

## Attachment 2: Section 32AA Evaluation

Recommended Amendment	Options Evaluated	Zone Criteria	S32AA Assessment
<p><u>46-56 Port Road (Port Road West)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rezone to COM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Option 1</b> – Notified zoning of locations WZ (Mixed use)</li> <li><b>Option 2</b> – Rezone to COM</li> <li><b>Option 3</b> – Rezone to Mixed Use with consequential amendments to MU.</li> </ul>	<p><b>WZ SD-28</b></p> <p><b>1. Adjacent to the Open Space Zone, Hatea River or Waiarohia Stream.</b> Agree – 46-56 Port Road is adjacent to operative Open Space and proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone.</p> <p><b>2. In proximity to the Hatea Loop Walkway.</b> Agree – Port Road West is near (across the road from) the Hatea Loop Walkway.</p> <p><b>3. That are well connected to convenient transport routes and major facilities.</b> Agree – Port Road West is connected to Port Road and close to (within easy walking distance of) Cobham Oval and Northland Events Centre.</p> <p><b>COM SD-P22</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a range of existing commercial business and small-scale industry. Agree - Port Road West has existing commercial, and business and industrial activities:</li> <li>Good transport access is available. Agree - Port Road West has access located in proximity to Port Road.</li> <li>The area is located within 1km of the City Centre Zone. Disagree - Port Road West is further than 1km from the CC. approx. 1.2-1.3km</li> <li>There is a low to moderate presence of active frontages at ground floor. Agree - existing activities operate in small to large</li> </ol>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic</u> Option 1 and 3 may incur additional consenting costs should landowners wish to extend or undertake new activities which require consent in the WZ.</p> <p>Options 2 is less likely to require consent for landowners who wish to extend or undertake new activities.</p> <p><u>Environmental</u> Option 1 and 3 have similar environmental costs and benefits, as identified in the s32 reports. These options have the greatest degree for environmental protection for the WZ.</p> <p>Option 2 provides a means to provide greater flexibility with respect to future uses. The protection isn't strong like in Option 1, or 3 however, and there is a small risk to the WZ due to possible incompatible land uses.</p> <p>Option 3 could undermine expected development within the MU, zone wide so that anticipated environmental outcomes may be compromised and may not be achieved across the MU.</p> <p><u>Social and Cultural</u> Option 1 none known. Option 2 carries a low risk of compromising the WZ. Options 3 has the potential to undermine the social and cultural benefits provided by the collective CC, MU, COM, WZ and SCZ package as notified.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p>

		<p>buildings with some active frontages and footpaths.</p> <p>5. There is a low presence of residential and retail activities. Agree - Port Road West does not have residential activities, and general retail is limited.</p> <p>6. The criteria for other business zones is not met. Disagree - Port Road West also meets the criteria for WZ.</p> <p><b>MU SD-P23</b></p> <p>1. <b><u>Are adjacent to the City Centre Zone.</u></b> Disagree – the sites are not adjacent to the CC.</p> <p>2. <b><u>Are adjacent or in proximity to key arterial transport routes or the Waterfront Zone.</u></b> Agree – Port Road West is adjacent to Port Road.</p> <p>3. <b><u>Have an existing presence of active frontages at ground floor.</u></b> Disagree – active frontages at the sites are minimal.</p> <p>4. <b><u>Have an existing level of amenity that is compatible with residential activities.</u></b> Disagree – residential amenity is poor at the sites and existing development is not compatible with residential activity</p>	<p>Options 1 and 2 are equally efficient, utilising existing zoning and provisions as proposed by Council.</p> <p>Options 3 is not considered effective because the degree of consequential amendments required means that the MU would no longer be fit for purpose at other locations and, as discussed in the s32 report, the WZ was created as a zone because using an overlay cannot adequately enable appropriate development in the WZ.</p> <p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Option 1 is most effective when the purpose, future uses and objectives for the WZ are considered.</p> <p>Options 2 is more effective when providing for existing uses is considered.</p> <p>Options 3 is not considered effective because the degree of consequential amendments required means that the MU would no longer be fit for purpose at other locations and, as discussed in the s32 report, the WZ was created as a zone because using an overlay cannot adequately enable appropriate development in the WZ.</p>
--	--	--	---

Recommended Amendment	Options Evaluated	Zone Criteria	S32AA Assessment
<p><u>117-133 Port Road (Port Road East)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain Waterfront Zone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Option 1</b> – Notified zoning of locations WZ (Mixed use)</li> <li><b>Option 2</b> – Rezone to COM</li> <li><b>Option 3</b> – Rezone to Mixed Use with consequential amendments to MU.</li> </ul>	<p><b>WZ SD-28</b>  <b>Adjacent to the Open Space Zone, Hatea River or Waiarohia Stream.</b>  Agree – 117-133 Port Road is adjacent to operative Open Space and proposed Sport and Active Recreation Zone.</p> <p><b>In proximity to the Hatea Loop Walkway.</b>  Agree – Port Road East is adjacent to the Hatea Loop Walkway.</p> <p><b>That are well connected to convenient transport routes and major facilities.</b>  Agree – Port Road East is connected to Port Road and close to (within easy walking distance of) Cobham Oval and Northland Events Centre.</p> <p><b>COM SD-P22</b>  <b>There is a range of existing commercial business and small-scale industry.</b>  Agree - Port Road East has existing commercial, and business and industrial activities:  <b>Good transport access is available.</b>  Agree - Port Road East has access located in proximity to Port Road.  <b>The area is located within 1km of the City Centre Zone.</b>  Disagree - Port Road East is further than 1km from the CC. approx. 1.1-1.4km  <b>There is a low to moderate presence of active frontages at ground floor.</b>  Agree - existing activities operate in small to large buildings with some active frontages and footpaths.  <b>There is a low presence of residential and retail activities.</b>  Agree - Port Road East does not have residential activities, and general retail is limited.</p>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b>  <u>Economic</u>  Option 1 and 3 may incur additional consenting costs should landowners wish to extend or undertake new activities which require consent in the WZ.</p> <p>Options 2 is less likely to require consent for landowners who wish to extend or undertake new activities.</p> <p><u>Environmental</u>  Option 1 and 3 have similar environmental costs and benefits, as identified in the s32 reports. These options have the greatest degree for environmental protection for the WZ.</p> <p>Option 2 provides a means to provide greater flexibility with respect to future uses. The protection isn't strong like in Option 1, or 3 There is a risk of adverse effect due to incompatible land uses.</p> <p>Option3 could undermine expected development within the MU, zone wide so that anticipated environmental outcomes may be compromised and may not be achieved across the MU.</p> <p><u>Social and Cultural</u>  Option 1 none known.  Option 2 risks the WZ and the social and cultural benefits of the zone by creating a 'hole in the WZ and enabling alternative uses which are not compatible.  Options 3 has the potential to undermine the social and cultural benefits provided by the collective CC, MU, COM, WZ and SCZ package as notified.</p> <p><b>Efficiency</b></p>

		<p><b>The criteria for other business zones is not met.</b> Disagree - Port Road East also meets the criteria for WZ.</p> <p><b>MU SD-P23</b> <b>Are adjacent to the City Centre Zone.</b> Disagree – the sites are not adjacent to the CC.</p> <p><b>Are adjacent or in proximity to key arterial transport routes or the Waterfront Zone.</b> Agree – Port Road East is adjacent to Port Road.</p> <p><b>Have an existing presence of active frontages at ground floor.</b> Disagree – active frontages at the sites are minimal.</p> <p><b>Have an existing level of amenity that is compatible with residential activities.</b> Disagree – residential amenity is poor at the sites and existing development is not compatible with residential activity</p>	<p>Options 1 and 2 are equally efficient, utilising existing zoning and provisions as proposed by Council.</p> <p>Options 3 is not considered effective because the degree of consequential amendments required means that the MU would no longer be fit for purpose at other locations and, as discussed in the s32 report, the WZ was created as a zone because using an overlay cannot adequately enable appropriate development in the WZ.</p> <p><b>Effectiveness</b> Option 1 is most effective when the purpose, future uses and objectives for the WZ are considered.</p> <p>Options 1 and 2 is equally effective when providing for existing uses is considered. Some existing uses within Port Road East already support culture tourism and recreation.</p> <p>Options 3 is not considered effective because the degree of consequential amendments required means that the MU would no longer be fit for purpose at other locations and, as discussed in the s32 report, the WZ was created as a zone because using an overlay cannot adequately enable appropriate development in the WZ.</p>
--	--	--	--