

Appendix 10: Evaluation of alternative options to achieve plan change objectives

Option One: Status Quo (Rural Zone)	Option Two : Rezone plan change area ODP Residential Zone	Option Three: Rezone Plan Change Area Low Density Residential Zone (consistent with Draft District Plan)	Option Four: Seek for Residential Zone change via Structure Plan or Urban Development Area.	Option Five: Precinct Plan approach that sits within the ODP Residential Zone.
<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No changes to the ODP necessary.</li> <li>- Existing productive potential of the plan change area can continue to be realised.</li> <li>- Removes the cost of initiating a plan change for the applicant.</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not address NPS-FM and NES-FM.</li> <li>- ODP format does not align or give effect to Planning Standards.</li> <li>- Does not address the NPS-UD</li> <li>- Residential living capacity and housing choice is not provided, cost of living and housing affordability increased within Dargaville.</li> <li>- Ecological features will not benefit from enhancement and increased protection (afforded by the proposed precinct provisions).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Only requires minor changes to ODP policies and rules.</li> <li>- Plan-users are familiar with approach.</li> <li>- Cost of implementation for Council will be similar to that of existing provisions.</li> <li>- Development contributions for wastewater upgrades or on-site wastewater solution needed to support desired density.</li> <li>- Includes policy framework for that puts onus on developer to provide wastewater/infrastructure servicing solution.</li> <li>- The density provisions provide for residential living and development via an integrated residential development.</li> <li>- Ensures consistency of amenity and character of residential zone.</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of policy direction for a range of residential intensities and choices, urban design outcomes and RMU units.</li> <li>- Activity status Discretionary and may trigger notification.</li> <li>- Does not address NPS-FM and NES-FM.</li> <li>- ODP format does not align or give effect to Planning Standards.</li> <li>- Urban design outcomes are limited and does not address NPS-UD.</li> <li>- Ecological features will not benefit from enhancement and increased protection (afforded by the proposed precinct provisions).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will provide certainty for future subdivision proposals when compared to option one.</li> <li>- Development contributions for wastewater upgrades or on-site wastewater solution needed to support desired density.</li> <li>- Includes policy framework for that puts onus on developer to provide wastewater/infrastructure servicing solution.</li> <li>- The density provisions provide for residential living.</li> <li>- Ensures consistency of amenity and character of a residential zone.</li> <li>- Format could align or give effect to Planning Standards.</li> <li>- Policy direction for a low density residential intensities and choices, urban design outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pre-empts the future KDC proposed Low Density Residential Zone.</li> <li>- Inconsistency between private plan change zone provisions and KDC proposed District Plan provisions.</li> <li>- Increased cost to applicant preparing and evaluating entire Zone provisions.</li> <li>- Ecological features will not benefit from enhancement and increased protection (afforded by the proposed precinct provisions).</li> <li>- Will not blend effectively and efficiently with the ODP structure and provisions.</li> <li>- In efficient use of land, which does not maximise residential density.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Certainty of outcomes for Council and applicant.</li> <li>- Certainty of infrastructure provision.</li> <li>- Consistent with Chapter 3 of the KDP.</li> <li>- Positive environmental benefit, open space and public access connections are secured.</li> <li>- This approach can be designed to address higher order policy direction.</li> <li>- Can include provisions to provide for increased residential densities, high level of urban design and protection and enhancement of ecological features.</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Costly for applicant and requires detailed investigations to support it.</li> <li>- Can result in inflexible development provisions.</li> <li>- Additional costs for Council to administer.</li> <li>- Inefficient given the scale and scope of the plan change area.</li> <li>- Duplication of the MSP.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Benefits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Align with higher order policy direction.</li> <li>- Takes into account the ODP provisions, but introduces targeted provisions that will apply to this particular site to manage effects.</li> <li>- Provides certainty of outcomes for the Council and future development.</li> <li>- Will ensure character and amenity of the zone is maintained, whilst enabling a range of densities and living opportunities.</li> <li>- Strong policy direction for a range of residential intensities and choices, urban design outcomes.</li> <li>- Addresses NPS-FM and NES-FM.</li> <li>- Strong urban design outcomes which address NPS-UD.</li> <li>- Ecological features will benefit from enhancement and increased protection (afforded by the proposed precinct provisions).</li> </ul> <p><b>Costs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ODP format does not align or give effect to Planning Standards.</li> <li>- Pre-empts Proposed District Plan and will need to be integrated.</li> <li>- Cost of initiating a plan change for the applicant and cost to Council to process.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b>				
<p>Whilst this option is an effective and efficient method with respect to the ODP generally. It will not give effect to the objectives of the plan change.</p>	<p>Option 2 will effectively achieve the Residential Zone objectives; however, Option 2 is inefficient as it does actively manage potential effects on ecology,</p>	<p>Option 3 is an effect and efficient option when considering rezoning. However, it is not the most effective method in achieving PRECX-O1. Option 3 will not result in a</p>	<p>Given the scale and location of the plan change area, combined with information and direction set in the MSP, it is considered that Option 4 would not be the most</p>	<p>Option 5 will provide the most effective and effective method in achieving PRECX-O1, because it provides for a precinct map to identify particular features and design</p>

<p>This option is ineffective and inefficient and will not achieve PREC-O1 as it will not provide residential living opportunities.</p>	<p>character and amenity required in PRECX-O1. Option 2 is effective in achieving the Residential Zone objectives, but is ineffective in achieving PREC-O1 as it does not enable range of allotment sizes nor does it actively manage potential effects on ecology, character and amenity.</p>	<p>range of residential living options, nor does it maximise residential density to ensure efficient use of land.</p>	<p>effective and efficient method in achieving PRECX-O1.</p>	<p>outcomes of the site. The precinct objectives and policies provide clear and directive outcomes which clearly link to the proposed methods.</p>
---	--	---	--	--