE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE Objectives. Table 20 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions.
### TABLE 20: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVIE BUILDING BULK AND LOCATION PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>The proposed height and setback restrictions will limit adverse effects on neighbouring properties and allow for consideration of reverse sensitivity effects and provision of mitigation where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Reduces the risk of potential adverse effects due to privacy, outlook, shading, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for resource consents with associated cost to applicant if provisions are not met.</td>
<td>The proposed impervious area provision will help manage the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased restrictions on development compared to status quo.</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The costs associated with formulating and implementing new provisions.</td>
<td>Discontent between neighbours is reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Provides for more clarity in interpretation and implementation of rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Efficiency

The provisions address building bulk and location provisions without being overly prescriptive and by providing more clarity for the public. The benefits associated with this option are considered to outweigh the costs and therefore the provisions are efficient.

#### Effectiveness

The proposed provisions provide clear methods of managing bulk and location in a manner which will contribute towards achieving the objectives of the RVE. The provisions are effective in managing the scale of development in the RVIE.

#### Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities

There is a low impact in terms of economic growth and employment associated with the proposed provisions. Bulk and location provisions have a direct relationship to the amenity and sense of place of an area. These controls have the ability to increase or decrease development costs associated with built development. Building costs do have an effect on overall economic growth; however, the provisions present reasonable mitigation with a low cost implication. The proposed bulk and location provisions provide for the continuation of existing landuses. Reduction of conflicts between activities will result in a reduction in operational costs for non residential activities.

#### Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information

The risk of not acting is low to moderate as the status quo would be maintained and reverse sensitivity effects and adverse effects on amenity values within the RVE may not be as effectively assessed. The risk of acting is low as the proposed provisions are designed to minimise risks arising from reverse sensitivity effects and adverse effects on amenity values.
Scale of Activity

158. Proposed Rule RVE.2.3.3(c) implements policies RVE.1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.6 and 1.3.11 relating to protecting character and amenity values within the RVIE and surrounding RVE by regulating the scale of activities.

Traffic Movements

159. While Business Environments tend to be very busy in terms of vehicle movements, significant increases in traffic can result in adverse effects due to loss of amenity, noise, pedestrian safety, road safety and efficiency, dust, odour and parking. The Business 2 and 4 Environments have limit the number of traffic movements being generated by an activity to 200 traffic movements from a site within a 24 hour period; however, this limitation may be exceeded where the activity complies with the EES.

160. An alternative option is to remove all traffic movement limitations and only require that access and parking areas are constructed in accordance with the EES. However, as it is proposed for the RVIE to be adjacent to the RVRE it is considered important to protect and maintain amenity values and avoid or mitigate adverse effects where possible.

161. The option to maintain the status quo with a 200 traffic movement limit was evaluated. Within the RVE the primary issue related to traffic movements is the effect on amenity values. It is considered appropriate to retain the 200 traffic movement limit, with no exemption for compliance with the EES, so that activities exceeding 200 traffic movements per site per day may be assessed against the objectives and policies.

Hours of Operation

162. Within the Business 2 and 4 Environments there is no limit on hours of operation. The option to maintain the status quo was evaluated. This is however not considered appropriate it is proposed that the RVIE be adjacent to the RVRE.

163. Within the Business 3 Environment the permitted hours of operation are between 0600 and 2200 within 50m of a Living Environment boundary. As the Business 3 Environment applies to business areas in close proximity to Living Environments, this provision is considered appropriate for the RVIE to maintain amenity levels within the RVE.

Conclusion

164. The proposed provisions relating to scale of activity within the RVIE are considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE Objectives. Table 21 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provisions:
### TABLE 21: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVIE SCALE OF ACTIVITY PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased opportunities for people to maximise their land value through development compared to status quo.</td>
<td>Larger scale industrial activities that will potentially have greater effects on the RVE will be assessed by the consent process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for resource consents with associated cost to applicant if provisions are not met.</td>
<td>Effects associated with hours of operation and traffic movements are managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased restrictions on development compared to the status quo.</td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong> Smaller scale development is permitted. Reduces the risk of land use conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to the current provisions for landowners and investors. Reduced flexibility for landowners and investors in terms of land use and development options compared to the status quo.</td>
<td>Health and well-being of some landowners is protected through the reduction of risk of exposure to noise, odour, extended hours of operation, etc. Maintains the amenity levels anticipated within the RVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**

Will focus assessment on larger scale development without being overly prescriptive as smaller scale development will be permitted, promoting efficiency.  

**Effectiveness**

Signals the scale of development Council wants to assess and achieves the RVE objectives by protecting amenity levels while allowing for a range of activities.

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

This option provides for appropriately scaled industrial activities as permitted activities. The proposed provisions aim to minimise adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, which could in turn reduce operational costs.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The risk of not acting is low to moderate as the status quo would be maintained and the current provisions may provide for activities that would have adverse effects on the amenity values of the RVE. The risk of acting is low as the proposed provisions are similar to the existing provisions, but are slightly more restrictive, and will only apply to existing activities within the RVIE. Generally, the provisions seek to minimise risk.

---

**Sensitive Activities**

165. Proposed Rule RVE.2.1.4 implements policies RVE.1.3.3, 1.3.6 and 1.3.11 relating to protecting character and amenity values in the RVIE and surrounding RVE by regulating sensitive activities.

166. Conflicting land use resulting in reverse sensitivity effects has been raised as a major issue through the RDS and consultation on the draft rural Plan Changes. The RVE objectives and policies seek to avoid land use conflicts and reverse sensitivity effects, acknowledging that the types of land use activities throughout the RVE are varied in nature and effects. Sensitive activities are provided for elsewhere within the RVE and therefore it is considered appropriate to prohibit sensitive activities within the RVIE given the potential for reverse sensitivity effects.

**Conclusion**

167. The proposed provision relating to sensitive activities within the RVIE is considered to be the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE Objectives. Table 22 further assesses the appropriateness of the proposed provision:
TABLE 22: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVIE SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES PROVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits potential uses of</td>
<td>Provides clearly distinct zones with separated activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land within the RVIE.</td>
<td>and separated effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits development potential of land for sensitive activities within the RVIE.</td>
<td>Commercial and industrial activities are enabled which provides landowners an opportunity to undertake commercial and industrial activities which may improve their ability to earn an income. Prohibiting sensitive activities will reduce operational costs for commercial and industrial activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>Reduces adverse and reverse sensitivity effects within the RVE, thereby improving the quality of life for residents and business operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**

- Efficiently restricts sensitive activities within the RVIE through prohibited activity status and reduces compliance and enforcement costs.

**Effectiveness**

- Clearly establishes which activities are expected within the RVIE and contributes towards maintaining and protecting amenity values in the RVE by directing sensitive activities outside the RVIE.

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

- Retains RVIE land for industrial purposes and encourages the establishment of sensitive activities elsewhere within rural villages. Helps reduce operational costs by separating conflicting land uses.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

- The risk of not acting is moderate to high as the status quo would be maintained and sensitive activities would not be clearly managed within industrial areas.
- The risk of acting is low as the proposed provision aims to minimise risks associated with locating conflicting land uses in close proximity to each. Sufficient land is provided elsewhere in rural villages for Sensitive Activities.

---

**Subdivision**

168. Proposed Rule RVE.3.3.3 implements policies RVE.1.3.3, 1.3.6, 1.3.11 and 1.3.12 relating to protecting character and amenity values in the RVIE and nearby RVE by regulating subdivision.

169. The WDP provides for subdivision in the Business 4 Environment as a controlled activity where the net site area of an allotment is at least 1,000m².

170. A number of alternatives have been evaluated in relation to subdivision in the RVIE. The first option is to have no provisions, with all subdivision being permitted. This option is considered inappropriate as access and servicing arrangements would not be evaluated by Council and lots could potentially be created that could not be built on.

171. The second option is to provide for subdivision as a permitted activity where there is compliance with the EES. Servicing and access arrangements could then be evaluated by Council. However, as the EES are standards it is therefore difficult to try to administer compliance with them without consent being required. Therefore this option could not be administered effectively. Additionally, it
is considered appropriate to impose a minimum allotment size to ensure that lots created are an appropriate size for development. The current 1,000m$^2$ minimum in the Business 4 Environment has operated effectively and efficiently and is considered appropriate to retain.

172. Alternative minimum lot sizes were considered for the proposed RVIE. Smaller lot sizes would increase the difficulty of complying with the proposed 4.5m setback from any road boundary and may hinder the feasibility of an industrial activity’s operation. Larger lot sizes may encourage larger scale industrial activities which may not comply with proposed Rule RVE.2.3.3(c) and which may have adverse effects on surrounding residential properties. Therefore, the proposed minimum lot size is considered appropriate and is consistent with the WDP provisions.

Conclusion

173. The proposed provision relating to subdivision within the RVIE is the most appropriate way of achieving the RVE Objectives. Table 23 further assesses the appropriateness of the provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 23: SECTION 32 ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED RVIE SUBDIVISION POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require consent as a controlled or discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient method of achieving the objectives of the RVE as the provisions are similar to the existing Business 4 provisions and require minimal changes.</td>
<td>Consistent with the objectives of the RVE as they aim to provide for the managed growth of rural villages while protecting the amenity values of rural villages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic Growth and Employment Opportunities**

The proposed provisions have a low impact on economic growth and employment opportunities as they enable the continued use of the industrial activities within the rural villages with minimal changes to the current provisions.

**Risk of acting and not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information**

The proposed provisions are similar to the existing provisions and there is sufficient information to reduce the risk of acting or not acting.
5. **Conclusion**

174. Plan Change 85C has been developed to respond to the unique environments and plan for managed growth of the district’s rural villages.

175. Pursuant to s32 of the RMA, the proposed RVE objectives have been analysed against Part 2 of the RMA and the relevant provisions of higher order plans and policy documents. It is considered that the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

176. The proposed provisions have been detailed and compared against viable alternatives in terms of their costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness and risk in accordance with the relevant clauses of s32 of the RMA. The proposed provisions are considered to represent the most efficient and effective means of achieving the proposed objectives and of addressing the underlying resource management issues relating to the district’s rural villages.
Appendix 1: RVE Stage 1 Zoning Criteria

1. **Rural Village Residential Sub-Environment (RVRE) zoning criteria:**
   
   A. Within the rural villages, areas are to be rezoned RVRE where:
      
      i. Any area is currently zoned Living 1 or 3 Environment; 
      
      ii. Any site, or area of a split-zoned site, adjacent\(^3\) to an existing Living Environment or proposed RVRE currently comprises an area of CE or CCE up to 2,000m\(^2\); 
      
      iii. Any site adjacent to an existing Living Environment is currently developed at a density greater than 1 residential unit per 1,000m\(^2\) net site area; or 
      
      iv. Any site currently zoned CE or CCE is surrounded by proposed RVRE. 
   
   B. Within the rural villages areas are to be excluded from rezoning to RVRE where:
      
      i. Any area does not have access to a formed road; 
      
      ii. Any area is identified as being within the Ngararatunua Overlay; 
      
      iii. Any area contains an unformed indicative road; 
      
      iv. Any area is not within 6m of an existing Living Environment or proposed RVRE; 
      
      v. Any area is identified for Māori Reservation, Esplanade Reserve, Hydro, Electrical works, Railway or Roadway purposes; or 
      
      vi. Except where 1(A) applies:
   
      a. Any site, or area of a split-zoned site, comprises an area of non-Living Environment greater than 5,250m\(^2\); 
      
      b. Over 50% of an area is identified as being flood susceptible; or 
      
      c. Over 75% of an area is covered in indigenous vegetation and/or wetland. 
   
   C. Where an area does not meet any of the above inclusion or exclusion criteria then the following criteria shall be used to assess rezoning:
      
      i. Land Use Capability classification 
      
      ii. Natural Landscapes and Natural Character Areas 
      
      iii. Indigenous vegetation and/or wetland coverage 
      
      iv. Flood susceptibility 
      
      v. Other hazards 
      
      vi. Proximity to reticulated wastewater 
      
      vii. Potential use identified under a SP 

2. **Rural Village Centre Sub-Environment (RVCE) zoning criteria:**
   
   A. Within the growth villages and large villages, areas are to be rezoned RVCE where any area is currently zoned as Business 2, 3 or 4 Environment and the existing land use is not Industrial (except for Rural Centre Service Activities). 

3. **Rural Village Industry Sub-Environment (RVIE) zoning criteria:**
   
   A. Within the rural villages, areas are to be rezoned RVIE where any area is currently zoned as Business 2 or 4 Environment and the existing land use is Industrial (except for Rural Centre Service Activities). 

---

\(^3\) Adjacent is used as meaning adjoining, or directly across a legal road or railway line.
1. The RVCE does not appropriately reflect industrial activities (expect for those meeting the definition of Rural Centre Service Activities). Within Hikurangi and Waipu there are areas of Business 2 and 4 Environments, respectively, which are used for industrial purposes. Therefore these areas have been excluded from the proposed RVCE and more appropriately rezoned proposed RVIE.

2. With regard to the proposed RVRE, where areas are adjacent to an existing Living Environment and are developed at a residential scale it will generally be appropriate for the area to be rezoned to proposed RVRE as this will more accurately reflect the existing land use than the proposed RPE.

3. The exclusion criteria for the RVRE are intended to avoid risks and adverse effects that may be caused by an increased development density. Therefore, where an area is susceptible to natural hazards, comprises significant indigenous vegetation and/or wetland or is culturally sensitive it is considered unsuitable for residential expansion. It is undesirable to encourage uncoordinated growth in areas that are inaccessible from a formed road or where an indicative road is identified and unformed. Finally, sites that comprise a relatively large area or that are used for clearly defined purposes are considered unsuitable for RVRE.

4. Within the rural villages where an area does not meet the inclusion or exclusion criteria for the proposed RVRE then it is appropriate to assess the area’s appropriateness for proposed RVRE based on the criteria listed in 1(C). An explanation of the criteria used for the assessment is detailed in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description &amp; Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Capacity classification</td>
<td>To encourage productive use of soils, proposed RVRE zoning is considered less suitable where high class soils I &amp; II are identified. Middle range soils class III, while still considered to be suitable for productive activities, are more suitable for proposed RVRE zoning. Proposed RVRE zoning is considered most suitable where IV – VI class soils are identified as these areas are generally considered less suitable for productive purposes. Lower classes VII – VIII are generally considered less suitable for proposed RVRE zoning as these areas are often steep and unstable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Landscapes and Natural Character Areas</td>
<td>Development can affect natural character and landscapes. The RPS identified areas of High and Outstanding Natural Character in the coastal environment and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features throughout the district. Sensitive landscapes and/or character areas identified under proposed PC87 and PC114 are considered less suitable for proposed RVRE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous vegetation and/or wetland coverage</td>
<td>Residential development can lead to degradation of vegetation and wetland; therefore, proposed RVRE zoning is considered less suitable where a significant portion of an area is covered in indigenous vegetation and/or wetland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Susceptible Areas</td>
<td>Areas identified as flood susceptible on the WDP Resource Maps are generally low lying and difficult for built development and effluent disposal. To avoid and/or minimise potential adverse effects and/or additional building costs, areas identified as flood susceptible are generally avoided for proposed RVRE zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other hazards</td>
<td>To minimise adverse effects and/or additional costs, hazard areas are considered less suitable for proposed RVRE zoning. Hazards include coastal erosion, instability &amp; HAIL sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to reticulated wastewater</td>
<td>Under the consolidation approach development is clustered around existing services to maximise their efficiency and avoid additional servicing costs. Therefore, proposed RVRE zoning is generally encouraged if reticulated wastewater is in close proximity and discouraged where there are constraints to servicing such as distance and capacity. In settlements where there is currently no reticulated wastewater service available then proposed RVRE zoning is considered less suitable at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Plan</td>
<td>In keeping with any adopted SP, where a site is identified as potential residential use under a SP then it is considered more suitable for proposed RVRE zoning. Where no SP exists then the option to defer residential zoning to the next district planning cycle is considered where there is not considered to be an identified need for additional residential land at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: RVCE Stage 2 Zoning Criteria

1. Within the rural villages where additional commercial zoning is required based on projections, and an area has been proposed as Business 3 Environment under a SP, then the area has been assessed based on the Stage 2 criteria listed in Table 1 to determine its appropriateness for the proposed RVCE.

| TABLE 1: RVCE STAGE 2 ZONING CRITERIA |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| **Criterion**                  | **Discussion & Application** |
| WDP zoning                     | The current Living Environments better reflect the proposed RVCE than the CE, CCE or Open Space Environment. Therefore where an area is currently zoned as a Living Environment it is generally considered more suitable for proposed RVCE zoning than areas zoned as CE, CCE and Open Space Environments. Proposed RVCE zoning is strongly discouraged in areas zoned as Open Space Environment due to the high importance of retaining open space within villages. |
| Current use                     | Existing commercial and community service activities strongly reflect the intended nature of the proposed RVCE and are considered more appropriate for proposed RVCE zoning. Where the existing uses are not of a commercial and/or community service nature then proposed RVCE zoning is considered less suitable. |
| Natural Landscapes and Natural Character Areas | Development can greatly affect natural character and landscapes. The RPS has identified areas of High and Outstanding Natural Character in the coastal environment and Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features throughout the district. Highly sensitive landscapes and/or character areas identified under proposed PC87 and PC114 are considered less suitable for proposed RVCE zoning. |
| Indigenous vegetation and/or wetland coverage | Development can lead to degradation of vegetation and wetland; therefore, proposed RVCE zoning is considered less suitable where a significant portion of an area is covered in indigenous vegetation and/or wetland. |
| Hazards                         | To avoid future adverse effects and/or additional building cost, hazard areas are considered less suitable for proposed RVCE zoning. Potential hazards include: coastal erosion, land instability, HAIL sites and flood susceptibility. |
| Proximity to reticulated wastewater | Under the consolidation approach development is clustered around existing services to maximise their efficiency and avoid additional servicing costs. Therefore, proposed RVCE zoning is generally encouraged if reticulated wastewater is in close proximity and discouraged where there are constraints to servicing such as distance and capacity. In settlements where there is currently no reticulated wastewater service available then proposed RVCE zoning is considered less suitable at this time. |
Appendix 3: Growth Projections and Demands within Each Village

1. 30/50 and the WDGM provide population projections for each growth village and large village up to 2061. 30/50 uses Usual Resident Population (URP) while the WDGM uses Estimated Resident Population (ERP). The URP is a count of everyone who usually lives in a particular area, and is present in New Zealand on census night. The ERP is an estimate of all the people who live in a particular area at a given date and is derived using the URP adjusted for net census undercount (i.e. residents temporarily overseas, births, deaths and migration between census night and the 30 June 2013 reference date). Table 1 below provides the census figures as at 2006 and 2013 under 30/50 and the WDGM, respectively, and details the associated population projections at 2041 and 2061.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>30/50 Populations</th>
<th>WDGM Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 URP</td>
<td>2041 Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>3,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>2,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura / Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>3,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Each growth village and large village is generally comprised of a main centre with Living Environments and occasionally Business Environments, surrounded by a mixture of CE, CCE and Open Space Environment. 30/50 determined the split between residential dwellings (i.e. those located in the Living and Business Environments) and rural dwellings (i.e. those located outside the Living and Business Environments) as at 2011. The WDGM provides an update of these figures as at 2013. 30/50 also provides a 2061 target split. Table 2 details these rural and residential dwelling splits.
### TABLE 2: 30/50 AND WDGM RURAL AND RESIDENTIAL DWELLING SPLITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>30/50 Rural / Residential Dwelling Split as at 2011 (percentages)</th>
<th>WDGM Rural / Residential Dwelling Split as at 2013 (percentages)</th>
<th>30/50 Projected Rural / Residential Dwelling Split by 2061 (percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>40 / 60</td>
<td>19 / 81</td>
<td>25 / 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>36 / 64</td>
<td>37 / 63</td>
<td>30 / 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>88 / 12</td>
<td>79 / 21</td>
<td>60 / 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>93 / 7</td>
<td>77 / 23</td>
<td>75 / 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>14 / 86</td>
<td>15 / 85</td>
<td>10 / 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>26 / 74</td>
<td>23 / 77</td>
<td>20 / 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>38 / 62</td>
<td>18 / 82</td>
<td>25 / 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>58 / 42</td>
<td>62 / 38</td>
<td>25 / 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>56 / 44</td>
<td>47 / 53</td>
<td>30 / 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>41 / 59</td>
<td>23 / 77</td>
<td>30 / 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>22 / 78</td>
<td>18 / 82</td>
<td>15 / 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>47 / 53</td>
<td>38 / 62</td>
<td>25 / 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>42 / 58</td>
<td>36 / 64</td>
<td>32 / 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. With regard to business demand, the WDGM states the employees by workplace address as at 2013 and provides projections to 2028, as shown in Table 3.

### TABLE 3: WDGM EMPLOYEES BY WORKPLACE ADDRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number of Employees by Workplace Address as at 2013</th>
<th>Projected Number of Employees by Workplace Address by 2028</th>
<th>Projected Increase in Number of Employees by 2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Rural Village Land Supply and Residential Density

1. Table 1 details the current approximate land area of Living Environments (living 1 and 3) and Business Environments (Business 1, 3 and 4) within each growth village and large village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Approximate area of Living Environments (ha)</th>
<th>Approximate Area of Business Environments (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Table 2 details the average number of people per household as determined under 30/50 and the WDG. Table 2 also shows the average Living Environment lot size as determined under 30/50. The Table 1 and Table 2 figures are used when determining the projected growth in dwellings and the estimated supply of residential land required to meet growth demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>30/50 Average Household Size as at 2011 (people)</th>
<th>30/50 Average Living Environment Lot Size as at 2011 (ha)</th>
<th>WDGM Average Household Size as at 2013 (people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikurangi</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapouri</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakaramea</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungatapere</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLeod Bay/Reotahi</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngunguru</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakura</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parua Bay</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pataua</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurikura/Urquharts Bay</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutukaka</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipu Cove/Langs Beach</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Hikurangi – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand in Hikurangi village until approximately 2043 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2024 due to biophysical constraints). However, given the high 30/50 population target, the village’s capacity is considered likely to be sufficient to meet the revised projection of residential growth over the next 12 years.

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 10 residential lots in Hikurangi village over the next 12 years. There is however over 20ha of relatively hazard free land that is currently zoned as Living 1 and Business 2 Environments and is undeveloped. These areas are proposed to be rezoned to RVRE and RVCE which will provide for minimum lot sizes of 500m$^2$ and 100m$^2$, respectively, where serviced. Under the more conservative 30/50 average Living Environment lot size of 0.1ha, the available 20ha would provide approximately 200 additional lots.

3. Given the above, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion of Hikurangi village.

4. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is also not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion within Hikurangi village.

Structure Plan

5. No SP has been developed for Hikurangi village. 30/50 identifies developing a SP as a high priority. A SP will help guide the future development of the village and will be beneficial for decision making when future expansion may be required in the next district planning cycle.

Rural Development Strategy

6. The RDS identifies Hikurangi village as a growth node in which residential and commercial growth should be focused. The current spatial extent of the Living and Business Environments is considered sufficient to meet the projected growth demand in this district planning cycle.

Infrastructure Capacity

7. **Water**: Hikurangi village is currently reticulated for water and was connected to the city network in 2006. The limiting factors on this network are considered to be the Waitara pumps and the Hikurangi link. Hikurangi has enough capacity to meet the high-scenario population growth under 30/50 until 2026 (or later if growth is slower), when additional storage capacity will likely be required at a potential cost of $1.5 million. Following this work’s completion, it is expected that Hikurangi village would have the water supply capacity to accommodate growth until at least 2061.

8. **Wastewater**: There is present capacity in the wastewater system to accommodate the high-scenario projected levels of growth under 30/50 until 2031. To meet population demands beyond 2031, required works will likely include a further upgrading of the present waste water treatment
plant as well as an upgrade of the main trunk sewer line. The cost estimate for this work is $7 million.

9. **Stormwater:** The stormwater network is sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

10. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Hikurangi village, it is considered appropriate to concentrate residential and commercial development in close proximity to the existing infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing water supply and wastewater network.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

11. Despite being located on the fringes of the Hikurangi Swamp Basin, only 83ha (14%) of Hikurangi village is regarded as flood susceptible, and these locations are in close proximity to the small waterways within the village. Some of the hills above Hikurangi village are classified as having high instability risk, with about 110ha (19%) falling into this category. Another key hazard, dating back to the origins of Hikurangi, is mining hazard zones located in some parts of the village. These are areas where there is risk of subsidence due to past coal mining activities in the area. The highest levels of mining hazard risk are close to Lake Waro, medium levels of mining hazard risk are along the upper parts of King Street and near the Wilsonville Quarry entrance, whilst the lowest areas of mining hazard risk are along the slopes of Mount Hikurangi.

12. These constraints somewhat limit potential residential and/or commercial expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living and Business Environments is identified as being hazard prone. It is not considered appropriate to rezone areas susceptible to hazards for residential or commercial purposes at this time. Instead a SP should be prepared for the area taking into account natural hazard constraints.

**Existing Land Uses**

13. Lot 2 DP 103880, Pt Allotment SW40 PSH of Hikurangi, Lot 30 DP 2997 Lot 4 DP 23472 and a portion of Pt Allot68 PSH of Hikurangi are of a residential scale but are zoned as CE. Additionally, Lot 1 DP 183890 is currently *split-zoned* as CE and Living 1 Environments. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to proposed RVRE due to their size and current use, as they are considered to be too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning as they meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

14. Lot 1 DP 417056 is located to the north of Valley Road and comprises some 1.8ha of CE. The site contains an area of approximately 800m² that is bounded by Living 1 Environment sites on each of the side boundaries. The area is developed at a residential scale, and rezoning the site to proposed RVRE will help to provide a contiguous pattern of development while acknowledging the
existing scale of development. Therefore it is considered appropriate to rezone the site to proposed RVRE.

15. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time as they do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria. This is primarily due to the fact that the sites are larger than the maximum lot size and/or are within the Ngararatunua overlay and therefore do not meet the stage 1 RVE zoning criteria. Lot 7 Deeds 512 is zoned as CE and comprises 1195m². However, as the site contains an indicative road it does not meet the stage 1 RVE zoning criteria and therefore is not proposed to be rezoned RVRE.

Feedback

16. No pre-notification consultation feedback has been received regarding rezoning within Hikurangi village.

Conclusion

17. The proposed location of the RVE boundaries for Hikurangi village reflects existing Environments, land uses and patterns of development and aims to consolidate development until a SP has been prepared for Hikurangi village. The proposed rezoning of the current Living and Business Environments to proposed RVRE, RVCE and RVIE and the proposed minimal residential expansion is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth, existing capacity and the need to rezone some smaller sites to better reflect existing development.
Appendix 6: Parua Bay – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. 30/50 determined that there is capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand in Parua Bay village until approximately 2042 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2028 due to biophysical constraints). However, given the high 30/50 population target, the village’s capacity is considered likely to be sufficient to meet the revised projection of residential growth over the next 12 years.

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 10 residential lots in Parua Bay village over the next 12 years. However, PC85C proposes to create an additional 16 residential lots by rezoning sites meeting the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria from CE and CCE to proposed RVRE and RVCE. PC85C also proposes to create an additional approximate 1.5ha of proposed RVCE within Lot 1 DP 201475 and Lot 2 DP 104170 which will enable increased residential development. Therefore, there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion within Parua Bay village over the next 12 years. However, if the population grows beyond the projected levels or if the development potential of the village is significantly reduced due to biophysical constraints then providing for residential expansion through PC85C may be beneficial to meet future growth demands. Therefore, options for expansion are assessed below.

3. Based on the projected increase in employees, there is considered to be a need for commercial expansion in Parua Bay village. The selection of the proposed RVCE boundaries will be based on the existing Environments, land uses and development patterns as well, as the suitability of land for commercial expansion.

Structure Plan

4. Council adopted the Parua Bay SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:

- Residential expansion by rezoning over 40 ha of CE to Living 3 Environment (only with connections to reticulated water and wastewater services).
- Proposed extension to the existing Business 3 Environment over an area of approximately 7.6ha of land currently zoned CE.
- Provision of new Business 2 Environment over an area of approximately 2ha of land currently zoned CCE.

5. There is considered to be an identified potential need for commercial land in Parua Bay village over the next 12 years. Therefore, the potential Business 3 Environment identified under the SP has been partially included in the proposed RVCE. A significant portion (approximately 2ha) of Lot 1 DP 104170 comprises an existing wetland and is not considered suitable for commercial development at this time, nor is it considered necessary to meet the projected commercial demand over the next 12 years. This area has therefore been excluded from the proposed RVCE. Additionally, the Parua
Bay School area is proposed to be rezoned to RVCE as this more accurately reflects the current land use.

6. The area identified as potential Business 2 Environment under the SP is currently used as a boat ramp and parking area. Rezoning this area as Business 2 Environment (or RVIE) is not considered appropriate as it would allow capacity for commercial or rural centre service activities beyond projected demand. Additionally, the area is not centrally located within the village and therefore is not considered appropriate for proposed RVCE zoning. Therefore, the potential Business 2 Environment identified under the SP has been excluded from proposed RVCE.

7. Over the next 12 years the WDGM estimates that approximately an additional 60 residential dwellings (including permanently occupied dwellings and holiday homes) will be required within Parua Bay village to accommodate the projected population growth. As at January 2016 there were approximately 50 vacant Living 1 and 3 properties. Therefore, it is estimated that there will be a shortfall of approximately 10 dwellings over the next 12 years. As discussed above, the proposed RVRE and RVCE boundary locations will increase the village’s residential development capacity. However, given biophysical constraints and the current development patterns, the development potential of the village may not sufficiently accommodate unforeseen growth. Three options for the spatial extent of the RVRE boundaries within Parua Bay village were considered and are assessed below:

Option 1 – Minimal Residential Expansion Where Sites Have Been Developed at a Residential Scale (Plan Change Option)

8. Option 1 involves rezoning all of the existing Living 1 and 3 Environment to proposed RVRE, and rezoning the following sites from CCE and CE to proposed RVRE: Pt Lot 2 DP 28706, Sections 1 and 2 SO 61866 and Lot 1 DP 42943, Pt Lot 4 DP 28706, Allotment 299 PSH of Owhiwa, Pt Lot 4 DP 28706, Lots 1, 2 and 3 DP 56453 and Rahuikuri C3A. These sites have all been developed at residential scales and meet the stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

9. This option is consistent with the RVE zoning criteria and is considered to provide sufficient residential land based on projections. However, this option presents the risk of not providing sufficient residential land to accommodate unforeseen growth.

Option 2 – Rezone All Potential Residential Areas Identified in the Parua Bay SP to RVRE

10. Option 2 involves rezoning approximately 42ha of land zoned CE, to the north of Whangarei Heads Road and between Kiteone Road and Whangarei Heads Road, to proposed RVRE – outlined in red in Figure 1:
11. This option would provide ample residential land to accommodate any future growth; however, it may lead to disjointed and inefficient patterns of development which could compromise the future development potential of the village. The approximate location of the closest wastewater connection point is indicated by the green circle in Figure 1. There is a ridgeline roughly indicated by the blue line in Figure 1. These factors, combined with the current pattern of development and parcel sizes, suggest that it is unlikely that the area would be developed to a uniform Living 1 Environment-type pattern (this is discussed further under the Infrastructure Capacity heading below). Instead the lots are considered more likely to be developed to an unserviced Living 3 Environment-type intensity with areas of around 2,000m$^2$ each. Once lots are developed to this density they become more difficult to further subdivide when services are available, often resulting in an inefficient use of land.

12. While the Parua Bay SP identifies potential residential expansion in this area, it states that development should only be allowed with connection to water and wastewater services. This is to ensure that the land is used efficiently and that the future capacity of the village is not compromised.

13. Overall it is considered that the potential long term costs of this option outweigh the potential short term benefits.
14. Option 3 involves reducing the area of potential residential expansion identified under the SP to an area of approximately 20ha – outlined in red in Figure 2:

Figure 2: Option 3 RVRE Zoning

15. This option will allow for easier servicing of reticulated water as the RVRE boundary would follow the ridgeline. However, it is considered that this option would also likely lead to generally disjointed subdivisions and on-site wastewater disposal within new sites. Similar to option 2, this option would provide sufficient capacity over the medium term to accommodate unforeseen growth, but may also compromise the long term future development potential of Parua Bay village as a growth node.

Conclusion

16. Option 1 is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA as it will provide for the wellbeing of the village over the medium term while not compromising the sustainability and wellbeing of the village over the long term future. It will be important to monitor and manage Parua Bay village’s growth and to allow for growth in a coordinated fashion so that land is efficiently developed and sites are appropriately serviced.
17. With regard to options 2 and 3 there is a risk associated with not acting due to insufficient information. Detailed engineering assessments have not been undertaken to assess the feasibility of connecting to reticulated services, which was a pre-condition for rezoning under the SP. In the event that the sites were able to be connected to reticulated water and wastewater networks, and therefore developed at a Living 1 Environment-type intensity, then the costs associated with options 2 and 3 would be significantly reduced and these options may be more viable.

18. The proposed rezoning under option 1 will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will protect the character and environmental values of the area and will cluster residential and appropriate commercial development, rather than allowing sprawl or ‘ribbon’ development connecting settlement areas. Additionally, further unserviced development will be avoided.

Coastal Management Strategy

19. Within the Parua Bay to Waikaraka Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

- Recognising the peri-urban lifestyle of the area and providing appropriate infrastructure
- Promoting development that ‘fits in’ with the natural and heritage landmarks and avoids ribbon development.
- Providing a community hub in Parua Bay servicing this area as well as the Whangarei Heads and Pataua South / Taiharuru areas.
- Managing activities that may adversely impact on the ‘scenic journey’ of the Whangarei Heads Road or conflict with the tourist and residential functions of this route.

20. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by managing and clustering growth around Parua Bay village. Additionally, PC85C proposes additional commercial land to further develop the community hub.

Infrastructure Capacity

21. **Water:** Parua Bay village is currently reticulated and is connected to the city water supply. Limiting factors for the water supply system include the Whangarei Heads main, the Parua Bay reservoir and local reticulation. In order to meet future growth needs it is anticipated that expanded water storage at Parua Bay Reservoir and a pumps upgrade is required at an estimated cost of $1.5 million. These works are expected to occur within 10-20 years.

22. The topography within Parua Bay creates complications with regard to reticulated water provision. In particular, the land in between Kiteone Road and Whangarei Heads Road has a ridge approximately in the middle. The land on the eastern half is difficult to service as the pressure and capacity may be compromised by further development since the water line is located on the Kiteone Road side. Providing reticulated services to the eastern half would likely require the installation of a water line along Whangarei Heads Road which would open up a great deal more potential development and should be coordinated with appropriate rezoning. At this time it is not planned to install a water line on Whangarei Heads Road in the next 10-15 years.
23. **Wastewater**: Parts of Parua Bay village are reticulated as part of the Whangarei Heads Sewerage Scheme. To accommodate anticipated growth some wastewater works are required. These works would include, over time, reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers, and some increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant or a new plant. The cost of these additional works is estimated at $6.5 million but would not be required for at least 20 years.

24. In Parua Bay village the soils have been identified as poor draining, and high bacteria levels have been found in drains which have adversely affected the water quality of the harbour. Therefore, the effects of unserviced development must be carefully assessed and monitored.

25. **Stormwater**: The stormwater network is sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

26. **Transportation**: 30/50 identifies that Whangarei Heads Road will likely need upgrading to accommodate increased traffic volumes caused by the projected growth in the village and wider area. It is estimated that works will not be required until approximately 2046.

### Natural Hazard Risks

27. Very little of the village is subject to natural hazard constraints, with only 17ha of land being flood susceptible (1% of the village area). About 46ha of Parua Bay village is regarded as having high land instability (about 2.4%), much of this on steeper slopes. Accordingly there are relatively few hazard constraints to residential expansion.

### Existing Land Uses

28. Within Parua Bay village there are several smaller sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments either zoned as CE or CCE. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to RVRE due to their size and current use, as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning as they meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

29. Parua Bay School is zoned as CE. As the school is located in the centre of the settlement and acts as a focal point for the village, it is considered more suitable for proposed RVCE zoning than RPE zoning.

### Feedback

30. During pre-notification consultation, feedback was received requesting that 100 Kiteone Road be rezoned from CCE to proposed RVRE. It is not considered appropriate to rezone this area to proposed RVRE for the following reasons:

- The Parua Bay SP defines a strong urban boundary along Taihoa Road, which excludes 100 Kiteone Road.
The RPS has identified a majority of the site as being located within the coastal environment. To give effect to RPS Policy 5.1.2 and Method 5.1.5(2)(c), Council must consider mapping the spatial extent of villages so as to avoid sprawling or sporadic patterns of development in the coastal environment.

- Residential expansion is proposed through PC85C to accommodate projected growth. It is not considered that further residential expansion is required over the medium term.
- The site does not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

31. Feedback was also received both in support of and in opposition to the proposed RVCE zoning of the land between Lamb Road and the Community Centre, as a portion of the land contains a small wetland area that affects the development potential of the land. As discussed above this area of land has been excluded from the proposed RVCE based on the criteria listed in Appendix 2 as it is considered unsuitable for commercial development and is not considered to be necessary based on growth projections.

32. Comment was received stating that an updated, more detailed Parua Bay SP or Concept Plan would provide sound input on the intended direction of the village. To enable Parua Bay village’s potential as a growth node it is considered that a new SP could help guide and enable coordinated and managed growth. This approach should be considered and may help avoid ad-hoc development similar to what has happened in the past or what may occur through options 2 and 3 discussed above.

**Conclusion**

33. The proposed location of the RVE boundaries reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development in the most suitable areas. Projections estimate that there will be a shortage of commercial land supply over the next 12 years and therefore commercial expansion is considered appropriate; however, some of the potential expansion identified under the SP is not considered appropriate for rezoning at this time due to the existing wetland within Lot 1 DP 104170.

34. There is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion over the next 12 years. However, Parua Bay village is identified as a growth node and there may be insufficient residential land in the instance of unforeseen growth beyond what has been projected. Therefore several options have been assessed to determine the most appropriate spatial extent of proposed RVRE boundaries in the village. Minimal expansion is proposed to ensure that the future development capacity of the village is not compromised. The proposed residential expansion will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially while also slightly increasing the village’s capacity. The proposed RVE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of Parua Bay village as well as the fact that development within the village is constrained by the existing infrastructure.
Appendix 7: Waipu – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. 30/50 determined that there is capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2051 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2043 due to biophysical constraints).

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 132 residential lots in Waipu village over the next 12 years. However, additional capacity is provided through:
   - An approved 88 lot residential subdivision within Lot 91 DP 396647
   - Over 10ha of relatively hazard free land that is currently zoned as Living 1 and 3 Environments and is undeveloped. These areas are proposed to be rezoned to RVRE which will provide for minimum lot sizes of 500m² where serviced. Using the more conservative 30/50 average Living Environment lot size of 0.1ha, 10ha would provide approximately 100 additional lots.
   - PC85C proposes to create an additional 10 residential lots by rezoning sites meeting the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria from CE to proposed RVRE.

3. Therefore, there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion.

4. With regard to the estimated increase in employees working in Waipu village, the existing Business zoned land is considered sufficient to meet the projected demand.

Structure Plan

5. A SP for the Waipu Township was prepared in 2003 and has been partially implemented through PC69 in 2011, which resulted in additional Living and Business Environments within Waipu and increased the village’s development capacity. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate to allocate future residential growth areas at this time as rezoning was addressed in PC69 and there remains sufficient residential land within the village.

Rural Development Strategy

6. The RDS identifies Waipu as a growth node in which residential and commercial growth should be focused. The current spatial extent of the Living and Business Environments is considered sufficient to meet the projected growth demand in this district planning cycle.

Infrastructure Capacity

7. **Water**: Waipu village is currently reticulated for water. To meet the high-scenario projected future population growth under 30/50 upgrades are likely required within the next 10 years (though lower growth projections extend this timeframe). These include local reticulation upgrades, the development of extra storage at the Waipu Reservoir and Cove Road line upgrades. The cost for a new 4,000m³ reservoir, reticulation, pumps and a water treatment plant upgrade are estimated at $3 million.
8. **Wastewater:** Waipu village is reticulated through to the Waipu Wastewater Treatment Plant. To meet the high-scenario demands of the projected future growth under 30/50 anticipated works include reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers, and an increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant or a new plant. The costs estimate for these works are $14 million and are estimated to be required in 2036-2040 (though lower growth projections extend this timeframe). The 2015-2025 LTP also states that trunk main upgrades will be required within the next year at an estimated cost of $2.5 million.

9. **Stormwater:** The stormwater network is sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

10. **Electricity:** Waipu village has experienced significant growth recently which has created significant constraints on the supply of electricity within the village. Northpower has stated that additional strategic infrastructure will be necessary to support continued growth in the immediate and long term future, and that currently Northpower may be unable to provide power supply to new subdivisions.

11. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Waipu village and the costs required to upgrade the existing systems, it is considered appropriate to concentrate residential development in close proximity to the infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing water supply and wastewater network. The most restrictive infrastructure concern is electricity supply. Due to the current constraints on electricity supply, significant residential and commercial expansion is not considered appropriate at this time.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

12. The most notable natural hazard risk in Waipu village is flooding, with 22% of the wider village classified as being flood susceptible, some of which is close to the present village centre. Some small pockets of land are regarded as having high risk of slope instability, about 70ha in total, or 6% of the land area. These constraints somewhat limit potential residential expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living Environments is identified as being hazard prone. Over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

**Existing Land Uses**

13. Within Waipu village Lot 1 DP 69422, Lot 14 DP 17815, Lot 1 DP 129968, Section 1 SO 308281, Lot 1 DP 158350, Lot 1 DP 84933, Pt Allot 3 PSH Of Waipu, and Lots 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 DP 308117 have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CE. Additionally, Lots 1 and 3 DP 402272 are currently split-zoned as CE and Living 1 Environment. It is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern, as
they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

Feedback

14. During pre-notification consultation, comment was received requesting that Lot 2 DP 142476 be rezoned to RVRE. This site is not adjacent to an existing Living Environment, is 7.63ha in area and contains a flood susceptible area and LUC Class 2 soils. It does not meet the criteria to be rezoned and therefore is not proposed as RVRE under PC85C.

15. A public meeting was also held to discuss PC85C with the Waipu community. It was suggested by the Waipu Residents and Ratepayers that the residential zoning should be extended to the south along South Road. This option was assessed but is not considered appropriate for the following reasons:

- It is estimated that there will be sufficient capacity to meet projected residential demand over the next 12 years and that further expansion is not required.
- Within Waipu village there are constraints on electricity provision, and providing for significant expansion that is not coordinated with appropriate infrastructure upgrades may limit development potential.
- The land within South Road that is adjacent to the existing Living Environment comprises Land Use Capability Class 2 soils which, in accordance with the RPS, should not be materially compromised.
- The land further south along South Road comprises Land Use Capability Class 3 soils and is identified as being flood susceptible. Rezoning this area as proposed RVRE would not only potentially compromise the productive use of the land but may also increase the likelihood and consequences of flood-related risks.

Conclusion

16. The proposed location of the RVE boundaries for Waipu village reflects existing Environments, land uses and patterns of development and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living and Business Environments to RVRE, RVCE and RVIE and the proposed minimal residential expansion, is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth, existing capacity, the need to rezone smaller sites to reflect existing development and the current infrastructure constraints.
Appendix 8: Maungakaramea – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Maungakaramea 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2044 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2024 due to biophysical constraints). The WDGM estimates that there will be an oversupply of residential land over the next 12 years. Therefore, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion of Maungakaramea village.

2. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion of Maungakaramea village.

Structure Plan

3. No SP has been developed for Maungakaramea village. 30/50 states that it is essential that a SP is produced for Maungakaramea village and that the SP identifies sufficient land for future residential, mixed use and rural residential development over a 20/30 year period based upon growth projections. A SP will help guide the future development of the village and will be beneficial for decision making when future expansion may be required in the next district planning cycle.

Rural Development Strategy

4. The RDS seeks to consolidate residential, commercial and lifestyle development within Maungakaramea village. PC85C is consistent with the RDS.

Infrastructure Capacity

5. **Water:** Maungakaramea village is currently reticulated for water, but the system is reasonably limited. In terms of future water infrastructure requirements, it is unlikely that the projected rates of growth would warrant further water treatment over the next 40-45 years. However, should the growth rates increase faster than projected, then there would be a need for a water treatment plant. A 500m³ reservoir and water treatment plant upgrade could be required at an estimated cost of $1 million.

6. **Wastewater:** Council does not currently have a reticulated wastewater network at Maungakaramea. In order to meet anticipated population growth, some wastewater infrastructure would be required, although this is not likely to happen until around 2050. These required works include the installation of new trunk sewers, some reticulation upgrades and probably some new wastewater treatment plant capacity. Estimated cost of providing reticulation and treatment is $17 million.

7. **Stormwater:** Council has some stormwater assets within Maungakaramea village but no network. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their
development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of
new stormwater infrastructure.

8. Given the large costs associated with infrastructure provision in Maungakaramea village, it is
considered appropriate to defer further zoning of residential land until reticulated wastewater
services are available.

Natural Hazard Risks


Productive Land

10. There are significant areas of highly productive farmland (i.e. class I – III soils) in the area which
have been facing increased pressure from lifestyle development in recent years. As the population
grows, the land occupied by residential and lifestyle activities will grow, likely at the expense of
pastoral land, but potentially also on highly productive land. If this highly versatile and productive
land resource is not protected from residential and rural residential development this valuable
resource will be lost within a relatively short space of time. Therefore, sporadic residential and rural
residential development needs to be carefully managed if this resource is to be retained for future
productive use.

Existing Land Uses

11. Within Maungakaramea village Lots 1 and 2 DP 150947 and Lot 1 DP 88378 have been developed
at a residential scale but are zoned as CE. Additionally, Lot 2 DP 466811 and Lot 1 DP 165216 are
currently split-zoned as CE and Living 1 Environment. It is considered appropriate to rezone these
sites to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern, as they are considered
too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the stage 1
RVE zoning criteria.

12. With regard to Lot 1 DP 142820 the site is currently used for the Stonehaven Retirement Village.
While it is over 4,000m² in area, the density of development is greater than 1 RU per 1,000m² and
therefore is considered appropriate for residential zoning as it meets the stage 1 RVE zoning
criteria. The property to the north, Lot 1 DP 452791, contains the wastewater disposal field for the
retirement village and is approximately 2.0889ha in area. The site represents a unique
circumstance, as there is a shortage or rural retirement land available within the district, and is
therefore considered appropriate for rezoning to proposed RVRE to enable the expansion of the
existing retirement village.

13. The CE sites adjacent to the existing Living 1 Environment are not considered suitable for rezoning
at this time primarily due to the fact that they are larger than the maximum lot size, comprise high
class soils or comprise large areas of native vegetation and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE
zoning criteria.

Feedback
14. No written feedback has been received during pre-notification consultation. Council has discussed PC85C with Maungakaramea village residents and no major concerns were raised.

**Conclusion**

15. The proposed location of the RVRE boundaries for Maungakaramea village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living Environment to proposed RVRE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially. It is considered appropriate to defer further residential expansion until a SP is prepared for the area and reticulated wastewater services are available.
Appendix 9: Maungatapere – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Maungatapere village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2047 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2031 due to biophysical constraints).

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 18 residential lots over the next 12 years. However, additional capacity is provided through:
   - Over 5ha of relatively hazard free land that is currently zoned as Living 3 Environment and is undeveloped. This area is proposed to be rezoned to RVRE which will provide for minimum lot sizes of 2,000m$^2$ where unserviced. Using the 30/50 average Living Environment lot size of 0.1ha, 5ha would provide approximately 50 additional lots.
   - PC85C proposes to create an additional 6 residential lots by rezoning sites meeting the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria from CE to proposed RVRE.

3. Therefore, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion.

4. With regard to the estimated increase in employees working in the village, the existing Business zoned land is considered sufficient to meet the projected demand within Maungatapere village.

Structure Plan

5. No SP has been developed for Maungatapere village. 30/50 states that it is essential that a SP is produced for Maungatapere and that the SP identifies sufficient land for future residential, mixed use and rural residential development over a 20/30 year period based upon growth projections.

6. In 2009 a private plan change (PC66) rezoned 5.43ha of CE to Living 3 Environment, increasing the residential capacity of the village.

Rural Development Strategy

7. The RDS seeks to consolidate residential, commercial and lifestyle development within Maungatapere village. PC85C is consistent with the RDS.

Infrastructure Capacity

8. **Water:** Maungatapere village is currently reticulated for water with the main source of water being Poroti. The limiting factor in Maungatapere village is local reticulation from the main water pipelines. At present, there is no further water infrastructure required to meet the demands of anticipated growth.

9. **Wastewater:** Council does not currently have a reticulated wastewater network at Maungatapere. In order to meet future population growth it is estimated that wastewater infrastructure will need to be provided. This includes the installation of new trunk sewers, reticulation upgrades and new
wastewater treatment plant capacity. The estimated cost of providing reticulation and treatment is $28 million; however, it is unlikely that these works will be required until at least 2041.

10. **Stormwater:** Within Maungatapere village, Council has some stormwater assets but no network. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

11. Given the large costs associated with infrastructure provision in Maungatapere village, it is considered appropriate to somewhat restrict further zoning of residential land until reticulated wastewater services are available.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

12. Few natural hazard constraints exist within Maungatapere village.

**Productive Land**

13. There are significant areas of highly productive farmland (i.e. class II & III soils) in the area which have been facing increased pressure from lifestyle development in recent years. As the population grows, the land occupied by residential and lifestyle activities will grow, likely at the expense of pastoral land, but potentially also on highly productive land. If this highly versatile and productive land resource is not protected from residential and rural residential development this valuable resource will be lost within a relatively short space of time. Therefore, sporadic residential and rural residential development needs to be carefully managed if this resource is to be retained for future productive use.

**Existing Land Uses**

14. Within Maungatapere village several sites have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CE. Additionally, Lot 1 DP 194285 is currently *split-zoned* as CE and Living 1 Environments. It is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to RVRE due to their current use and development pattern, as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVRE zoning criteria.

15. Lot 1 DP 188549 is currently zoned as CE but is being used for industrial purposes. It is not considered appropriate to rezone this site as it comprises Land Use Capability Class 2 soils. It is considered prudent to retain the land for production purposes so as to not compromise the potential future productive use. It is noted that the current land use may continue with existing use rights.

**Feedback**

16. During pre-notification consultation, comments were received requesting that additional residential opportunities be provided for within Maungatapere village to encourage growth within the village.
17. No residential or commercial expansion is identified as being necessary based on projected growth. The land adjacent to the proposed RVE boundaries either comprises Land Use Capability Class 2 and 3 soils or is currently being used as an orchard. It is therefore not considered appropriate to rezone these areas to proposed RVE at this time as that may compromise the production potential of the land.

Conclusion

18. The proposed location of the RVRE and RVCE boundaries for Maungatapere village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development should further infrastructure be provided in the future. The proposed rezoning of the current Living and Business Environments to proposed RVRE and RVCE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially. It is considered appropriate to defer further residential and/or commercial expansion until a SP is prepared for the area and reticulated wastewater services are available.
Appendix 10: Matapouri – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Matapouri village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2199 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2099 due to biophysical constraints). Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 2 residential lots over the next 12 years. On balance it is considered that there is not an identified need for residential expansion as 30/50 determined that there is sufficient residential land supply to meet the projected demand until approximately 2099 under the constrained scenario.

2. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion of Matapouri village.

Structure Plan

3. Council adopted the Matapouri – Woolleys Bay SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:
   - Limited residential expansion by rezoning approximately 4.6ha of CCE to Living 1 Environment.
   - Provision of new Business 3 Environment over a 2.7ha area currently zoned as Living 1 Environment to accommodate a potential future outdoor recreation centre and a potential future community centre.

4. Given the population projections and available capacity, there is not considered to be an identified need to provide for residential expansion over the next 12 years. The minimal residential expansion proposed under PC85C is based on the existing patterns of development and the fact that the sites proposed to be rezoned for residential purposes are relatively small in size and are therefore more suitable for residential use than rural-residential use. Therefore, the potential residential expansion identified under the SP has been largely excluded from PC85C.

5. With regard to the potential new Business 3 Environment for a recreation and/or education centre, population projections suggest that there will be little demand for Business zoned land over the medium term. The proposed RVRE is considered appropriate for a potential recreation and/or education centre as it will provide for these uses as discretionary activities and, is considered more suitable than a Business zoning that may allow for commercial or light industrial activities which may not be necessary or appropriate within Matapouri village. Therefore, the potential Business 3 Environment identified under the SP has been excluded from PC85C.

6. The proposed rezoning of the current spatial alignment by replacing the current Living Environments with RVRE and by providing for minimal residential expansion is considered appropriate to meet the projected future demands, and will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will provide for consolidated residential development on suitable land.
Coastal Management Strategy

7. Within the Sandy Bay – Tutukaka Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:
   • Acknowledging existing and ongoing growth and development and directing this growth to retain character and sense of place;
   • Clustering and maintaining the diversity of settlements and retaining areas of bush between settlements.
   • Clustering a commercial centre in the Tutukaka Basin at an appropriate scale and sympathetic form and design to the surrounding environment;

8. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by clustering and accommodating growth in a manner which sustains the environment and retains the character of the area, and by limiting commercial growth within Matapouri village and instead focusing it in Tutukaka village.

Infrastructure Capacity

9. Water: Matapouri village is not currently reticulated. Should future development warrant a reconsideration of this approach, there are several water assets that would be required to be built at an estimated cost of $4 million. The LTP notes that there does not appear to be community support or demand for public water provision in this area.

10. Wastewater: Council does not currently have a reticulated wastewater network at Matapouri. To meet the requirements of the projected population growth, wastewater assets would need to be developed. 30/50 estimates the cost of providing reticulation and treatment is $54 million. Given the growth projections of the village, it is considered unlikely that a wastewater system would be cost effective for at least 25 years.

11. Stormwater: Council has a limited stormwater network in Matapouri village consisting primarily of open drains. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

12. Given the large costs associated with infrastructure provision in Matapouri village and the limited demand, it is considered appropriate to consolidate residential development and defer further residential expansion until reticulated wastewater services are available.

Natural Hazard Risks

13. Matapouri village is hemmed in by areas categorised as having high risk of land instability and flood susceptibility. These constraints mean that prospects for future expansion are constrained as most of the land adjacent to the existing Living 1 Environment is identified as being hazard prone. Substantial expansion of the Living 1 Environment would likely require a significant level of effort to
attenuate hazards. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

**Existing Land Uses**

14. Within Matapouri village many sites have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CCE. Additionally, several sites are currently *split-zoned* as CCE and Living 1 Environments. It is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to RVRE due to their current use and development pattern, as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

15. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CCE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time. This is primarily because the sites are larger than the maximum lot size and/or comprise large areas of vegetation or flood susceptible land and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

**Feedback**

16. No pre-notification consultation feedback has been received regarding rezoning within Matapouri village.

**Conclusion**

17. The proposed location of the RVRE boundary for Matapouri village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development should further infrastructure be provided in the future. The proposed rezoning of the current Living 1 Environment to proposed RVRE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially and for the more efficient use of *split-zoned* sites. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards and infrastructure limitations.
Appendix 11: McLeod Bay/Reotahi – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within McLeod Bay/Reotahi village 30/50 determined that that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2145 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2048 due to biophysical constraints).

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be a shortage of 24 residential lots over the next 12 years. There is however over 25ha of land zoned as Living 1 or 3 Environment which is largely undeveloped. This land is proposed to be rezoned to proposed RVRE based on the RVE Stage 1 zoning criteria. The proposed RVRE will provide for minimum lot sizes of 500m² where serviced and 2,000m² where unserviced. Based on the minimum 2,000m² lot size, 25ha would provide over 100 additional residential lots. Therefore, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion of McLeod Bay/Reotahi village.

3. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion of McLeod Bay/Reotahi village.

Structure Plan

4. Council prepared the McLeod Bay/Reotahi SP in 2003 which was partially implemented in 2009 through PC70. This plan change extended the Living 1 and 3 Environments, created a new Open Space Environment area and a new Business 3 Environment area. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate to allocate future residential growth areas at this time as was addressed in PC70 and there remains sufficient residential land within the village.

Coastal Management Strategy

5. The CMS identifies the Ocean Beach and Whangarei Heads Policy Area as including the McLeod Bay/Reotahi village. Within the Ocean Beach and Whangarei Heads Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:
   - Maintaining and promoting the small communities as individual destinations rather than linking them along the coastal road.
   - Promoting development that ‘fits in’ with the natural and heritage landmarks.
   - Maintaining and protecting the right to farm and recognising its contribution to the area’s heritage.
   - Promoting self-contained communities with opportunities for education, employment and for people to provide for their social and economic well-being.

6. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by clustering development in a manner which protects the natural and heritage values of the village while retaining the current spatial extent of production land. Little Business zoned land is projected to be required in the
McLeod Bay/Reotahi village. The proposed zoning will however provide for non-residential activities. It is however noted that within the wider area, the potential availability of Business zoned land at Parua Bay village will likely meet most future business demands for Whangarei Heads.

Infrastructure Capacity

7. **Water**: McLeod Bay/Reotahi village is reticulated for water provision. To meet future demands of the projected population growth within the village it is anticipated that there will be a need to expand the existing water storage at McLeod Bay, as well as local reticulation upgrades. This is estimated to cost in the region of $0.80 million and may be required by 2026. It is anticipated that development contributions will cover the costs for upgrades.

8. **Wastewater**: McLeod Bay/Reotahi village is reticulated as part of the Whangarei Heads Sewer Scheme. It is anticipated that further upgrades to the wastewater system may be necessary by 2026 to meet the projected population growth within the village. Such work would require reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers, and a small increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant or new plant. The estimated cost for these works is $6.4 million. It is anticipated that development contributions will cover the costs for upgrades. However, if some lots are larger than 2,000m² and soakage is adequate then individual onsite wastewater treatment and disposal systems may prove acceptable with a subsequent reduction in the cost and need for Council asset upgrades.

9. **Stormwater**: The limited stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies, a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. This generally results in little impact to the existing Council stormwater network. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

10. **Given the level of existing infrastructure in McLeod Bay/Reotahi village, it is considered appropriate to consolidate residential development in close proximity to the existing infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing water supply and wastewater network.**

Natural Hazard Risks

11. A very small portion of the village is flood susceptible with about 6ha (1% of total area) primarily in the vicinity of the small streams that flow into the harbour. About 18% of the area is at high risk of land instability (146ha), especially on the steeper slopes, and 23% of the area is regarded as erosion prone (about 186ha), mainly behind the main built up areas. These constraints somewhat limit potential residential expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living Environments is identified as being hazard prone. Substantial expansion of the Living Environments would therefore likely require a degree of effort to attenuate hazards. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.
Existing Land Uses

12. Within McLeod Bay/Reotahi village Lot 1 DP 58704 has been developed at a residential scale but is zoned as CCE. Additionally, Lot 1 DP 439071 is currently split-zoned as CCE and Living 1 Environment. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern, as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

13. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CCE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time. This is primarily because the sites are larger than the maximum lot size and/or comprise large areas of vegetation and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

Feedback

14. No pre-notification consultation feedback has been received regarding rezoning within McLeod Bay/Reotahi village.

Conclusion

15. The proposed location of the RVRE and RVCE for McLeod Bay/Reotahi village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living and Business Environments to proposed RVRE and RVCE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites which are currently being used at a residential scale and meet the proposed RVRE criteria. The proposed zone boundaries have taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is somewhat constrained by natural hazards surrounding the village.
Appendix 12: Ngunguru – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Ngunguru village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2135 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2036 due to biophysical constraints).

2. The WDGM estimates that there are approximately 65 vacant residential properties as at January 2016. On 30 May 2016 a site visit was taken to Ngunguru to review the identified vacant sites within the village. It was confirmed that the WDGM vacant site calculation has misidentified some sites due to recent occurrences such as new builds or new subdivisions. The number of identified vacant sites was considered to be approximately 10% too high. Therefore, the 65 vacant properties has been reduced by 10% and this assumption was applied to the vacant property estimates within the district’s other rural villages.

3. The WDGM estimates that an additional 32 residential dwellings will be required by 2028 (both occupied dwellings and holiday homes). Based on these estimates and the number of vacant lots there is a projected oversupply of 26 residential lots over the next 12 years, even without taking into account the potential development capacity of the village due to the potential for further subdivision.

4. Given the above, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion of Ngunguru village.

5. Based on the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion in Ngunguru village.

Structure Plan

6. Council adopted the Ngunguru SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:

   • Limited residential expansion by rezoning approximately 1.1ha of CE and approximately 0.7ha of CCE to Living 1 Environment.

   • Proposed extension to the existing Business 3 Environment over a 2ha area within Lot 1 DP 90198 which is currently zoned as Open Space Environment.

   • Provision of new Business 2 Environment over a 5ha area currently zoned as CE.

7. Given the population projections and available capacity, there is currently not considered to be an identified need to zone more residential land in Ngunguru village in the medium term. Therefore, the potential residential expansion identified under the SP has been excluded based on the RVRE zoning criteria.
8. The SP potential expansion areas are also identified as being at high risk of instability and flood susceptible, and as Māori land. Therefore the land may not be suitable for residential development at this time due to hazards and is considered unlikely to be subdivided for residential development.

9. Population projections suggest that there will be little demand for Business zoned land over the medium term. The proposed RVRE will allow for appropriate commercial activities and is more suitable than a Business zoning that may allow for commercial or rural centre service activities beyond what is needed. Therefore, the proposed Business 2 and 3 Environments under the SP have been excluded.

10. The existing hardware store within Pt Tuateanui 2A and the existing Ngunguru Substation within Pt Tuateanui No 1 will be able to continue to operate with existing use rights and under designation. Rezoning these sites for industrial purposes is not considered appropriate due to their distance from Ngunguru village and the low demand for industrial land in the area.

11. The proposed zoning will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will protect the character and environmental values of the area and will cluster residential and appropriate commercial development, rather than allowing sprawl or ‘ribbon’ development connecting villages.

Coastal Management Strategy

12. Under the CMS the Ngunguru Policy Area is described as extending from the Ngunguru River to Kumi Point. Within the Ngunguru Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:
   - Providing for growth and development where this does not adversely impact on sense of place or the significant natural values of the waterways.
   - Maintaining opportunity for rural activities and rural lifestyle surrounding the area.
   - Providing for activities that support the lifestyle of the Ngunguru settlement, including managed development of commercial services to support the permanent population.

13. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by clustering and accommodating growth in a manner which sustains the environment and retains the sense of place of the area. Additionally, PC85C will retain opportunities for rural activities and will allow for appropriate commercial development.

Infrastructure Capacity

14. **Water:** Ngunguru village is not reticulated for water. The cost to reticulate Ngunguru is estimated at around $10 million. Based on the existing level of growth, and the lack of demand from the Ngunguru community, it is anticipated that no reticulated water services are required for Ngunguru village at present. The LTP states that there does not appear to be community support or demand for public water provision in this area.

15. **Wastewater:** Ngunguru village is reticulated for wastewater disposal through to the Ngunguru Wastewater Treatment Plant. Anticipated growth levels indicate that future wastewater works are
required, including reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers and an increase in capacity of the existing treatment plant or a new plant. However, these works are not projected to be required until at least 2036. In total the estimated cost for these works is $6 million.

16. **Stormwater**: The stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. Future developments are expected to undertake on-site attenuation and upgrades to the network. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

17. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Ngunguru village, it is considered appropriate to consolidate residential development in close proximity to the infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing wastewater network.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

18. A very small portion of the village is flood susceptible with about 146ha (8% of total area) mainly close to Waiotoi Creek but also around Tongatu Road and other parts of the village near the water. Small portions of the village are classified as having high risk of land instability (90ha or 5%) or are erosion prone (91ha or 5%), mainly in the hills behind the main settlement and near Matapouri Road. These constraints somewhat limit potential residential expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living Environments is identified as being hazard prone. Substantial expansion of the Living Environments may therefore require a degree of effort to attenuate hazards. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

**Existing Land Uses**

19. The existing hardware store within Pt Tuateanui 2A and the existing Ngunguru Substation within Pt Tuateanui No 1 are currently zoned as CE. Rezoning these sites for industrial purposes (as identified under the SP) is not considered appropriate due to their distance from the main Ngunguru settlement and the low demand for industrial land in the area. These activities can continue to operate with existing use rights and under designation.

20. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CE or CCE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time. This is primarily due to the fact that the sites are larger than the maximum lot size, are used for Māori reservation purposes, are identified as unstable land or flood susceptible and/or comprise large areas of vegetation and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

**Feedback**

21. During pre-notification consultation, comment was received requesting that a portion of Lot 14 DP 374000 (the site) be rezoned to RVRE. The site was subject of a private plan change (PC65) to enable a maximum of 24 lots with proposed visual, flooding and stormwater mitigation. PC65 was declined by the Environment Court in 2012. It is noted that since then the RPS ‘coastal
environment’ boundaries have been adjusted and the site is no longer considered to be within the ‘coastal environment’. This change in circumstances means that the option of rezoning the site should be reconsidered. A site visit was undertaken on 29 January 2016 to investigate the suitability of the site for residential development.

22. There is not considered to be an identified need for further residential capacity to meet the projected population growth. Therefore, the site does not qualify for stage 2 of the RVE zoning.

23. As the site comprises some 6.6472 ha in area and is zoned CCE it is excluded from stage 1 of the RVE zoning. Furthermore, the site is not considered appropriate for rezoning to proposed RVRE as it contains a flood susceptible area and LUC Class 3 soils and is located outside of the strong urban boundary identified under the Ngunguru SP.

24. The Environment Court determined that rezoning the site for residential development may result in a fundamental change in the character of the area with a built dominance that would diminish the landscape values of the area and would allow for urban creep into the elevated land potentially resulting in a sprawling pattern of development. It is considered that those issues remain.

25. One option is to reduce the area of land to be rezoned to the low-lying area in the south-western portion of the site. This would result in an area of approximately 1ha being rezoned to proposed RVRE and would reduce the potential adverse effects described above. This would yield approximately 10-15 new residential sites. The potential benefits of minimally increasing the capacity of Ngunguru village in this location are not considered to outweigh the potential costs, especially as there is no identified need for residential expansion.

26. As discussed in Part 1 of the s32 evaluation report, Council has been systematically removing scheduled activities from the WDP and avoiding new ones. As such, if a site is not considered suitable to be developed to the density and built form envisaged by a zone without adverse effects requiring more stringent controls, it is not considered appropriate to rezone the site. A resource consent is considered to be a better mechanism to assess and control those effects.

27. There is currently not considered to be an identified need to zone more residential land in Ngunguru village based on the existing vacant properties and development potential of the village and projected population growth. This site and the surrounding CCE are therefore not considered appropriate for rezoning as RVE at this time.

Conclusion

28. The proposed location of the RVRE and RVCE boundaries for Ngunguru village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living Environments to RVRE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The potential residential expansion identified under the SP has been excluded based on the existing capacity and the RVRE zoning criteria. The potential Business Environments identified under the SP are not considered necessary based on the minimal projected growth in employees in Ngunguru village.
Appendix 13: Oakura – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Oakura Village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2112 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2019 due to biophysical constraints). While Oakura is not identified as a growth node under 30/50, the future population is also partially based on a target needed to meet the 30/50 preferred settlement pattern. The high population figures based on a target instead of a projection is taken into account when considering the likelihood that the residential development capacity will be exhausted by the 30/50 constrained scenario projection.

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM it is estimated that there will be an oversupply of 9 residential lots over the next 12 years.

3. Given the above, there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion.

4. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion of Oakura village.

Structure Plan

5. Council adopted the Oakura SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:

   - Limited residential expansion by rezoning approximately 1.7ha of CE to Living 1 Environment.
   - Provision of approximately 10ha of new Living 3 Environment over land currently zoned as CCE and CE.

6. Given the population projections and available capacity, there is currently not considered to be an identified need to zone more residential land. Therefore, the potential residential expansion identified under the SP has been partially excluded. The minimal proposed residential expansion will allow for more efficient use of split-zoned sites and sites developed at a residential scale while also slightly increasing the capacity of the village.

7. The proposed rezoning of the existing Living 1 Environment to proposed RVE and the proposed minimal residential expansion is considered appropriate to meet the projected future demands and will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will provide for consolidated residential development on suitable land.

Coastal Management Strategy

8. The CMS identifies the Bland Bay - Mimiwhangata Policy Area as including Oakura village. Within the Bland Bay - Mimiwhangata Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

   - Maintaining and ‘rounding off’ the existing settlements;
• Limiting growth in areas of high natural value;
• Managing opportunities for people in the settlements to provide for their economic and social well-being through controlled and managed growth and development.

9. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by clustering and managing growth in a manner which sustains the environment and by allowing for appropriate economic opportunities.

Infrastructure Capacity

10. **Water**: Oakura villages is not currently reticulated for water. To meet future population demands, it is anticipated that some water infrastructure works are required. The cost to reticulate Oakura is estimated at $10 million. The LTP notes that there does not appear to be community support or demand for public water provision in this area.

11. **Wastewater**: Oakura village has a wastewater treatment plant which has recently been upgraded. The extent of wastewater reticulation is limited to the main settlement area. Reticulation is sufficient to service existing demand and will require renewal/rehabilitation, as necessary, over the next 50 years. No additional upgrades or installation works are likely to be required over at least the next 20 years.

12. **Stormwater**: The stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

13. Given the level of existing wastewater infrastructure in Oakura village, it is appropriate to consolidate residential development in close proximity to the infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing wastewater network.

Natural Hazard Risks

14. Coastal hazards are an important consideration in Oakura village, especially near the sandy beaches, and also alongside streams running into the bays. Coastal hazards include coastal erosion and coastal inundation processes. In terms of climate change effect, increased risk of landslides near the main transport routes to and from Oakura village, and increased risk of flooding and coastal erosion are of concern. With many properties located in flood susceptible areas and close to beach frontages, any residential expansion must consider these constraints. Therefore, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

Existing Land Uses

15. Within Oakura village several sites have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CE and CCE. Additionally, several sites are currently *split-zoned* as CE and Living 1 Environments. It
is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on Stage 1 of the RVE zoning criteria.

16. Lots 1-3 DP 369518 and Ohawini A2 are currently zoned CCE and are located to the north of the existing settlement. While these sites are all less than 1,000m$^2$ in area and are adjacent to an existing Living Environment, it is not considered appropriate to rezone them to proposed RVRE due to the limited servicing (wastewater, roading) and flood hazards within the sites. The sites do not meet Stage 1 of the RVE zoning criteria as there is no access to a formed road. Additionally, no further residential zoning is considered necessary at this point to meet the projected population growth over the next 10+ years. Therefore these sites are not proposed to be rezoned to proposed RVRE under PC85C.

Feedback

17. During pre-notification consultation, comment was received requesting that Lots 1 – 4 DP 428866 be rezoned to proposed RVRE. Lots 1 – 4 DP 428866 comprise a total area of approximately 62.5ha and are located to the south of the Oakura residential settlement. The lots are not adjacent to an existing Living Environment or proposed RVRE and are over 5,250m$^2$ in area, and therefore do not meet the RVRE rezoning criteria. There is no evidence suggesting that the lots need to be rezoned to proposed RVRE to meet projected residential demand. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate to rezone the lots to proposed RVRE as this will lead to sprawling development in a manner which is inconsistent with the Oakura SP and the CMS.

Conclusion

18. The proposed location of the RVRE boundary for Oakura village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate future development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living Environment to proposed RVRE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for more efficient use of split-zoned sites and sites that are developed at a residential scale. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards.
Appendix 14: Pataua – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Pataua village 30/50 determined that there is capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2043; however, under the constrained scenario it was estimated that the residential land supply could shortfall by 2012.

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be an oversupply of 6 residential lots over the next 12 years. Additional capacity is provided through:
   - An approved 32 lot subdivision within Lot 38 DP 438160
   - Over 4ha of land that is currently zoned as Living 1 Environment and is undeveloped. This land is proposed to be rezoned to RVRE which will provide for minimum lot sizes of 2,000m² where unserviced, resulting in an additional 20 residential lots.

3. Therefore, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion in Pataua village.

4. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion of Pataua village.

Structure Plan

5. Council adopted the Pataua SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:
   - Residential expansion by rezoning over 11ha of CE and approximately 0.7ha of CCE to Living 1 Environment.
   - Provision of over 20ha of new Living 3 Environment over land currently zoned as CCE and CE.

6. Over the next 12 years, the WDGM it is estimates that approximately an additional 10 residential dwellings (including permanently occupied dwellings and holiday homes) will be required within Pataua village to accommodate projected population growth. As at January 2016 there were approximately 16 vacant Living 1 properties. Therefore, it is estimated that there will be an oversupply of approximately 6 dwellings.

7. Within Patau North a 32 lot residential subdivision has recently been approved which will create 32 new vacant properties. Within Pataua South there is currently approximately 2.6ha of residually zoned land within Pt Pukahakaha East 5C. The land is Māori owned and is located within a flood plain and potentially might not be developed within the next 12 years due to these constraints. However, this area is proposed to be rezoned to RVRE as it is currently zoned Living 1 Environment and therefore presents additional residential capacity.

8. The potential residential expansion identified in the SP that is excluded from the proposed residential expansion under PC85C is considered unsuitable for development due susceptibility to flooding. Under the SP these areas are identified as suitable for development only once elevated
above the flood plain. These areas are not elevated above the flood plain and are therefore not considered suitable for residential development.

9. The proposed zoning under PC85C is considered appropriate to meet the projected future demand and will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will provide for clustered residential development on suitable land while protecting the surrounding natural character of the area. Based on the projected growth and the development capacity of the village there is no identified need for residential expansion at this time.

Coastal Management Strategy

10. The CMS identifies the Horahora to Awahoa Bay Policy Area as including Pataua village. Within the Horahora to Awahoa Bay Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

- Maintaining the diverse and important lifestyles, cultures and land uses of the area through managing and controlling growth.
- Ensuring any growth and development does not adversely impact on sense of place or the significant natural values of the there rivers / estuaries.
- Maintaining opportunity for rural activities and rural lifestyle surrounding the area.

11. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by managing growth in a manner which sustains the environment and protects the sense of place of the area and by retaining sufficient land for rural activities and rural lifestyle opportunities.

Infrastructure Capacity

12. Water: Pataua village is not currently reticulated for water. In order to meet the long term projected growth levels, several new water infrastructure works may be required. These include building the reticulation system to and within Pataua and a need to build a new reservoir. These works are estimated to cost $3.5 million. The LTP notes that there does not appear to be community support or demand for public water provision in this area, and it will not likely be required until at least 2056.

13. Wastewater: Council does not currently have any wastewater network at Pataua. In order to meet future population growth it is expected that upgrades and extensions to the wastewater system will be required. Anticipated works include reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers that connect to the Whangarei Heads Scheme, and an increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant. An estimated cost for providing reticulation and treatment is $11 million based on connection to the Whangarei Heads Scheme; however, it is estimated that these works will not be required until at least 2051. Alternately, if zoning is such that minimum section sizes are restricted to 2,000m², the current practice of individual onsite wastewater treatment and disposal systems may prove acceptable.

14. Stormwater: Council has some stormwater assets but no network within Pataua village. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a
continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

15. Given that the 30/50 projected permanent population for the village is around 843 in 2041 and 1,001 by 2061, it is unlikely that a reticulated system for water and wastewater would be cost effective for at least 30 years. Future development will therefore need to rely upon on-site solutions for the medium term. Given the effluent suitability of the soils where land is not flood prone, unserviced lots are generally suitable.

Natural Hazard Risks

16. Coastal hazards are an important consideration in Pataua village, especially along the coast, but also in Pataua South beside the estuary. Coastal hazards can include coastal erosion and coastal inundation processes. In terms of climate change effect, the main consideration for the area is potential sea level rise and whether this will have a significant impact on coastal erosion or inundation. Changes in beach morphology and potential increased risk of land slippage near the main routes to and from Pataua village (especially the north side) are also concerns. It is likely that Council will continue to be involved in ongoing costs to address these risks. It is important not to add to these costs by allowing inappropriate location of residential development. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

Existing Land Uses

17. Lot 1 DP 56244 and Lot 2 DP 139256 are currently zoned as CE but are being used at more of a residential scale. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to proposed RVRE due to their current use as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning as they meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

18. Lot 1 DP 139256 is also zoned as CE and is developed at a residential scale. However, as the entire site is identified as flood susceptible and the area of the site is greater than 2,000m² it does not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

Scheduled Activities 11/1, 11/2, 11/3 and 11/4

19. As discussed in Part 1 of the s32 report Scheduled Activities Nos. 11/1 (S11/1), 11/2 (S11/2), 11/3 (S11/3) and 11/4 (S11/4) apply to Part Lot 1 DP 93517 (the site) within the Pataua village. The site comprises 44.0629ha and is split zoned in the WDP as Living 3 Environment and CCE. S11/1 applies to the Living 3 Environment portion and has been established as a camping ground, while S11/2 – S11/4 apply to the CCE portion and are vacant. S11/2 is also identified as Future Living 3 Environment.

20. The scheduled activities enable the creation of 65 sites as a controlled activity within S11/1 and S11/3 and a further 31 sites as a discretionary activity within S11/2. The scheduled activities are
generally more permissive than the underlying Environment provisions; however, there are extensive information requirements, vegetation protection requirements and slightly more restrictive building height limits.

21. The scheduled activities have been assessed in Part 1 of the s32 report to determine the most appropriate method of achieving the Rural Area objectives.

22. The following options have been evaluated:

Option 1: Status Quo – Keep the scheduled activities in the WDP and convert the underlying zone to the most similar proposed zones. Under this scenario S11/1 would be rezoned to proposed RVRE while S11/2 – 11/4 would be rezoned to proposed RPE, with the scheduled activities being retained.

Option 2: S11/1 RVRE – Remove the scheduled activities and convert the underlying zone to the most similar proposed zones. Under this scenario S11/1 would be rezoned to proposed RVRE while S11/2 – 11/4 would be rezoned to proposed RPE.

Option 3: S11/1 & S11/2 RVRE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone S11/1 and S11/2 to proposed RVRE and S11/3 and S11/4 to proposed RPE.

Option 4: S11/1 – S11/3 RVRE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone S11/1 – S11/3 to proposed RVRE and S11/4 to proposed RPE.

Option 5: RPE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone the entire site to proposed RPE.

Option 6: S11/1 Modified RVRE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone the underlying zone to the most similar proposed zones. Under this scenario S11/1 would be rezoned to proposed RVRE while S11/2 – 11/4 would be rezoned to proposed RPE. Additionally, site specific information requirements for S11/1 would be retained in the WDP.

Option 7: RLE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone the site to proposed RLE.

Option 8: RUEE – Remove the scheduled activities and rezone the site to proposed RUEE.

23. A more overview of the scheduled activities and evaluation of the options are included within Attachment 2 of Part 1 of the s32 report.

24. In conclusion, Options 5 and 6 are considered the most appropriate ways to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

25. Option 5 provides a high level of social, cultural and environmental benefits while potentially resulting in economic costs and a loss in economic growth and employment opportunities.

26. Option 6 presents similar costs and benefits but allows for residential development of S11/1 in a manner which mitigates adverse effects on natural character, natural features and natural landscapes and provides consolidated, managed growth for Pataua village.
27. Option 6 is considered the most appropriate. Accordingly S11/1 is proposed to be rezoned to proposed RVRE while S11/2 – S11/4 are proposed to be rezoned to RPE. In addition the following provision is proposed to be included in the proposed RVE Chapter:

**RVE.3.4 Information Requirement**

1. Any application for subdivision within Pt Lot 1 DP 93517 shall include a comprehensive visual and landscape assessment & design, prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architecture professional which shall be referred to Council's Parks and Landscape Officer for review. The assessment shall provide detail regarding the following matters over which control is reserved (in addition to RA.4):

   a. The location, height and appearance of future buildings and their potential effect on the amenity and landscape values of the locality.
   
   b. The visibility of future buildings from the marine environment.
   
   c. Effect of buildings on the appearance of skylines and ridgelines.
   
   d. Effect of access and buildings on known archaeological sites and tangata whenua cultural and heritage values.
   
   e. Location and finished appearance of accesses.
   
   f. The potential effect of subdivision patterns on the landscape values of the locality.
   
   g. Extent & nature of landscape planting proposed, and measures proposed to implement and maintain such plantings

**Feedback**

28. No pre-consultation feedback has been received regarding rezoning within Pataua village.

**Conclusion**

29. The proposed location of the RVRE boundary for Pataua village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living 1 Environment to proposed RVRE is considered appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially and for the more efficient use of split-zoned sites. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards and an absence of reticulated wastewater.
Appendix 15: Taurikura/Urquharts Bay – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2182 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2041 due to biophysical constraints).

2. Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be an oversupply of 23 residential lots over the next 12 years. There is also over 20ha of Living 1 and 3 Environment zoned land within Lot 1 DP 82407, Pt Lot 1 DP 187063, Lot 2 DP 211836 and Lot 1 DP 337999 that is largely undeveloped. This land is proposed to be zoned as proposed RVRE, which at a 2,000m² minimum unserviced lot size, would provide for 100 additional residential lots.

3. Therefore, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion in Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village.

4. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village.

Structure Plan

5. Council adopted the SP for Taurikura/Urquharts Bay in 2003. As a result of the SP in 2009 Plan Change 74 (PC74) rezoned approximately 1.5ha of CCE adjoining the Living 1 Environment at Urquharts Bay into Living 1 Environment; and extended the Living 3 Environment. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate to allocate future residential growth areas at this time as rezoning was addressed in PC74 and there remains sufficient residential land within the village.

Coastal Management Strategy

6. The CMS identifies the Ocean Beach and Whangarei Heads Policy Area as including Taurikura/Urquharts Bay. Within the Ocean Beach and Whangarei Heads Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

- Maintaining and promoting the small communities as individual destinations rather than linking them along the coastal road.
- Promoting development that ‘fits in’ with the natural and heritage landmarks.
- Maintaining and protecting the right to farm and recognising its contribution to the heritage of the area.
- Promoting self-contained communities with opportunities for education, employment and for people to provide for their social and economic well-being.

7. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by accommodating growth in a manner which retains the small community character of the area and protects the environmental values of the village. Little Business zoned land is projected to be required in Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village and the SP did not recommend any Business rezoning. The proposed RVRE provisions
will however provide for appropriate non-residential activities. Within the wider area, the potential availability of Business zoned land at Parua Bay village will likely meet most future business demands for Whangarei Heads.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

8. **Water**: Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village is currently reticulated for water provision. To meet future population demands in terms of water, it is anticipated that an upgrade of the reticulation system will be required along with the development of a water reservoir near Urquharts Bay. This is estimated to cost $0.6 million and is not estimated to be required until at least 2036.

9. **Wastewater**: Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village is reticulated as part of the Whangarei Heads Sewerage Scheme and is connected to the Whangarei Wastewater Treatment Plant on Kioreroa Road. To meet the demands of future population growth, reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers and an increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant or a new plant will be required for the wastewater system. This is estimated to cost $3.8 million and is not estimated to be required until at least 2036.

10. **Stormwater**: The stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. Future developments are expected to undertake on-site attenuation and upgrades to the network. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

11. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village, it is appropriate to consolidate residential development in close proximity to the existing infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing water supply and wastewater network.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

12. The largest natural hazard constraint in this location is erosion prone land. There is about 379ha affected, mainly in the hill slopes above Taurikura and Urquharts Bay (about 37% of the area). A small area of the village is flood susceptible, with about 124ha (12%) affected. About the same amount is classified as having a high risk of land instability 106ha (10%). These constraints somewhat limit potential residential expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living Environments is identified as being hazard prone. Substantial expansion of the Living Environments may therefore require a degree of effort to attenuate hazards. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

**Existing Land Uses**

13. Within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village Lot 1 DP 69177 and Lot 1 DP 158872 have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CCE. Additionally, Lots 3 and 4 DP 337999 are currently *split-zoned* as CCE and Living 1 Environments. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to RVRE due to their current use and development pattern as they are considered too small for
production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

14. There are also sites which are zoned as CCE but do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria as they are larger than the maximum lot size and/or comprise large areas of established vegetation. In particular Lot 1 DP 409640 comprises 2,001m² in area but is nearly 100% covered in vegetation (which is identified as Protected Natural Area) and therefore is not proposed to be rezoned to proposed RVRE.

Feedback

15. No pre-notification consultation feedback has been received regarding rezoning within Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village.

Conclusion

16. The proposed location of the RVRE boundary for Taurikura/Urquharts Bay village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development in the most suitable areas. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially and for the more efficient use of split-zoned sites. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards.
Appendix 16: Tutukaka – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Tutukaka village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2143 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2044 due to biophysical constraints). Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be an oversupply of 100 residential lots over the next 12 years. Therefore, there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion.

2. As there are currently a high number of employees working within the village and there are several commercial activities centrally located in the village, it is considered appropriate to provide Business zoning in accordance with the SP, existing uses and land suitability.

Structure Plan

3. Council adopted the Tutukaka SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:
   
   - Expansion of the existing Living 1 Environment near the marina, Pacific Bay and Whangaumu Bay.
   - Provision of new Business 3 Environment near the marina.

4. Given the population projections and available capacity, there is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion, and significant further zoning of residential land may exacerbate existing oversupply. Therefore, the potential residential expansion identified in the SP has been largely excluded. The minimal residential expansion proposed under PC85C is based on the existing patterns of development and the fact that the sites proposed to be rezoned for residential purposes are relatively small in size and are therefore more suitable for residential use than rural-residential use.

5. The potential Business Environment identified in the SP has been considered. The rezoning criteria for RVCE, where there is an identified need for commercial expansion, are contained within Appendix 2. A portion of the potential Business 3 Environment identified in the SP has been excluded from proposed RVCE rezoning as it does not satisfy the criteria due to the existing zoning, land uses, vegetation coverage, landscape sensitivity and land instability. Approximately 1.5ha of land, which is currently zoned as Living 1 and 3 Environments, is proposed to be rezoned to proposed RVCE.

Coastal Management Strategy

6. Within the Sandy Bay – Tutukaka Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

   - Acknowledging existing and ongoing growth and development and directing this growth to retain character and sense of place;
• Clustering and maintaining the diversity of settlements and retaining areas of bush between settlements.

• Clustering a commercial centre in the Tutukaka Basin at an appropriate scale and sympathetic form and design to the surrounding environment;

7. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by clustering and accommodating growth in a manner which sustains the environment and retains the character and sense of place of the area. The zoning will also provide for a commercial centre in the Tutukaka Basin.

Infrastructure Capacity

8. **Water:** Tutukaka village does not have a water reticulation scheme, and there doesn’t appear to be any desire within the local community for water reticulation in the short to medium term. However, should this view change and the community demand water services, reticulation of Tutukaka village would first require reticulation of Ngunguru village. To meet future population growth it is then anticipated that a trunk line connecting Ngunguru to Tutukaka, a water reservoir in the vicinity of Whangaumu/Wellingtons Bay and reticulation in Tutukaka village would be necessary. The estimated cost for these works is $3.2 million.

9. **Wastewater:** Tutukaka is reticulated to the Tutukaka Wastewater Treatment Plant. Reticulation is sufficient to service existing demand and will require renewal/rehabilitation as necessary. In order to meet the high-scenario future population growth under 30/50, it is anticipated that reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers and an increase in capacity of the existing wastewater treatment plant or new plant would be needed. The estimated cost for these works is $10.5 million and it is anticipated that these works will not be required for approximately 20 years at the current rate of growth.

10. **Stormwater:** The stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. Future developments are expected to undertake on-site attenuation and upgrades to the network. Under this approach, Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

11. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Tutukaka village, it is considered appropriate to consolidate residential and commercial development in close proximity to the existing infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing wastewater network.

Natural Hazard Risks

12. A very small portion of the village is flood susceptible with about 24ha (1.6% of total area) near the mouths of the small streams. About 24% of the area is at high risk of land instability, and 7% of the area is regarded as erosion prone. Most of this land is on the coastal headlands and on the hills above the main settlement. These hazards represent constraints for future growth within the area as substantial expansion of the Living Environments may require a degree of effort to attenuate hazards.

Existing Land Uses
13. Within Tutukaka Basin there are several commercial activities currently zoned as Living Environment. It is considered appropriate to rezone these sites to proposed RVCE to better reflect the concentration of commercial activities in the Tutukaka Basin area.

14. Within Tutukaka village many sites have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CE or CCE. It is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

15. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CE or CCE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time. This is primarily because the sites are larger than the maximum lot size, comprise large areas of established vegetation and/or are flood susceptible and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

Feedback

16. During pre-notification consultation, comment was received stating that land on Landowner’s Lane, which is currently zoned as CE, should be considered for rezoning to proposed RVRE as the land is not suitable for productive uses.

17. This land comprises an area of some 5.1ha and the smaller lots along Landowner’s Lane are not adjacent to an existing Living Environment or a proposed RVE, and therefore do not meet stage 1 of the RVE zoning criteria.

18. With regard to stage 2 of the RVE zoning criteria, it is projected that Tutukaka village will have a surplus of residential land by 2028. Additionally, the area is identified as coastal environment under the RPS, and therefore residential expansion in this area should be limited to minimise sprawl along the coast. The land is also largely outside the potential residential area identified in the SP and allowing for expansion outside of the potential residential area would be inconsistent with the SP. The land that is within the potential residential area identified in the SP is largely identified as being highly unstable and contains large areas of existing vegetation.

19. The land on Landowner’s Lane is therefore not considered suitable for proposed RVRE zoning at this time.

Conclusion

20. The proposed location of the RVRE boundaries for the Tutukaka village reflects existing patterns of development and landuses and aims to consolidate development in the most suitable locations. The proposed rezoning of the current Living Environment to proposed RVRE is considered appropriate based on projected population growth and existing capacity. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards, infrastructure limitations and the Coastal Area. The proposed RVCE locations are considered appropriate to recognise and more accurately zone the business activities in Tutukaka village.
Appendix 17: Waipu Cove/Langs Beach – Proposed RVE Rezoning

Capacity

1. Within Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village 30/50 determined that there is sufficient maximum capacity under the WDP zoning to meet residential demand until approximately 2106 (this could however be reduced to approximately 2052 due to biophysical constraints). Without taking into account additional subdivision potential, the WDGM estimates that there will be an oversupply of 95 residential lots over the next 12 years. Therefore, there is not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion.

2. Taking into account the minimal projected increase in employees there is currently not considered to be an identified need for commercial expansion in Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village.

3. It is also noted that the Patuharakeke Hapu Environmental Management Plan 2014 raises the concern that there is currently an oversupply of land available for development within the village, as shown by the excerpt below. This must be taken into account when considering residential expansion.

"PTB believe coastal subdivision in Ruakaka, One Tree Point, Waipu Cove and Langs Beach has reached saturation point. There is currently a massive oversupply of sections, yet the councils are actively supporting further growth and expansion of subdivisions through private plan change mechanisms and a permissive planning approach. There appears to be little regard for the concerns consistently raised by Patuharakeke through our responses to consent processes and submissions to such plans as the Marsden Point Ruakaka Structure plan and other planning and policy documents."

Structure Plan

4. Council adopted the Waipu Cove/Langs Beach SP in 2009. The main land use proposals for this area are as follows:

- Limited residential expansion by rezoning approximately 2.3ha of CE to Living 1 Environment.

- Provision of over 70ha of new Living 3 Environment over land currently zoned CCE and CE.

5. Given the population projections and available capacity, there is currently not considered to be an identified need to provide for residential expansion over the next 12 years. The minimal residential expansion proposed under PC85C is based on the existing patterns of development and the fact that the sites proposed to be rezoned for residential purposes are relatively small in size and are therefore considered more suitable for residential use instead of rural-residential use. Therefore, the potential residential expansion identified in the SP has been largely excluded.

6. The proposed maintaining of the current spatial alignment by replacing the current Living Environments with proposed RVRE and by providing for minimal residential expansion is
considered appropriate to meet the projected future demands and will generally be consistent with the vision of the SP as it will provide for consolidated residential development on suitable land.

**Coastal Management Strategy**

7. The CMS identifies the Uretiti to Bream Trail Policy Area as including the Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village. Within the Uretiti to Bream Trail Policy Area the following local vision statements have been considered relevant to PC85C:

- Recognising and providing for ongoing growth sensitive to those values that contribute to its ‘holiday’ sense of place and heritage.
- Encouraging development that maintains the ‘village’ character of Waipu, central to the heritage values and sense of place.

8. PC85C is consistent with the relevant provisions of the CMS by providing for and managing growth in a manner which retains the character and sense of place of the area.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

9. **Water**: Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village is reticulated for water provision. To meet the high-scenario future demands under 30/50, it is anticipated that an upgrade of the Ahuroa Water Treatment Plant, Cove Road reticulation and pumps and additional storage at Langs Beach Reservoir is required. This is estimated to cost approximately $3 million and it is estimated that the works will not be required for at least the next 10 years.

10. **Wastewater**: Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village is reticulated for wastewater. With the high-scenario anticipated population growth under 30/50, some wastewater works would be required to meet future demand. The works include reticulation upgrades and/or installation of new trunk sewers, and increasing capacity of existing wastewater treatment or new plant. The cost estimate for this is $20 million. The LTP estimates that some works will be required around 2020; however, under 30/50 a majority of the works are estimated to not be required until at least 2036.

11. **Stormwater**: The stormwater network is generally sufficient to service a 1 in 5 year rainfall event. In alignment with current best practice, future stormwater management is envisaged to be a continuation of current stormwater policies (through the EES). Under these policies, a developer is required to undertake onsite attenuation and treatment of stormwater generated by their development. This generally results in little impact to the existing Council stormwater network as Council does not itself undertake projects involving creation of new stormwater infrastructure.

12. Given the level of existing infrastructure in Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village, it is considered appropriate to consolidate residential development in close proximity to the infrastructure to efficiently utilise the existing water supply and wastewater networks.

**Natural Hazard Risks**

13. A very small portion of the village is flood susceptible with about 14ha (0.5% of total area) primarily in the vicinity of the small streams. A larger portion is classified as having high risk of land
instability, about 314ha or 12% of the village, primarily located in the hills surrounding the main settlements. About 204ha of the land is regarded as erosion prone, which represents around 8% of the area. These constraints somewhat limit potential residential expansion as some of the land adjacent to the existing Living Environments is identified as being hazard prone. Substantial expansion of the Living Environments may therefore require a degree of effort to attenuate hazards. Consequently, over the medium term it is considered that the best prospect for accommodating increased population is utilisation of current development capacity and existing vacant residential land.

Existing Land Uses

14. Within Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village many sites have been developed at a residential scale but are zoned as CE. Additionally, several sites are currently split-zoned as CCE or CE and Living Environments. It is considered appropriate to rezone these areas to proposed RVRE due to their current use and development pattern as they are considered too small for production purposes and are better suited for residential zoning based on the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

15. There are also some sites adjacent to the existing Living Environments which are zoned as CE or CCE but are not considered suitable for rezoning at this time. This is because the sites are larger than the maximum lot size and therefore do not meet the Stage 1 RVE zoning criteria.

Feedback

16. During pre-notification consultation, feedback was received requesting that the boundary of the proposed RVRE include more of the land proposed under the SP, particularly Lot 2 DP 193435, for residential expansion. There is currently not considered to be an identified need for residential expansion based on the capacity of the village and the projected population growth. The minimal residential expansion proposed under PC85C is based on the existing patterns of development and the fact that the sites proposed to be rezoned for residential purposes are currently used at a residential scale. Lot 2 DP 193435 and the surrounding CE are not considered appropriate for rezoning at this time as additional residential land is not necessary and the area does not meet the stage 1 or 2 criteria for the RVRE zoning. Furthermore, the land is at a higher elevation than the surrounding Living 1 and 3 Environments. Providing reticulated water supply to these higher areas can be problematic and may significantly increase servicing costs.

Conclusion

17. The proposed location of the RVRE boundary for Waipu Cove/Langs Beach village reflects existing patterns of development and uses and aims to consolidate development. The proposed rezoning of the current Living Environments to proposed RVRE is appropriate based on the projected population growth and existing capacity. The minimal residential expansion proposed will allow for appropriate zoning of sites currently being used residentially and for the more efficient use of split-zoned sites. The proposed RVRE boundary has taken into account the desire to retain the character and sense of place of the village as well as the fact that residential development within the village is constrained by natural hazards and infrastructure limitations.