

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
Roading / Traffic		
<p>a) Amend MHSP to change road layout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move new road intersection with Cove Road; and</li> <li>• Internal road layout changed to align with topography.</li> </ul> <p>b) Amend DEV1-R19 to include a matter of discretion to consider the provision of pedestrian and cycle connectivity.</p> <p>c) Amend DEV1-S12 to delete clauses e and f (transferred to driveway standard).</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-S13 to apply to roads only.</p> <p>e) Insert DEV1-S13A Vehicle Access/Driveway.</p> <p>f) Insert DEV1-S13B Pedestrian Footpaths and Cycleways.</p> <p>g) Insert DEV1-S13C Public Road Upgrades.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions – no modifications to the provisions and structure plan as notified.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended revised provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental, Cultural and Social</u></p> <p><b>Option 1</b> – The costs between options 1 and 2 are very similar, both options include the identification of a transport network within the plan change area with provisions to implement at the time of subdivision and development. Cost of development and upgrading the transport network is placed on the developer. Submitters identified social and environmental effects associated with the proposed road layout, particularly the southern most road intersection with Cove Road.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> – The costs of Option 2 are considered to be more balanced than Option 1, and the benefits are greater as the road alignment avoids the social and environmental effects of the southern road intersection with Cove Road as identified by submitters. The updated MHSP reflects a connected network and provisions seek to implement the MHSP at time of development. Cost of development and upgrading the transport network is placed on the developer. Submitters identified social and environmental effects associated with the proposed road layout, particularly the southern most road intersection with Cove Road.</p> <p><b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Options 1 and 2 both have similar levels of efficiency and effectiveness, with Option 2 has refined the provisions to improve their readability and are more effective. Option 2 includes changes which address the technical concerns raised improving effectiveness of the provisions.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>h) Amend DEV1-REQ2 to include the requirement to assess effects on specified intersections.</p> <p>i) Amend Table DEV1.1 as detailed in Attachment 3.</p>		
Open Space		
<p>a) Amend DEV1-O2: Subdivision and development are comprehensively designed, and promote high quality urban design <u>and open space networks</u> that responds positively to the local context and outcomes anticipated with a large lot residential housing density.</p> <p>b) Amend DEV1-P4: Require subdivision within the Mangawhai Hills Development Area to provide for the recreational needs of residents by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishing <u>active</u> open spaces which are prominent, and of a quality and size in proportion to the anticipated density.</li> <li>2. <u>Establishing a strong network of lineal open spaces, connected by pedestrian and cycle linkages.</u></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified structure and subdivision matters for open space.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended revised provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>The notified structure plan included specified locations of active open spaces. Upon review by Reset it was concluded that significant areas of passive open space afford adequate open space for future residents. Option 2 requires the provision of active open space at time of subdivision, the main cost of this rule is that it will cost the developer and landowners to construct and maintain open space areas.</p> <p><b>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The recommended provisions are more efficient and effective to achieve plan change objectives as they provide for active open spaces in locations necessary to service future resident's needs.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>3. <u>Creating a range of active and passive recreational activities within the network of lineal open spaces, whilst also enhancing the local ecology, landscape and amenity.</u></p> <p>c) Amendment to subdivision rule DEV1-R19 to insert requirement to comply with active open space standard and insert a new matter for lineal open space networks.</p> <p>d) New Standard DEV1-S18, to require all allotments to be located within 400m<sup>2</sup> of an active open space which is no less than 300m<sup>2</sup> which is flat open spaces.</p> <p>e) Amend MHSP to remove active open space areas, introduce lineal open space areas.</p>		
Community Hubs, Commercial Activities. Community Facilities and Educational Facilities		

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>a) Amend DEV1-P7</p> <p>To <b>enable provide for</b> commercial activities, community facilities and educational facilities within the Mangawhai Hills Development Area where the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commercial activity, community facilities and educational facilities are located to maintain the amenity of adjoining residential activities.</li> <li>2. Scale and size of commercial activities, <b>and</b> community facilities <b>and</b> <b>educational facilities</b> is restricted <b>within</b> <b><u>Community Hub Areas A and B</u></b> to maintain the vitality and vibrancy of the existing commercial zones within Mangawhai.</li> <li>3. <b><u>Educational facilities and associated accessory activities are clustered in Community Hub Area C and are of a character and scale that provides a high standard of amenity and safety while enabling the efficient use of the site.</u></b></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified structure plan and provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 provides a conservative level of non-residential activities located within a single community hub, with an aim to service the needs of future residents within the plan change area. Submissions have raised concern with respect to the lack of educational facilities within Mangawhai, Council s42A raised concern with respect to the ability of Option 1 to meet community employment needs raising potential economic and social effects.</p> <p>Option 2 provides a greater level of social and economic wellbeing by increasing the community hub areas within the MHSP and creating more targeted provisions enabling educational facilities and commercial activities. Mr Osborne has confirmed that Option 2 provides for commercial and community activities at a size and scale that will not adversely affect the existing vibrancy of Business Zones within Mangawhai.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of Option 1 and 2 is similar. Option 2 is considered to be more efficient and effective because it allows greater flexibility for the establishment of commercial activities and educational facilities while ensuring that there is adequate control via a restricted discretionary activity consent. Option 2 is more effective as it directs types of activities to appropriate locations.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

<b>Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 &amp; 3</b>	<b>Options Evaluated</b>	<b>S32AA Assessment</b>
<p>b) Amend the MHSP to identify additional areas of community hubs with bespoke outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area A – Commercial Activities and Community Facilities</li> <li>• Area B – Commercial services, Parking, Servicing</li> <li>• Area C – Educational Facility</li> </ul> <p>c) Amend DEV1-R3 to ensure that home businesses are located outside of Community Hub Areas A and B.</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-R4 to ensure that visitor accommodate is located outside of Community Hub Areas A and B.</p> <p>e) Create a separate rule DEV1-R5A for Educational Facilities, to direct these to Community Hub Area C, with a minimum net floor area of 5000m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>f) Amend DEV1-S1 to limit the building coverage within Community Hub Areas A-C to 30% net site area.</p> <p>g) Amend DEV1-S10 to limit the total traffic generated from each</p>		

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>Community Hub to 200 daily one way traffic movements.</p> <p>h) Insert DEV1-REQ3 to require an integrated transport assessment where DEV1-S10 is infringed.</p>		
Landscape		
<p>a) Amend the MHSP to increase the Landscape Protection Area (LPA), insert green areas and the ridgeline (prominent).</p> <p>b) New policy DEV1-P8:</p> <p><b><u>To require the form and pattern of built development within the Landscape Protection Area is integrated and recessed into the landscape by:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><u>1. Limiting the location and extent of built development.</u></b></li> <li><b><u>2. Requiring the establishment and protection of planting to visually mitigate development into the wider landscape.</u></b></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions and structure plan.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 identifies an area suitable for protection to manage potential landscape effects within the plan change area, achieving environmental benefit associated with future development. The s42A officer considers that Option 1 has taken a light touch to management of effects, whilst submitters have raised concerns with respect to development being visible on ridgelines. Reset have recommended a number of changes to the MHSP and provisions which increase the spatial extent of the LPA and strengthen provisions, as such Option 2 provides a greater level of environmental benefit. Cost of achieving this landscape protection is largely born by developers at time of subdivision. Both options require on-going limitation of built colours, height, whilst Option 2 requires maintenance of planting.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of Option 1 and 2 is similar, both options establish permitted activity standards with restricted discretionary activity consents required. The increased standards and level of protection afforded by Option 2 improves it's effectiveness and implementation, proposed policy DEV1-P8 affords direction for future implementation of the LPA giving effect to DEV1-O1 and DEV1-O4.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

<b>Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 &amp; 3</b>	<b>Options Evaluated</b>	<b>S32AA Assessment</b>
<p>c) Amend DEV1-R7 to delete clause b and cross reference DEV1-S9.</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-S1 to limit the maximum building coverage within the LPA to 25% and the introduction of matter of discretion enabling the consideration of massing and dominance of buildings within the LPA.</p> <p>e) Amend DEV1-S2 to limit building height within the LPA on the major ridgeline to 5m.</p> <p>f) Delete matter of discretion which required compliance with Mangawhai Hills Design Guidelines.</p> <p>g) Amendment to DEV1-S4 to ensure buildings a setback a minimum of 5m from any boundary from any boundary other than road.</p> <p>h) Amend DEV1-S6 to require planting along the length of internal boundaries and to require subdivision to establish native vegetation planting within the proposed green corridor.</p>		

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>i) Amend DEV1-S8 to delete matter of discretion which required compliance with Mangawhai Hills Design Guidelines.</p> <p>j) Amend DEV1-REQ4 to ensure information required to link directly to LPA standards.</p>		
<b>Flood Hazard</b>		
<p>a) Amend DEV1-R1 to insert a new permitted activity standard requiring buildings, accessory building or structure is located outside of the 1% AEP flood risk.</p> <p>b) Attach a flood map as recommended by Chester.</p> <p>c) Amend DEV1-S17 to reduce repetition</p> <p>d) Amend DEV-S9 to insert provision to exclude earthworks within a 1% AEP flood risk area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions and structure plan.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 provides for the management of flood hazard via stormwater provisions and identification of building platforms at time of subdivision. Cost of this approach is born by the developer at time of subdivision. Option 1 approach can result in cost to future landowners and residents due to the potential exposure to flood hazard risk and the need design at building stage to reduce risks. Submitters and s42A Reporting raised concerns with respect to Option 1's management of risk to flooding, with NRC seeking to include their flood hazard mapping in the plan change.</p> <p>Option 2 afford a greater benefit than Option 1 as a more detailed a site specific flood hazard map accompanied by land use rules requiring build development and earthworks to avoid flood hazard areas increase protection whilst reducing the risk costs.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Option 2 is considered to be more efficient and effective than Option 1 because it ensures that there is adequate avoidance of flood risk areas, providing certainty of a site specific map of the hazard areas and providing a restricted discretionary activity consent with a clear matters of discretion.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p>



Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
		There is no known risk due to insufficient information.
Land Instability Hazard		
<p>a) Amend MHSP to include the identification of a medium-high instability area.</p> <p>b) Amend DEV1-R19 to insert a requirement to revegetate moderate to high risk hazard areas.</p> <p>c) Amend DEV1-S9 to insert provision to exclude earthworks within a moderate to high risk instability area.</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-REQ1 to include the requirement for a stormwater management plan to achieve acceptable site ability as a result of any disposal.</p> <p>e) Insert DEV1-REQ5 to require a high risk soil assessment, retirement and rehabilitation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 relies upon the requirements of section 106 and the provision of a suitable building platform at time of subdivision to manage potential risk of natural hazard and land instability, these methods pose a cost at subdivision stage as geotechnical assessment is necessary to determine appropriateness of development. S42A reporting has raised concerns with respect to Option 1.</p> <p>Option 2 improves the environmental benefits via the introduction of a mapped area of moderate – high risk instability area supported by provisions avoiding built development and requiring retirement and planting. The cost of Option 2 to the developer is higher due to the upfront requirements at subdivision stage, however, on-going cost to landowners may be reduced.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Option 2 is considered to be more efficient and effective than Option 1 because it ensures that there is adequate avoidance of flood risk areas, providing certainty of a site specific map of the hazard areas and providing a restricted discretionary activity consent with a clear matters of discretion.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
management plan in support of any subdivision application of a site that contains a moderate – high risk instability area as identified on the MHSP.		
Three Waters		
<p>a) Add an advice note to DEV1-R7 to cross reference best practice to stormwater management GD01 and consideration of this as a matter of discretion.</p> <p>b) Amend DEV1-S14 to include the requirement to provide 10,000l of water for fire fighting purposes.</p> <p>c) Amend DEV1-S15 to ensure that stormwater detention is for the 100 year ARI, 24 hour rainfall event with climate change adjustment and to refer to GD05.</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-S16 to clarify condition requirements and to ensure onsite systems comply with AS/NZS 1547:2012.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Both options have similar costs and benefits.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of Option 1 and 2 is similar. Option 2 is considered to be more efficient and effective due to cross referencing of best practice standards.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
Ecology		
<p>a) Amend the MHSP to include indicative wetlands.</p> <p>b) Amend DEV1-R7 to ensure that the exemption for earthworks is limited to outside of native vegetation, stream or riparian areas as identified on the MHSP.</p> <p>c) Amend DEV1-R8 to limit the exemption for vegetation clearance for walking tracks to only be undertaken by manual means which does not remove trees with a girth exceeding 300mm.</p> <p>d) Amend DEV1-R19 to include the requirement to enhance and legally protect natural wetlands, stream or indigenous biodiversity at time of subdivision.</p> <p>e) Amend DEV1-S7 to ensure that buildings, accessory buildings and structures are setback 5m from the edge of a stream or wetland restoration area, and 5m from existing indigenous vegetation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Option 1 identifies an area suitable for protection to manage potential ecological effects within the plan change area, achieving environmental benefit associated with future development. The s42A officer has raised concerns about Option, particularly concerned about potential effects to freshwater and wetlands. Mr Delaney has recommended a number of changes to provisions which ensure delineation of wetlands that the time of subdivision and limit the ability to undertake vegetation clearance and earthworks within areas of indigenous vegetation. As such Option 2 provides a greater level of environmental benefit. Cost of achieving this ecological protection is largely born by developers at time of subdivision.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of Option 1 and 2 is similar, both options establish permitted activity standards with restricted discretionary activity consents required. The increased standards and level of protection afforded by Option 2 improves its effectiveness and implementation.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>

Recommended Amendment(s) – see Attachment 2 & 3	Options Evaluated	S32AA Assessment
<p>f) Insert DEV1-S19 to ensure all wetland and stream restoration areas are planted to a minimum width of 10m.</p> <p>g) Amend DEV1-REQ6 to ensure ecological assessment delineates wetlands and water courses, considers the NPS-IB, and considers management of cats and dogs.</p>		
Residential Density		
<p>a) Amend DEV1-R2 to allow a maximum of on residential unit per site.</p> <p>b) Delete DEV1-S8.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Option 1:</b> Notified provisions.</li> <li>• <b>Option 2:</b> Recommended provisions and MHSP as outlined in the left column.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Costs and benefits</b></p> <p><u>Economic, Environmental Cultural and Social</u></p> <p>Both options have similar costs and benefits.</p> <p><b>Efficiency and Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The efficiency and effectiveness of Option 1 and 2 is similar. Option 2 is considered to be more efficient and effective ensuring that there is no ambiguity with respect to residential density, capacity and servicing.</p> <p><b>Risks</b></p> <p>There is no known risk due to insufficient information.</p>