

Table No. 1

Section 32(3) Assessment of Plan Change 12 (an amending proposal)			
Proposed amendments to WDP (numbering as set out in Appendix 1 of PC12 application document)	Other reasonably practicable options	Efficiency and effectiveness of amending proposal	Reason for provision chosen
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add to Residential Zone Rule 2.4.2.4 (Setbacks) 2. Add to Residential Zone Rule 2.4.2.9 (Building Height) 3. Add to Residential Zone Rule 2.4.2.20 (Fencing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do nothing: The additional residential development standards proposed are required to provide a specific development outcome for future development on the site, as identified in the Landscape and Visual Assessment. The standards help to avoid and/or minimise adverse landscape and visual effects on surrounding properties and the locality, that have been identified for this site. Doing nothing (ie. relying only on existing rules in the WDP) will not achieve the necessary outcome for the site (avoid/minimise effects) and therefore this option is not suitable. - Building covenants: Building covenants on titles are an alternative method of specifying development standards. Compliance with land covenants is the responsibility of the land owner, the Council does not ensure compliance. As such, enforcement is 	<p>The benefits associated with these amendments are environmental. They will result in a built amenity which responds well to the existing surrounding environment.</p> <p>There are some minor economic costs associated with reduced development potential for some properties on the edge of the site.</p> <p>It is not considered the amendments proposed will result in any identifiable cultural or social costs or benefits.</p> <p>The chosen options are considered to the most efficient and effective way of achieving the desired outcomes.</p>	<p>The amendments chosen are consistent with the District Plan approach to applying development standards. It is inefficient to introduce a new separate resource consent rule for sites on the perimeters or require covenants to be registered on the titles.</p> <p>The environmental benefits outweigh any minor costs of reduced development potential.</p>

	<p>difficult and less effective than a rule in the District Plan. There is a high degree of public familiarity with development standards in district plans, compared to covenants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional resource consent processes: Another option would be to require resource consents on a case-by-case basis for properties around the perimeter of the site. This would be inefficient as it will add resource consent costs and time delays for those sites, as well as uncertainty of outcome. 		
<p>4. Add to Rule 15.4.2.69 (Structure Plan)</p> <p>6. Add new Appendix for Te Awamutu T2 Growth Cell Structure Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do nothing: Doing nothing would result in an inconsistent approach to recording and setting out the details of structure plans in the Waipa District Plan. <p>No other options have been considered in relation to this proposal.</p>	<p>This proposal will set out the design intent and purpose of the structure plan, resulting in a clear direction for future development and subdivision and consistent approach across the structure plan area. This ensures an efficient approach to the structure plan area, rather than different landowners acting independently which is likely to be more costly. The structure plan description also sets out the purpose of other amendments set out in this table.</p>	<p>This approach is consistent in relation to other structure plans in the Waipa District Plan. The approach chosen provides clear direction for future development and requires coordination between owners.</p>
<p>5. Add new Rule 15.4.2.90 to Part D of Chapter 15 – Infrastructure, Hazards, Development and Subdivision (Te Awamutu T2 Growth Cell</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do nothing The additional landscaping standards help to avoid and/or minimise potential adverse effects on surrounding properties and environment, and enhance overall amenity. Doing nothing will not achieve the same outcome (avoid/minimise effects) and therefore this option is not suitable. - Covenants 	<p>The costs and benefits associated with these amendments are largely environmental. The amendments will achieve an environmental outcome which is consistent across the entire structure plan area, resulting in a built amenity which responds to the existing surrounding environment.</p>	<p>This approach is consistent with the District Plan and achieves environmental benefits that outweigh the minor additional development costs.</p>

<p>Structure Plan Area provisions)</p>	<p>Building covenants on titles are an alternative method of specifying development standards. Compliance with land covenants is the responsibility of the land owner, the Council does not ensure compliance. As such, enforcement is difficult and less effective than a rule in the District Plan. There is a high degree of public familiarity with development standards in district plans, compared to covenants.</p>	<p>There is a minor cost associated with the additional landscaping required.</p> <p>The amendments proposed will not result in any identifiable cultural or social costs or benefits.</p>	
<p>Add new Rule 15.4.2.92 deferring Stage 2 development until after 2035</p>	<p>- Do nothing The do nothing option would not add this rule to the District Plan. In that case the Stage 2 area would be able to develop at the same time as Stage 1.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment confines the short term development potential to Stage 1 which is the land owned by Sanderson Group and Kotare Properties. Both of these landowners have specific development plans and they have worked together to integrate them. It is efficient and effective to provide for some limited additional land capacity to meet Te Awamutu's needs, and there is a shortage of retirement facilities.</p> <p>There are no identifiable costs.</p> <p>The landowners in Stage 2 are not ready to develop so the land is likely to remain in rural use for some years. Deferring the Stage 2 land minimises the risk of oversupply and increases consistency with the Growth Cell staging in the District Plan.</p>	<p>The new rule is effective and efficient as it reflects landowner intentions and increases consistency with the Growth Cell staging.</p>