



HAWKE'S BAY REGIONAL COUNCIL



SAFEGUARDING YOUR ENVIRONMENT + KAITIAKI TUKU IHO



Section 32 Summary Evaluation Report

Proposed Change 4 to
Hawke's Bay Regional
Resource Management Plan

7 December 2011
HBRC Plan Number: 2345
ISBN: 1-234567-89-0





159 Dalton Street + Private Bag 6006 + Napier
Telephoni (06) 835 9200
Fax (06) 835 3601
Regional Freephone (06) 0800 108 838

SAFEGUARDING YOUR ENVIRONMENT + KAITIAKI TUKU IHO

Section 32 Summary Evaluation Report

Proposed Change 4 (Managing the Built Environment) to the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan

Adopted by Council: 23 November 2011

Release Date: 7 December 2011

**HBRC Plan Number: 2345
7 December 2011**

ISBN: 1-234567-89-0

© Copyright: Hawke's Bay Regional Council



Proposed Change 4 to the Hawke's Bay Regional Policy Statement

Section 32 Summary Evaluation Report Managing the Built Environment: Urban Development & the Strategic Integration of Infrastructure Policy

Prepared By

Rowena Macdonald
Senior Planning Consultant

Opus International Consultants Limited
Napier Office
Opus House, 6 Ossian Street
Private Bag 6019, Hawke's Bay Mail Centre,
Napier 4142, New Zealand

Reviewed By

Andrea Harris
Principal Planning Consultant

Telephone: +64 6 833 5100
Facsimile: +64 6 835 0881

Date: 8 November 2011
Reference: 2T3058.00/031NP
Status: Final

Gavin Ide
Team Leader Policy
Hawke's Bay Regional Council

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose of this Report	1
2	Statutory Context.....	1
2.1	Section 32 of the RMA	1
2.2	The Hawke’s Bay Regional Policy Statement	1
2.3	Statutory Basis for Addressing Long Term Land-Use & Infrastructure Issues in a Regional Policy Statement.....	2
3	Background to Development of Proposed Change 4.....	6
3.1	Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy.....	6
3.2	Alternative Methods.....	10
3.3	Approach to Development of Proposed Change 4	13
3.4	Stakeholder Involvement in Development of Proposed Change 4.....	13
3.5	Summary	14
4	Identifying the Resource Management Issues.....	15
4.1	Urban Development in Hawke’s Bay.....	15
4.2	Integrating Long-Term Land Use and Infrastructure Planning.....	16
4.3	Protection of Valuable Land & Water Resources for Food Production	18
4.4	Summary	19
5	Appropriateness of Objectives for Achieving the Purpose of the RMA.....	20
6	Appropriateness of Policies & Methods for Achieving the Objectives	27
7	Conclusion	42
	Bibliography.....	44

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report presents the summary evaluation in accordance with Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) on Proposed Change 4 to the Regional Policy Statement for the Hawke's Bay Region (contained within the Hawke's Bay Regional Resource Management Plan) to incorporate policy around managing urban development and ensuring the strategic integration of infrastructure within that setting.

2 Statutory Context

2.1 Section 32 of the RMA

In achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), section 32 requires an evaluation of alternatives, costs and benefits before a proposed plan, policy statement, change, variation, national policy statement or national environmental standard is publicly notified or other regulation is made.

Undertaking a section 32 evaluation assists in determining why changes to existing plan provisions may be needed and formalises a process for working out how best to deal with resource management issues. Section 32A provides for challenges to an objective, policy, rule or other method in the form of a submission on the grounds that the requirements of section 32 have not been complied with.

Therefore, under section 32, Proposed Change 4 to the Hawke's Bay Regional Policy Statement (RPS) must be accompanied by an evaluation that examines both:

- the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA; and
- whether the proposed policies and methods are the most appropriate way in which to achieve the objectives in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness (s32(3)).

Such an evaluation must take into account:

- the benefits and costs of the policies, rules or other methods; and
- the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information (s32(4)).

A section 32 summary evaluation report is required to accompany the proposed change at the time of public notification (s32(5)).

2.2 The Hawke's Bay Regional Policy Statement

Regional Policy Statements are policy-only documents prepared by Regional Councils under the RMA. In the Hawke's Bay setting, the RPS is published together with the Regional Resource Management Plan. Because an RPS is a high-level, policy-only document, it cannot contain rules.

Proposed Change 4 sets out to insert a new chapter into the existing RPS for Hawke's Bay and modify the glossary in the RPS. It is one of a series of plan changes currently under construction and does not represent a complete review of the RPS.

The purpose of an RPS limits what the proposed change can cover. Some of the things that Proposed Change 4 does not do are:

- Specify rules restricting the use of land, air, water or other activities commonly restricted by district plans and regional plans;
- Fully action all of the National Policy Statements (NPS) released by the government to-date. These generally need to be given effect to across multiple chapters in the RPS and through regional and district plans;
- Give effect to National Environmental Standards (NES). An RPS does not need to give effect to NES, as NES are more akin to rules and an RPS does not contain rules (an RPS can take NES into account, if relevant);
- Amend zoning of land in district plans, although it can give direction to areas where zoning may be altered in future to accommodate growth requirements determined in HPUDS;
- Determine budget and funding requirements for the Regional Council's implementation of HPUDS or any infrastructure development proposals across the region;
- Tackle each of the 60+ actions arising from HPUDS, but it will be a key action central to many other initiatives led by councils and/or other agencies. These include things such as revisions to district plans, review of transport strategies, additional hazard research, reviews of demographic projections and census data, assessments of how and where housing can be intensified, and so on.

2.3 Statutory Basis for Addressing Long Term Land-Use & Infrastructure Issues in a Regional Policy Statement

2.3.1 Part 2 (Purpose & Principles) of the RMA

Managing long term land-use and infrastructure aligns with the purpose of the RMA, which is *'the sustainable management of natural and physical resources'*. Section 5 of the RMA defines 'sustainable management' as:

"managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, while:

- a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;*
- b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
- c) Avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment."*

Section 6 of the RMA identifies matters of national importance. Of particular relevance to long term land-use and infrastructure management are:

- “a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*
- (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.”*

Section 7 identifies other matters requiring particular regard. Of particular relevance are:

- “b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;*
- ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy*
- c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*
- f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment*
- g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources*
- i) the effects of climate change.”*

2.3.2 Part 4 (Functions, Powers & Duties) of the RMA

The particular statutory functions of the Regional Council in giving effect to the Act as contained in section 30 of the Resource Management Act 1991 also provide a mandate for addressing long term land-use and infrastructure issues in a Regional Policy Statement. In particular:

- “(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the natural and physical resources of the region:*
- (b) the preparation of objectives and policies in relation to any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land which are of regional significance:*
- (c) the control of the use of land for the purpose of—*
 - (ii) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies and coastal water:*
 - (iv) the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards:*
- (f) the control of discharges of contaminants into or onto land, air, or water and discharges of water into water:*
- (gb) the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use through objectives, policies, and methods;”*

2.3.3 Part 5 (Standards, Policy Statements & Plans) of the RMA

Section 62(3) of the RMA requires that regional policy statements give effect to any national policy statements and the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.

Current national policy statements of relevance to long-term urban land use management and the integration of infrastructure are:

- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (in particular, Objectives 5 & 6, and Policies 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17 & 22 – 25);
- National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (in particular, Policies 1, 2, 10 & 14);
- National Policy Statement on Renewable Electricity Generation (in particular, Policies A & D).

[Note: Proposed Change 4 is not intended to give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management].

Proposed Change 4 to the RPS begins to respond to the above national policy statements in so far as guiding policy around the long term strategic planning for urban growth and the integration of infrastructure in Hawke's Bay.

The scope of Proposed Change 4 is restricted to guiding and directing urban development within the Region. It does not attempt to give full effect to the afore-mentioned national policy statements on its own. Further changes to the RPS will be necessary, along with changes to regional plans and district plans. These will be advanced in due course. These national policy statements provide for lead-in time, and do not require immediate changes to plans and the RPS.

New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010)

In summary, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement sets out objectives and policies that relate directly to long-term land use management and the integration of infrastructure through promoting:

- Co-ordinated and integrated management or control of activities within the coastal environment which could cross administrative boundaries;
- Identification of where development is inappropriate and protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;
- Consolidation of existing coastal settlements and urban areas
- Consideration of infrastructure implications of development in the coastal environment;
- Consideration for coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitat and species, natural character, historic & cultural heritage, public access, amenity and other values of the coastal environment;
- Provision for papakainga development and marae in the coastal environment; and
- Consideration of coastal hazards and climate change.

National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (2008)

In summary, the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission sets out objectives and policies that relate directly to long-term land use management and the integration of infrastructure through promoting:

- Recognition and provision for the national, regional and local benefits of sustainable, secure and efficient electricity transmission;
- Recognition and provision for the effective operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the electricity transmission network;
- Management of activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network and to ensure that operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised; and
- Inclusion of objectives, policies and methods to facilitate long-term planning for investment in transmission infrastructure and its integration with land uses.

National Policy Statement on Renewable Electricity Generation (2011)

In summary, the National Policy Statement on Renewable Electricity Generation sets out objectives and policies that relate directly to long-term land use management and the integration of infrastructure through promoting:

- Recognition and provision for the national significance of renewable electricity generation activities; and
- Management of activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on consented and on existing renewable electricity generation activities.

3 Background to Development of Proposed Change 4

It is useful to understand the background and context within which Proposed Change 4 to the RPS has been prepared, particularly its relationship with the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy (HPUDS).

Proposed Change 4 was initiated in response to the following drivers:

1. actions arising out of HPUDS;
2. legal requirements to implement relevant national policy statements relating to electricity infrastructure; and
3. the Regional Council's own initiatives to continually improve its plans to address urban environments and the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use across the Region.

The current RPS contains many policies for air, land and water resources and management of natural hazards, but contains little in terms of how urban development should occur and be managed in the region. These are new areas for coverage in the RPS for Hawke's Bay.

3.1 Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy

In the past, Hastings and Napier have planned for growth independently. Both Napier City and Hastings District each have existing urban growth strategies.

In 1992, Napier City Council commissioned an urban growth study to formulate a 'detailed long term growth strategy' for the City area. In 1999, the City Council undertook a review of the Strategy and developed a revised urban growth strategy, rolling forward the end date from the year 2011 in the previous strategy, to the year 2016. Similarly in 1993, Hastings District Council commissioned an urban development strategy to consider development in the District with a 25 year horizon. This was reviewed in 1999.

However, in recognising the interrelationship of these key urban centres, and the pressures on shared resources and infrastructure, Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Hastings District Council, Napier City Council and mana whenua (strongly supported by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)), embarked on a collaborative approach to urban growth and development, culminating in the development of HPUDS.

The Strategy is promoted as a broad scale, long-term, integrated land use and infrastructure strategy prepared under the framework of the Local Government Act 2002.

The existing growth strategies for Napier and Hastings are expected to successfully cater for growth up to 2015. HPUDS is anticipated to carry this work forward from 2015 out to 2045.

HPUDS sets out the preferred settlement pattern for the Heretaunga Plains sub-region. The key principles of the resulting sub-regional growth strategy (HPUDS) and spatial frameworks are matters that require cross boundary consistency and cooperation. The Regional Policy Statement is therefore an appropriate umbrella document for seeking this consistency.

Proposed Change 4 seeks to implement the preferred settlement pattern, integrating long-term land-use and infrastructure and addressing the protection of strategic infrastructure at the regional policy level. Proposed Change 4 to the RPS is considered a priority action in order to provide a framework within which the Territorial Authorities can then implement HPUDS within their district plans.

The following is a summary of the HPUDS development process:

The HPUDS Development Process
Phases 1 & 2: Data Needs Review & Further Research
This involved a data needs review and a gap analysis of all existing strategies, and then the undertaking of further research to fill the gaps. Further research was undertaken in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demographic & Economic Projections• Market Demand• Infrastructure & Services• Retirement Sector• Mana Whenua• Brownfields Sites• Climate Change
Phase 3 (Stage 1): Scenario Development
Three general directions or scenarios were created as part of the HPUDS development process, being: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scenario 1: the current growth pattern;• Scenario 2: consolidation with growth off the Heretaunga Plains; and• Scenario 3: compact development. These were developed in consultation with various key stakeholder groups (internal within the partner Councils, and external stakeholders).
<u>Release of Scenarios for Informal Public Comment</u>
The three scenarios were released for public comment and feedback on 18 November 2009. The submission period closed on 15 January 2010 – 46 written responses were received, the majority supported either Scenario 2 or 3, or a combination of both.
Phase 3 (Stage 2): Scenario Evaluation
Evaluation criteria were developed to provide a framework for assessing the three scenarios. The criteria used were based on the vision and guiding principles of the Strategy. The scenarios were then each evaluated against this set of criteria ¹ .

¹ HPUDS identifies the full set of criteria, and technical documentation associated with its development, and contains the detailed evaluation results.

Phase 4: Draft Strategy Development

Both the stakeholder/community consultation and the evaluation informed the identification of a preferred scenario.

Public Notification of Draft Strategy

The draft strategy was publicly notified for submissions using the special consultative provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 on 1 April 2010.

The submission period closed on 14 May 2010 – 108 submissions to the draft strategy were received on a range of matters.

Submissions were heard and considered by the HPUDS Joint Committee in June 2010. The strategy was subsequently amended to incorporate those changes considered necessary as a result of hearing submissions and the amended strategy then recommended to the partner Councils for adoption.

Phase 5: Consultation, Submissions, Hearings, Decisions & Adoption

Stakeholder & Wider Community Consultation

The HPUDS development process involved both informal and formal consultation with various key stakeholders (internally within the partner Councils, and externally), wider stakeholders and network utility groups, and the community.

This included the establishment of various special advisory groups, feeding into the Strategy development process throughout, including²:

- Governance Group (Mayors & Councillor reps)
- Technical Advisory Group (Council officers, tangata whenua, NZTA reps)
- Reference Stakeholder Group (key government/industry/environment reps)

Detailed documentation of the HPUDS consultation process can be found on the HPUDS website.

Strategy Adoption

The final Strategy was formally adopted by the partner Councils in August 2010.

HPUDS established a settlement pattern based on the preferred scenario that arose as a result of the above research, consultation and evaluation process.

Whilst the compact development scenario (Scenario 3) was identified as the 'best fit' in meeting the principles and outcomes for HPUDS, it was seen as requiring a significant level of intensification to take place in a short order of time, and moving straight to a compact development scenario was considered unlikely to be acceptable to local communities and the public in general. HPUDS recommended a transition from the current growth pattern to the compact development scenario.

² Appendix 8.8 Participants, 'Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy', August 2010.

The preferred growth pattern adopted in HPUDS is therefore based on a scenario that emerges from the current growth pattern (Scenario 1) and incorporates elements of consolidation with growth off the Heretaunga Plains (Scenario 2) towards a compact development scenario (Scenario 3) by the end of the Strategy period. The settlement pattern proposed in HPUDS is therefore based on components of both Scenario 2 and Scenario 3.

In order to achieve the preferred scenario, HPUDS determined that a settlement pattern is required that has identified growth areas so that development can consolidate around existing settlements. This was considered more efficient and cost effective from an infrastructure and servicing point of view. Defined limits for urban areas were also considered as necessary so that land use and infrastructure can be coordinated, development well planned, and growth on the plains avoided as much as possible.

The preferred scenario which underpins the settlement pattern aims to³:

- Avoid encroaching onto the Heretaunga Plains
- Increase densities and intensification in suitable locations
- Reduce the spread of both Napier and Hastings
- Provide for a range of housing types
- Encourage walking, cycling and public transport as an alternative to the private motor vehicle

HPUDS contains a series of actions to implement the strategy. Of particular relevance is Action 2⁴, being the preparation of a change to the RPS during 2011. Further, Appendix 8.7⁵ of HPUDS sets out the scope, direction and purpose of how the RPS could be amended to implement HPUDS.

In summary, Action 2 and Appendix 8.7 of HPUDS promote a change to the RPS that will guide where growth will occur and includes the concept of urban limits – working towards putting in place the overall settlement pattern for the HPUDS area, and providing a more detailed and directive geographic-based set of policies for the urban development of the Heretaunga Plains. Appendix 8.7 states:

“The proposed RPS change would have a significant focus on the HPUDS settlement pattern of integrating long-term land-use and infrastructure. The protection of strategic infrastructure corridors will also be an important consideration.”

A change to the RPS in order to implement HPUDS is likely to include:

- *Urban limits for growth areas which will be mapped*
- *Average density targets*
- *Policies relating to reverse sensitivity*
- *Areas for protection (where development should not locate).”*

³ Section 4.2.1 Preferred Scenario, ‘Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy’, August 2010.

⁴ Section 5.9.4 Actions, ‘Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy’, August 2010.

⁵ Appendix 8.7 Scope of Proposed Change to RPS, ‘Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy’, August 2010.

3.2 Alternative Methods

Three options were considered in terms of Council's response to the urban growth and strategic integration of land use with infrastructure issues identified for Hawke's Bay. These three options are evaluated in Table 1 in terms of their costs, benefits, effectiveness and efficiency:

- Option 1: Status Quo – No Change to the RPS
- Option 2: Change to the RPS – Guiding Regional Policy
- Option 3A: Change to the RPS – Directive Sub-Regional Policy
- Option 3B: Change to the RPS – Guiding Sub-Regional Policy

Table 1: Evaluation of Alternatives

OVERARCHING METHODS	COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES	BENEFITS	EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OPTION 1: STATUS QUO				
<p><i>This option involves sole reliance on the respective District Plans and the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy to deliver the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure throughout the Region.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little recognition of the specific issues affecting the Heretaunga Plains, and the cross boundary nature of those issues. Territorial authorities may end up with divergent policies, which may undermine their neighbouring district's attempts to manage these issues. District Plans are subject to potential private plan change requests, presenting a risk that policies addressing these issues in District Plans may be subject to short-term influences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low administrative cost to Regional Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not give effect to Council's statutory function around the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure. Not effective in supporting a collaborative approach across territorial boundaries. 	<p>Therefore this option is not the most effective and efficient method to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p>
OPTION 2: PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT – GUIDING REGIONAL POLICY				
<p><i>This option involves the inclusion of policy provisions in the RPS to guide the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure throughout the Region.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative costs in preparing and notifying change to the RPS. Little recognition of specific issues affecting the Heretaunga Plains, and the cross boundary nature of those issues. Territorial authorities may end up with divergent policies, which may undermine their neighbouring district's attempts to manage these specific issues. Little guidance to support long term public and private investment decision-making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low administrative cost to Regional Council. Regional Policy Statements are not subject to private plan change requests. Therefore, policy can take long term view and is less vulnerable to short-term influences. Timely guidance – policy in place relatively quickly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives general effect to Council's statutory function around the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure. Not effective in supporting a collaborative approach across territorial boundaries to address the specific issues on the Heretaunga Plains. 	<p>Therefore this option is not the most effective and efficient method to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p>
OPTION 3A: PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT – DIRECTIVE POLICY FRAMEWORK				
<p><i>This option involves the inclusion of policy provisions in the RPS to direct the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure throughout the Region, with additional policy specifically targeted to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</i></p> <p><i>This option involves establishing firm urban limits for the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, identification and mapping of future Greenfield Growth areas and intensification areas in the sub-region, and directing the sequence for release of those urban growth areas.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative costs in preparing and notifying change to the RPS. Significant additional data gathering & analysis cost to deliver the robust analysis necessary to support this level of direction to meet RMA tests. This level of detail is not currently available. Time delay in waiting for level of analysis to support directive policy. Inappropriate development could occur in the interim. Necessary plan changes to district plans may be delayed, or require additional plan changes if district plans found not to be giving effect to RPS. Significant potential cost in responding to any future change in assumptions or growth parameters. Any change in assumptions would likely require further changes to the RPS. Inflexible to responding to 'on-the-ground' issues as they arise. Potentially constrains development investment choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Policy Statements are not subject to private plan change requests. Therefore, policy can take long term view and is less vulnerable to short-term influences. Certainty as to urban limits and exact location and timing of urban growth areas, enabling definitive long term public and private investment decision-making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives effect to Council's statutory function around the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure. Effective in ensuring regional/sub-regional response to issues. 	<p>This is an effective and efficient method to achieve the purpose of the RMA. However, there is insufficient information and detailed data to enable the robust identification of future Greenfield growth and intensification areas across the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, or to determine exact sequencing of the release of those areas, to the level required for inclusion in an RPS, at this time.</p> <p>Further, the rate of population and household growth in Hawke's Bay (even the Heretaunga Plains sub-region) is not anticipated to be significant over the next 30+ years, and it is therefore not considered to warrant the level of constraint this alternative would entail, at this time.</p>

OVERARCHING METHODS	COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES	BENEFITS	EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OPTION 3B: PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT – GUIDING POLICY FRAMEWORK				
<p><i>This option involves the inclusion of policy provisions in the RPS to guide the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure throughout the Region, with additional policy specifically targeted to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</i></p> <p><i>This option involves providing a framework for identification of urban limits, future Greenfield Growth areas and intensification areas in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, so that those relevant territorial authorities make coordinated changes to their respective District Plans in line with the outcomes of the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative costs in preparing and notifying change to the RPS. • Potentially diminishes development investment choice. • Administration costs in preparing and notifying changes to district plans to give effect to the amended RPS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Policy Statements are not subject to private plan change requests. Therefore, policy can take long term view and is less vulnerable to short-term influences. • Some certainty as to long term growth parameters and direction, to support long term public and private investment decision-making. • Timely guidance – policy in place relatively quickly, and prior to TLAs notifying detailed plan changes to their district plans in response to HPUDS (enables plan changes to be able to give effect to RPS). • Flexible enough to enable TLAs to carry out the analysis and detail the extent of growth areas and intensification areas ‘on-the-ground’ in due course, within a set of clear parameters. • Enables response to future changes in assumptions and growth parameters, without necessarily requiring a change to the RPS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives effect to Council’s statutory function around the strategic integration of land use with infrastructure. • Effective in ensuring regional/sub-regional response to issues. 	<p>This is considered the most effective and efficient method to achieve the purpose of the RMA as it relates to Hawke’s Bay.</p> <p>This method is the preferred method, and reflects that specifically adopted by Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Napier City Council and Hastings District Council, in response to the outcomes of the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy.</p> <p><i>Note: Over time, the level of data and analysis may evolve to a point that supports a move towards Option 3A in a future review of the RPS.</i></p>

3.3 Approach to Development of Proposed Change 4

The approach to development of Proposed Change 4 has been to consider the real issues around managing urban growth and the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use as they relate specifically to Hawke's Bay, and to test those to determine whether they are significant enough to warrant addressing in the RPS.

This included consideration of approaches taken in other Regions (particularly the Bay of Plenty, Canterbury & Manawatu-Wanganui regions).

Upon determining that there are issues that warrant addressing at the regional level in Hawke's Bay, the focus then shifted to identifying the anticipated environmental results. It was considered important to be clear about the results being sought before starting to write the objectives and policies.

Objectives & policies were then developed with a view to addressing the issues and enabling achievement of the anticipated environmental results. Draft objectives and policies went through a number of iterations to test their appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency. Issues and anticipated environmental results were also fine-tuned during this process.

A full Draft Change was prepared and circulated, and feedback on the Draft guided further refinement of the provisions prior to formal notification of Proposed Change 4.

3.4 Stakeholder Involvement in Development of Proposed Change 4

The Council's 2009-2019 Ten Year Plan signalled early on that the Council intended to initiate a Change to the RPS following completion of HPUDS. Development of Proposed Change 4 to the RPS commenced in early 2011, and was influenced and refined through a series of briefings, discussions, meetings, circulated drafts, and informal comment and feedback iterations. This included:

- 1) initial discussions internally within Council's strategy and policy team to understand perceived issues (March 2011);
- 2) discussions with senior strategic & policy planning staff at Bay of Plenty Regional Council to learn and draw on their relevant experience in implementing their urban growth strategy through the RPS (what worked and what proved difficult) (April 2011);
- 3) internal comments from Council's strategy & policy team on a first-cut draft set of provisions (April 2011);
- 4) informal comment and feedback on a pre-circulated draft set of provisions through meetings with key strategy & policy staff from each of the territorial authorities (Wairoa District Council, Central Hawke's Bay District Council, Napier City Council & Hastings District Council) (April/May 2011);
- 5) further detailed comment and feedback on subsequent drafts from members of the Technical Advisory Group previously convened for the HPUDS development process

(comprising senior strategy and policy staff from Napier City Council, Hastings District Council & Hawke's Bay Regional Council) (June/July/August 2011);

- 6) comment on Draft Change 4 from Council's Environmental Management Committee, and the newly formed HPUDS Implementation Committee & Governance Committee (August/September 2011);
- 7) informal comment and feedback on Draft Change 4 from a targeted wider group of stakeholders (a draft was circulated to the same stakeholder groups convened for the HPUDS development process) (September/October 2011); and
- 8) response from release of Draft Change 4 for informal public comment (September/October 2011).
- 9) Council resolution to adopt proposed Change 4 and publicly notify it for submissions (November 2011).

3.5 Summary

High level regional policy has been determined as an appropriate response to the urban growth and strategic integration of land use with infrastructure issues identified for the Hawke's Bay Region. The method adopted was to develop a regional policy backdrop that provides clear guidance as to the appropriate provision for urban growth and development throughout the Region, particularly the Heretaunga Plains sub-region. This was to be in such a way as to enable the territorial authorities in the Region to respond collectively, collaboratively, and with some certainty, but retaining sufficient autonomy to tackle the issues that are specific to their district with a degree of flexibility.

Proposed Change 4 to the RPS is largely in response to the outcomes and specific actions arising from HPUDS. Even though it was prepared under the framework of the Local Government Act 2002, the HPUDS development process represents a significant part of the section 32 evaluation supporting this proposed change – in that it reflects the outcomes of stakeholder and community comment and feedback (both formal and informal), and is based on technical data and the outcome of a detailed evaluation process.

The subsequent development of Proposed Change 4 involved consideration of the issues driving the need to manage urban growth in Hawke's Bay (drawing on HPUDS), determining the desired outcomes, and constructing a policy framework that begins to both address the issues and deliver those outcomes.

4 Identifying the Resource Management Issues

4.1 Urban Development in Hawke's Bay

The first task in the policy development process for Proposed Change 4 involved determining if urban development creates regionally significant resource management issues in the Hawke's Bay Region that warrant addressing in the RPS.

Key findings in the HPUDS Demographic & Economic Growth Outlook Report⁶ indicate the following:

RELEVANT KEY FINDINGS:
<p>POPULATION GROWTH OUTLOOK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawke's Bay not projected to be a strong population growth area as a whole • Study area population projected to grow along midpoint of the Statistics New Zealand Medium-High projection, which also sees the population fall slightly from Year 2036 • Overall population growth of 8255 or 6.3%, driven by natural increase • Projected 68% increase in the 65+ population; other age-group populations fall • Maori population projected to grow by 25%
<p>HOUSING GROWTH OUTLOOK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projected 8014 or approx. 16% increase in total study area household numbers over the period • Falling household occupancy ratio propels household growth significantly in advance of population growth • Continued changes in the housing profile-15% increase in 'couple without children' families, 20% fall in two-parent families and 29% increase in sole-person households
<p>ECONOMIC & EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key industries in the study area will continue to include primary production and processing, commercial business services (including visitor industry servicing) and wholesale/retail trade • Key growth influences in the longer-term include the region's natural resource base, world importance of food, continued ability to 'add value', impact of international market and exchange rate fluctuations on the area's export performance, climatic factors, access to seasonal and skilled labour, science and technological application, quality infrastructure, and population and household growth
<p>LAND UPTAKE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total land area impact of the projected new housing growth in the study area over 2015-2045 is estimated at 1880 hectares • Total estimated floor-space impact of the forecast economic and employment growth over the projection period is the commercial sector- 700,000m² and the industrial sector 900,000m²

⁶ 'Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Study Phase 2 Technical Analysis: *Demographic and Economic Growth Outlook 2015-2045*', October 2009, Economic Solutions Limited

From the above, the population of the Region as a whole is not expected to grow significantly over the coming 35 years. In that sense, the issues around urban development in Hawke's Bay are not in response to rampant population growth (unlike Bay of Plenty, Waikato, Auckland, & Greater Christchurch regions). The issues around urban development that specifically affect the Hawke's Bay region revolve more around:

- a) integrating land use and infrastructure decisions across the Region in response to moderate household growth, and
- b) the unique characteristics of the land and water resources of the Region and the competing demands for those resources.

The latter is particularly concentrated on the Heretaunga Plains, where a large proportion of the Region's population resides & works, and where the land and water resources have very high value for food production.

4.2 Integrating Long-Term Land Use and Infrastructure Planning

Managing urban growth and development is a regionally significant issue, because what occurs in one area will invariably have an effect on other places. This is particularly so for the urban centres of Napier and Hastings, and surrounding coastal and rural settlements in and around the Heretaunga Plains. A lack of integration between land use and infrastructure can result in poor infrastructure investment decisions, public funding pressures and inefficient land use patterns that can transcend territorial authority boundaries.

The Region's population continues to steadily grow, with most of that growth anticipated to occur in the Heretaunga Plains area to 2045, and this 'sub-region' is where the issue of integrating land use and infrastructure is most keenly felt. Whilst population growth in the other parts of the Region is not projected to be significant over that period, the effects urban growth can have on people and communities, and the important role that efficient infrastructure plays in supporting settlement growth and prosperity, is relevant throughout the entire Region. The protection of the Region's wider strategic infrastructure networks is also essential for growth, and is a regional issue already identified to some extent in the RPS (refer Chapter 3.13 Maintenance & Enhancement of Physical Infrastructure). These strategic infrastructure networks also transcend territorial authority boundaries.

In respect of the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, the report of the Joint Hearings Committee on submissions to the Draft Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy succinctly outlines the key issues and drivers particular to the sub-region (but some aspects of this are directly attributable to other parts of the Region, also), as follows:

“Over the past twenty years urban development on the Heretaunga Plains has been characterised by single dwelling greenfields subdivision and development on the flats and lightly sloping elevated sites; often on productive land with some containing what could be described as highly versatile soils for food production.

Intensification has been through infill development where the back part of a section is subdivided off and a single dwelling erected so two detached dwellings exist where one previously stood. This is not considered a good urban design outcome and places unplanned pressure access existing infrastructure networks, which is difficult to plan for and expensive to accommodate.

Another feature has been the development of rural residential sites and strong demand for rural lifestyle lots; to the point that the lifestyle value of rural property exceeds its value for commercial food production.

These features contrast with the previous 20 years of development in the Hastings area, with greenfields development on the shingle beds in Flaxmere area and the Havelock North hills.

There is a strong emergent concern about continuing “urban sprawl” over productive land, especially the more versatile soils, and the land value distortions that rural residential and lifestyle lot development creates. The result is that commercial food production is not sustainable economically, and that this form of residential growth is not sustainable environmentally and socially, particularly against the backdrop of “peak oil”, carbon emissions and climate change.

In addition Napier and Hastings previous Urban Growth strategies, while cognizant of each other, were developed independently of each other and for a variety of reasons, the release of greenfields land has been uncoordinated and un-balanced. This has led to situations where such land was in short supply in one city and abundant in another. The lack of balanced locational choice has led to people choosing to live and work in different centers, driving increased travel, fuel use, carbon emissions and demands on the road transport infrastructure.

Again this is no longer considered sustainable and balanced supply choices between the two centres and coordinated implementation of growth areas is considered very important to the community and the environmental outcomes we desire.

Accordingly the key drivers for HPUDS are;

- Community recognition that both the soils and water resource are finite and under increasing pressure and should be better managed.
- The need to take a sub regional view to the growth needs over a longer period of time for balanced growth.
- The need to identify where the knowledge gaps are in planning for the long term growth.
- Accepting that the employment base of the Heretaunga Plains will continue to rely on land based industry.
- Establishing appropriate and planned responses to long term issues such as climate change and energy efficiencies.”⁷

Further, HPUDS acknowledges that a key part of its implementation is predicated on achieving higher densities as either brownfields or other currently developed sites are redeveloped. This is pertinent to the issue of integrating long term land use with the provision of infrastructure. HPUDS succinctly describes this issue as follows:

“Future growth options cannot be considered without direct reference to the servicing implications of that growth. There is an affordability issue to be considered as part of identifying future growth options. This is applicable both for greenfield development and intensification. While developers pay for a proportion of the servicing costs of new development through development levies, these costs must both meet the cost of servicing development but also be affordable for developers so as not to inhibit development.

Servicing costs have therefore been one of the assessment criteria for the growth areas identified in the strategy. The detailed feasibility of each of the growth areas identified in the Strategy is being worked through and the appropriate actions are outlined... It is also an important issue for the consideration of intensification. Intensification has the potential for considerable upgrade requirements of the existing infrastructure and these are costs that cannot be fully recouped from

⁷ Section 2.0 Background, ‘Report of the Joint Committee on Submissions to the Draft Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy’, 5 August 2010.

developers. Councils will be unable to afford to upgrade the infrastructure for intensification to happen everywhere. Intensification will therefore need to be targeted so that the costs to Councils are affordable.”⁸

These issues are not confined to a single local authority area. The strategic integration of infrastructure with land use is a common issue across all the local authorities within the Hawke’s Bay Region – in terms of managing the provision of services in response to development, in a way that achieves maximum environmental, social and economic benefits.

Unplanned urban form and ad hoc land use management over the long term can have adverse effects on people and communities, and on the natural environment (soils and water), that can cross territorial authority boundaries and is therefore a regional issue. Effective management of growth in the region is necessary to ensure development occurs in a planned, sustainable manner and in a way that also does not compromise the planned provision, operation, maintenance and upgrading of regionally significant infrastructure.

4.3 Protection of Valuable Land & Water Resources for Food Production

The Hawke’s Bay Region contains areas with an unusually high proportion of very high value versatile land. There are competing demands for this valuable finite resource. The diversity and intensity of horticultural and viticultural production on the Heretaunga Plains, for instance, creates a high demand for land which is in short supply, whilst the same land is highly desirable for urban and rural lifestyle development.

Urban expansion on to agricultural land continues unless controlled, because the financial incentives are strong. The increased market value of land developed for urban use is considerable and beyond agricultural returns to sustain. Once developed, the economic value of urban and industrial infrastructure normally means this land is permanently removed from primary production. Subdivision for urban development and non-rural production removes land from agricultural production but also impacts on the productivity of other land, in particular through reverse sensitivity. In short, within agriculture, land use conflicts occur around short-term economic incentives and the future sustainability of the soils.

The versatile land and water resources of the Heretaunga Plains are a regionally, if not nationally, significant resource for food production and ultimately underpin the economy of the Region. Therefore, pressure from urban development encroaching on these resources is undeniably a regionally significant issue. In addition, the Heretaunga Plains transcend the territorial authority boundaries of Napier & Hastings – this issue is not confined to one territorial authority.

The unusual concentration of highly versatile soils and other factors of production in conjunction with significant concentration of the Region’s population on the Heretaunga Plains reinforce the need to focus urban growth policy in the RPS on the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, at this time.

⁸ Section 1.3.9 Servicing Considerations, ‘Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy’, August 2010.

In addressing this issue, Proposed Change 4 has adopted the term ‘versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains’. This term reflects the integration of soil and many other physical and social factors when determining land worthy of protection for its productive capacity for future generations, rather than a narrow focus on versatile soils alone.

This approach is reflected in a Technical Paper commissioned by Council addressing issues associated with defining ‘versatile soils’ or ‘productive land’ for the purposes of avoiding inappropriate use, subdivision and development⁹. The Technical Paper highlights that because of a combination of the factors of production on the Heretaunga Plains, soils of lower versatility can have high value and be just as deserving of protection as recognised Class 1, 2 & 3e versatile soils. It notes that virtually every soil type on the Heretaunga Plains boasts examples of intensive primary production, and concludes that all soil types in the Heretaunga Plains act collectively to underpin intensive primary production activity and associated secondary services in the Region. A focus on versatile soils alone was considered insufficient in achieving the purpose of the RMA. This is an important development in thinking, and is supported by Environment Court decisions such as Judge Treadwell’s statements in W142/96 Canterbury Regional Council v Selwyn District Council¹⁰.

4.4 Summary

The preceding discussion clearly signals that there are built environment issues that need to be addressed in the RPS, at a broader regional level and at a sub-regional level.

The following issues are therefore considered regionally significant and are considered valid for inclusion in the RPS in terms of the management of urban growth and the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use:

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT ISSUES – URBAN DEVELOPMENT & STRATEGIC INTEGRATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE	
ISS UD1	The adverse effects of sporadic and unplanned urban development (particularly in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region), on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the natural environment (land and water); b) the efficient operation, maintenance and upgrading of physical infrastructure or services (particularly strategic infrastructure); and c) the economic, cultural and social wellbeing of the Region’s people & communities.
ISS UD2	The adverse effects from urban development encroaching on versatile land (particularly in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region where the land supports regionally and nationally significant intensive economic activity), and ultimately the adverse effects of this on the economic wellbeing of the Region’s people & communities both now and for future generations.

⁹ Page Bloomer Associates Ltd, ‘Versatile Soils – Productive Land, Report for Hawke’s Bay Regional Council’, 14 June 2011.

¹⁰ Canterbury Regional Council v Selwyn District Council [1996] NZEnvC, W142/96

5 Appropriateness of Objectives for Achieving the Purpose of the RMA

Proposed Change 4 proposes six (6) objectives to address the two regionally significant issues identified. The issues are addressed through the objectives as follows:

ISSUE	OBJECTIVES
ISS UD1 Adverse Effects of Sporadic and Unplanned Urban Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OBJ UD1 Urban Form (Region); - OBJ UD2 Intensification (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - OBJ UD3 Provision for Business Land (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - OBJ UD4 Planned Provision for Urban Development (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - OBJ UD5 Integration of Land Use with Significant Infrastructure (Region); and - OBJ UD6 Integration of Transport Infrastructure with Development (Region).
ISS UD2 Adverse Effects from Urban Development Encroaching on Versatile Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OBJ UD1 Urban Form (Region); - OBJ UD2 Intensification (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); and - OBJ UD3 Provision for Business Land (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region).

Section 32(3)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act.

The summary evaluation of the appropriateness of the objectives in achieving the purpose of the RMA is considered below in Table 2, in terms of:

- a) whether they address the identified regionally significant issues;
- b) whether they are appropriate in terms of the functions of the Regional Council;
- c) whether they address the purpose of the RMA as set out in Part 2; and
- d) an assessment of alternatives.

Table 2: Evaluation of Objectives

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD1 – URBAN FORM (REGION)				
<p><i>Establish compact, well-designed, and strongly connected urban form throughout the Region, that:</i></p> <p><i>a) achieves quality built environments that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. provide for a range of housing choices and affordability,</i> <i>ii. have a sense of character and identity,</i> <i>iii. retain heritage values and values important to tangata whenua, and</i> <i>iv. that are healthy, environmentally sustainable, functionally efficient, and economically & socially resilient;</i> <p><i>b) minimises reverse sensitivity effects at the urban/rural interface;</i></p> <p><i>c) minimises reverse sensitivity effects on existing strategic and other physical infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>d) avoids unnecessary encroachment of urban activities on the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains; and</i></p> <p><i>e) avoids or mitigates increasing the frequency or severity of risk to people and property from natural hazards.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD1 addresses both regionally significant issues (ISS UD1 & ISS UD2). It applies across the Region, but specifically addresses ISS UD2 in terms of the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains.</p> <p>A sprawling uncontrolled pattern of development does not promote sustainable forms of development, gives rise to reverse sensitivity and land use conflicts, and promotes less efficient use of existing infrastructure. Sprawling development also leads to unsustainable encroachment onto versatile land which underpins much of the Region's economy. Transitioning to a more compact, well-designed and strongly connected urban form better supports the economic, social and cultural well-being of the Region's people and communities.</p>	<p>OBJ UD1 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30.</p> <p>Clauses a) & c) are specifically appropriate in terms of section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p> <p>Clauses b) & d) are specifically appropriate in terms of section 30(b) (land of regional significance).</p> <p>Clause e) is specifically appropriate in terms of section 30(c)(iv) (avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards).</p>	<p>OBJ UD1 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use, development and protection of resources while enabling people and communities to provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing, health and safety; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(b) – safeguarding life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; & 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); • section 6(e) – relationship of Maori with ancestral lands, sites etc, & 6(f) – protection of historic heritage; and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources, 7(c) – amenity values, 7(f) – quality of the environment, 7(g) – finite characteristics of resources, & 7(i) – climate change. <p>Clause c) also gives partial effect to Policy D in the NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011, & Policy 2 in the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008 (in terms of minimising reverse sensitivity effects on 'strategic infrastructure')¹¹.</p>	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing urban form across the region. Having confirmed that there are urban growth and infrastructure issues that are of regional significance, it is appropriate that the RPS contain objectives guiding appropriate urban form across the Region.</p> <p>Having no objective means that the region's urban growth would not be addressed in the RPS and would be left to be managed by the territorial authorities independently, with no overarching guidance at the regional level.</p> <p>This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of guiding the region's urban growth and achieving appropriate development.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Apply Objective to the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region Only</u></p> <p>This alternative involves retaining the objective but applying it only to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region. Whilst the majority of issues around planning for urban growth have been identified as relevant to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region (ie. through the HPUDS process), the fundamental outcomes of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compact, well-designed and strongly connected urban form, • achieving quality built environments, and • addressing the actual and potential adverse effects of urban development, <p>apply readily across the entire region.</p> <p>To single out the Heretaunga Plains sub-region in this sense, ignores the benefits that a region-wide approach would deliver in achieving the purpose of the RMA. Applying OBJ UD1 across the whole region is therefore considered more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>

¹¹ Proposed Change 4 proposes a definition of 'strategic infrastructure' that includes infrastructure that is nationally significant, and specifically refers to (amongst other examples) 'the Electricity Transmission Network and electricity distribution networks', and 'renewable electricity generation activities'.

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD2 – INTENSIFICATION (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)				
<p><i>Provide for residential growth in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region through higher density development.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD2 primarily addresses ISS UD2, but also aspects of ISS UD1. New development accommodates growth and provides the opportunity to enhance the quality of the environment. More intensive forms of development promote efficient use of existing infrastructure, minimise energy use, and reduce the need to encroach on the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains.</p>	<p>OBJ UD2 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30, specifically section 30(b) (effects of the use, development & protection of land which are of regional significance) and in terms of section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p>	<p>OBJ UD2 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use, development and protection of resources; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(b) – safeguarding life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; & 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources, & 7(g) – finite characteristics of resources. 	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing management of urban growth on the Heretaunga Plains. Having confirmed that there are urban growth and infrastructure issues specific to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, it is appropriate that the RPS contain objectives promoting higher density of development to minimise encroachment onto the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains.</p> <p>Having no objective means that urban growth on the Heretaunga Plains would not be addressed in the RPS and would be left to be managed by the territorial authorities independently, with no guidance at the regional level. This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of addressing sub-regional urban growth issues.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Apply Objective to the Whole Region</u></p> <p>This alternative involves retaining the objective but applying it to the whole Region. Whilst this would generally achieve the purpose of the RMA in addressing provision for growth of business activities efficiently, the issue has only been investigated in respect of the Heretaunga Plains sub-region at this current time.</p> <p>Elevating it to a region-wide objective is currently unwarranted – there is no supporting technical evidence that such intervention is needed, and a region-wide approach may lead to unintended consequences in terms of unreasonably curbing business location options in other parts of the Region.</p> <p>At this point in time, limiting the application of this objective to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region is more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD3 – PROVISION FOR BUSINESS LAND (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)				
<p><i>Identify and provide for the land requirements for the growth of business activities in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region in a manner that supports the settlement pattern promoted in OBJ UD1.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD3 specifically addresses the provision of future land for business activity in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, in a way that is cognisant of both ISS UD1 & ISS UD2. It recognises that provision of adequate land for future business activities is important for long term economic growth and the provision of both employment and services to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region (both now and in the future), but that it should be provided for in a way that supports compact, well designed, and strongly connected urban form.</p>	<p>OBJ UD3 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30, specifically section 30(b) (effects of the use, development & protection of land which are of regional significance) and in terms of section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p>	<p>OBJ UD3 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use & development of resources while enabling people and communities to provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources. 	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing land use management and urban form at the regional or sub-regional scale. Having confirmed that there are urban growth and infrastructure issues specific to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, it is appropriate that the RPS contain objectives guiding the appropriate provision for that growth.</p> <p>Having no objective means that provision for growth of business in the sub-region would not be addressed in the RPS and would be left to be managed by the territorial authorities independently, with no overarching guidance at the regional level. This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of addressing specific urban growth & infrastructure issues identified in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Apply Objective to the Whole Region</u></p> <p>This alternative involves retaining the objective but applying it to the whole Region. Whilst this would generally achieve the purpose of the RMA in addressing provision for growth of business activities efficiently, the issue has only been investigated in respect of the Heretaunga Plains sub-region at this current time.</p> <p>Elevating it to a region-wide objective is currently unwarranted – there is no supporting technical evidence that such intervention is needed, and a region-wide approach may lead to unintended consequences in terms of unreasonably curbing business location options in other parts of the Region.</p> <p>At this point in time, limiting the application of this objective to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region is more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD4 – PLANNED PROVISION FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)				
<p><i>Enable urban development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, in an integrated, planned and staged manner, which allows for the adequate and timely supply of land and associated infrastructure.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD4 addresses ISS UD1 specifically as it relates to the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, in terms of enabling planned urban development in the sub-region that takes into account the efficient and planned provision of infrastructure. Successful long term growth management in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region is dependent on integrating long term land use, the infrastructure necessary to support this, and the ability to fund and supply the infrastructure in a timely and sustainable manner.</p>	<p>OBJ UD4 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30, specifically section 30(b) (land of regional significance) and section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p>	<p>OBJ UD4 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use and development of resources while enabling people and communities to provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing, health and safety; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(b) – safeguarding life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources, 7(c) – amenity values, 7(f) – quality of the environment, & 7(g) – finite characteristics of resources. <p>OBJ UD4 also gives partial effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008 (facilitating long-term planning for investment in transmission infrastructure and its integration with land uses).</p>	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing strategic integration of infrastructure with land use. The strategic integration of infrastructure and land use is a clear function of the Regional Council.</p> <p>Having confirmed that there are urban growth and infrastructure issues that are of particular significance for the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, it is appropriate that the RPS contain objectives guiding integrated, planned and staged urban development for that part of the Region.</p> <p>Having no objective means that the integration and staging of urban development would not be addressed in the RPS and would be left to be managed by the territorial authorities independently, with no overarching guidance at the regional level.</p> <p>This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of addressing specific urban growth & infrastructure issues in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Rely on OBJ UD5</u></p> <p>OBJ UD5 provides region-wide guidance for the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use. OBJ UD5 therefore could be sufficient for achieving the purpose of the RMA in terms of achieving development that is integrated with the planning & provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>However, it is considered that OBJ UD4 (in combination with OBJ UD5) is more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA, as it refers specifically to the timely supply of land and staging of development reflecting the different rates of growth and different pressures expected in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region compared to other parts of the Region.</p>

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD5 – INTEGRATION OF LAND USE WITH SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE (REGION)				
<p><i>Ensure through long-term planning for land use change throughout the Region, that the rate and location of development is integrated with the provision of strategic and other infrastructure, the provision of services, and associated funding mechanisms.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD5 addresses ISS UD1 at a region-wide level, through focus on the rate and location of development in a way that is integrated with the provision of strategic and other infrastructure. It recognises that consideration needs to be given to sequencing and costs of infrastructure development in decision making, as these can have significant effects on efficiency & the economic well-being of communities.</p>	<p>OBJ UD5 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30, specifically section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p>	<p>OBJ UD5 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use and development of resources while enabling people and communities to provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing, health and safety; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(b) – safeguarding life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources, 7(f) – quality of the environment, & 7(g) – finite characteristics of resources. <p>OBJ UD5 also gives partial effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008 (facilitating long-term planning for investment in transmission infrastructure and its integration with land uses).</p>	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use across the Region. The strategic integration of infrastructure and land use is a clear function of the Regional Council.</p> <p>Having confirmed that there are general land use and infrastructure integration issues across the Region, it is appropriate that the RPS contain objectives to guide long term land use planning.</p> <p>Having no objective means that the integration of infrastructure with land use for the rest of the Region (outside of the Heretaunga Plains sub-region) would not be addressed in the RPS and would be left to be managed by the territorial authorities independently, with no overarching guidance at the regional level.</p> <p>This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of addressing this issue from a region-wide perspective.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Rely on OBJ UD4</u></p> <p>OBJ UD4 provides guidance for the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use but is directed at issues in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region only. The strategic integration of infrastructure with land use is a common issue across all the local authorities within the Hawke's Bay Region.</p> <p>Therefore, relying solely on OBJ UD4 does not achieve the purpose of the RMA for those parts of the Region that sit outside of the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</p> <p>It is considered that OBJ UD5 (in combination with OBJ UD4) is more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>

PROPOSED OBJECTIVE	DOES IT ADDRESS THE ISSUES?	IS IT APPROPRIATE IN TERMS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL FUNCTIONS?	DOES IT ACHIEVE THE PURPOSE OF THE RMA?	ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
OBJ UD6 – INTEGRATION OF TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE WITH DEVELOPMENT (REGION)				
<p><i>Ensure that the planning and provision of transport infrastructure is integrated with development and settlement patterns and facilitates the movement of goods and provision of services throughout the Region, while:</i></p> <p>a) <i>limiting network congestion;</i></p> <p>b) <i>reducing dependency on private motor vehicles;</i></p> <p>c) <i>reducing emission of contaminants to air and energy use; and</i></p> <p>d) <i>promoting the use of active transport modes.</i></p>	<p>OBJ UD6 addresses ISS UD1 specifically in terms of the planning and provision of transport infrastructure at a regional level, and the need to integrate such infrastructure with development and settlement patterns. Land use patterns that are integrated with transport infrastructure minimise energy use through network optimisation, and enables greater recognition of the importance of strategic transport networks in supporting the economic and social wellbeing, and health and safety, of people and communities.</p> <p>This objective also ties in with the objectives of the Regional Land Transport Strategy.</p>	<p>OBJ UD6 is considered to be appropriate in terms of Council's functions as set out in section 30, specifically section 30(gb) (strategic integration of infrastructure with land use).</p>	<p>OBJ UD6 is considered most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA, specifically in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 5 (managing use and development of resources while enabling people and communities to provide for social, economic and cultural wellbeing, health and safety; 5(a) – sustaining potential of natural and physical resources to meet reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; 5(b) – safeguarding life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; 5(c) – avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects); and • section 7(b) – efficient use and development of resources, 7(ba) – efficiency of the end use of energy, 7(f) – quality of the environment, & 7(g) – finite characteristics of resources. 	<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Objective in the RPS</u></p> <p>There are currently no objectives in the RPS addressing the integration of transport infrastructure with development. Regional Council has direct responsibilities under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 which aims towards achieving an 'integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system'.</p> <p>Further, the strategic integration of infrastructure and land use is a clear function of the Regional Council under the RMA.</p> <p>It is therefore appropriate that the RPS contain objectives that tie long term transport infrastructure planning with long term land use planning at a regional level.</p> <p>Having no objective means that integrating the region's transport infrastructure would not be addressed in the RPS. This alternative therefore does <u>not</u> achieve the purpose of the RMA in terms of the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Rely on OBJ UD5</u></p> <p>OBJ UD5 provides guidance for the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use across the Region. The definition proposed for 'strategic infrastructure' in Proposed Change 4 includes reference to 'strategic transport networks' which is then further defined.</p> <p>OBJ UD5 therefore could be sufficient for achieving the purpose of the RMA and the Land Transport Management Act in terms of integrating transport infrastructure planning with long term land use planning.</p> <p>However, it is considered that OBJ UD6, which refers specifically to the unique benefits of integrated provision of transport infrastructure with development and settlement patterns, is more appropriate in achieving the purpose of the RMA.</p>

6 Appropriateness of Policies & Methods for Achieving the Objectives

Proposed Change 4 proposes fourteen (14) policies and six (6) methods to achieve the six proposed objectives in the new chapter. The objectives are specifically addressed through the policies and methods as follows:

OBJECTIVE	POLICIES & METHODS
<p>OBJ UD1 Urban Form (Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities; - POL UD2 Provision for Business Activities; - POL UD3 Rural Residential and Lifestyle Development; - POL UD4 Establishing Urban Limits; - POL UD5 Containing Urban Activities within Urban Limits; - POL UD6 Provision for Papakainga and Marae-Based Development; - POL UD7 Intensification in Existing Urban Areas; - POL UD8 Density of Urban Development; - POL UD12 Matters for Decision-Making; - POL UD13 Servicing of Developments; - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; MET UD4 Transportation Strategies; MET UD5 Provision of Information and Services; MET UD6 Preparation and Review of Objectives, Policies and Methods in Regional Plans; and District Plans.</p>
<p>OBJ UD2 Intensification (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD4 Establishing Urban Limits; - POL UD5 Containing Urban Activities within Urban Limits; - POL UD7 Intensification in Existing Urban Areas; - POL UD8 Density of Urban Development; - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; MET UD6 Preparation and Review of Objectives, Policies and Methods in Regional Plans; and District Plans.</p>
<p>OBJ UD3 Provision for Business Land (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities; - POL UD2 Provision for Business Activities; - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; and District Plans.</p>

<p>OBJ UD4 Planned Provision for Urban Development (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities; - POL UD9 Sequencing; - POL UD10 Structure Plans; - POL UD11 Rezoning for Urban Development; - POL UD12 Matters to have Regard to; - POL UD13 Servicing of Developments; - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; MET UD4; and District Plans.</p>
<p>OBJ UD5 Integration of Land Use with Significant Infrastructure (Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities; - POL UD2 Provision for Business Activities; - POL UD3 Rural Residential and Lifestyle Development; - POL UD9 Sequencing; - POL UD10 Structure Plans; - POL UD11 Rezoning for Urban Development; - POL UD12 Matters to have Regard to; - POL UD13 Servicing of Developments; - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; MET UD4; and District Plans.</p>
<p>OBJ UD6 Integration of Transport Infrastructure with Development (Region)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities; - POL UD2 Provision for Business Activities; - POL UD3 Rural Residential and Lifestyle Development; - POL UD4 Establishing Urban Limits; - POL UD5 Containing Urban Activities within Urban Limits; - POL UD9 Sequencing; - POL UD10 Structure Plans; - POL UD11 Rezoning for Urban Development; - POL UD12 Matters to have Regard to; and <p>Methods MET UD1 Advocacy; MET UD3 Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration; MET UD4; MET UD6 Preparation and Review of Objectives, Policies and Methods in Regional Plans; and District Plans.</p>

Those fourteen policies can be further grouped as follows, for evaluation purposes:

POLICY SUBJECT	POLICIES
Providing for development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD1 Provision for Urban Activities (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - POL UD2 Provision for Business Activities (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - POL UD3 Rural Residential and Lifestyle Development. (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region)
Achieving containment of urban activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD4 Establishing Urban Limits (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - POL UD5 Containing Urban Activities within Urban Limits (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region).
Providing for the relationship of Maori with their ancestral lands etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD6 Provision for Papakainga and Marae-Based Development (Region).
Encouraging intensification of urban activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD7 Intensification in Existing Urban Areas (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - POL UD8 Density of Urban Development (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region).
Achieving strategic integration of infrastructure with land use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD9 Sequencing Decision-Making Criteria (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region); - POL UD10 Structure Plans (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region/Region); - POL UD11 Rezoning for Urban Development (Region); - POL UD12 Matters for Decision-Making (Region); - POL UD13 Servicing of Developments (Region).
Monitoring and review of development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - POL UD14 Monitoring and Review (Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region).

Section 32(3)(b) requires an examination of whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.

Proposed Change 4 does not amend existing rules or propose new rules in the Regional Resource Management Plan. Change 4 only alters provisions in the RPS and rules cannot be included in an RPS.

In determining whether the policies and methods contained in Proposed Change 4 are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives, section 32(4) requires that this evaluation take into account:

- a) the effectiveness and efficiency of the policies and methods;
- b) the benefits and costs of the policies and methods; and
- c) the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies or methods.

Table 3 provides a summary of this evaluation in terms of any costs, risks and uncertainties associated with the policies and methods chosen; any benefits; and their effectiveness and efficiency in achieving the stated objectives, with an accompanying evaluation of alternative policy approaches. This evaluation is based on grouping the policies by policy subject as detailed above.

Table 3: Evaluation of Policies & Methods

POLICIES & METHODS PROVIDING FOR DEVELOPMENT		
<p>PROVISION FOR URBAN ACTIVITIES POL UD1 <i>In providing for urban activities in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, territorial authorities must place priority on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the retention of the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains for existing and foreseeable future primary production, and b) ensuring efficient utilisation of existing infrastructure. 		
<p>PROVISION FOR BUSINESS ACTIVITIES POL UD2 <i>In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, district plans shall provide for business activities to 2045, in a manner which:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reinforces the role of Napier and Hastings cities as the commercial and business core of the Heretaunga Plains, whilst supporting adequate capacity in defined rural towns and settlements for a range of day-to-day services and activities; b) Promotes the utilisation and redevelopment of existing commercial land; c) Promotes the utilisation and redevelopment of existing industrial land, and provides sufficient additional greenfields industrial land on an uptake basis; d) Promotes the utilisation of existing infrastructure availability, capacity and quality as far as reasonably practicable; e) Avoids unnecessary encroachment onto the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains; f) Protects existing and future communities from reverse sensitivity issues; g) Ensures close proximity to labour supply, major transport hubs and multi-modal transport networks; and h) Avoids or mitigates the following locational constraints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. projected sea level rise as a result of climatic changes ii. active coastal erosion and inundation iii. stormwater infrastructure unable to mitigate identified flooding risk iv. flood control and drainage schemes are at or over capacity v. active earthquake faults vi. high liquefaction potential vii. sensitive waterbodies are nearby, susceptible to potential contamination from runoff, stormwater discharges, or wastewater treatment and disposal. viii. no current wastewater reticulation and the land is poor draining ix. water short areas affecting the provision of adequate water supply. 		
<p>RURAL RESIDENTIAL AND LIFESTYLE DEVELOPMENT POL UD3 <i>In the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region, district plans shall include policies and methods discouraging or avoiding ad hoc residential development and further rezoning for rural residential purposes or lifestyle development outside existing rural residential zones.</i></p>		
<p>METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Plans • Advocacy (MET UD1) • Monitoring and Review (MET UD2) • Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3) • Preparation and Review of Objectives, Policies and Methods in Regional Plans; and District Plans (MET UD6) 		
COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES	BENEFITS	EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?
<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration costs incurred by individual territorial authorities through district plan policy development and resource consent processes. <p><u>BROADER ECONOMIC COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially constrains the range of investment/development decisions. <p><u>SOCIAL COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constrains the range of growth location options. <p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some encroachment onto versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains is acknowledged and required. 	<p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of the majority of the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains resource (other than on the fringes) for continued primary production for current and future generations. • Land use patterns that result in less reverse sensitivity effects in rural productive environments. • Better manages competing demands for land from production, urbanisation and recreation. <p><u>SOCIAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of ongoing social wellbeing to rural communities in providing for urban activities primarily off the versatile land. <p><u>ECONOMIC BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a degree of certainty to rural producers and businesses in making investment decisions. • Priority placed on versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains for primary production. • Maintains contribution of versatile land to the rural productive economy (on-going economic well-being). 	<p><u>EFFICIENCY</u></p> <p>Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD1, POL UD2 and POL UD3 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:</p> <p>Efficient</p> <p><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></p> <p>POL UD1, POL UD2 and POL UD3 and its methods are considered to be:</p> <p>Highly Effective</p> <p>given that the purpose is to meet the growth needs in the sub-region while valuing versatile land and the benefits of efficient utilisation of existing infrastructure investment. The policies are particularly relevant to achieving objectives OBJ UD1, OBJ UD3, OBJ UD4, OBJ UD5 and OBJ UD6 which seek to achieve a compact and strongly connected urban form that is integrated and efficient and avoids unnecessary encroachment on the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains land for agricultural production for current and future generations. • Reduces impact on productivity of other land (reverse sensitivity). • Economic efficiencies in utilising existing planned infrastructure and investment in infrastructure. • Retaining versatile soils close to urban areas lowers transport costs, creates local economy. • Better manages competing demands for land from rural production versus urbanisation. 	
<p>ALTERNATIVES</p>		
<p><u>Alternative 1 – No Policies or Methods Providing for Development in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region in the RPS</u> Unless controlled by District Plans, adverse effects of urban development on the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains may occur and may result in inefficient utilisation of infrastructure. A policy approach without these policies would provide no guidance on the settlement pattern promoted.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Apply Policies Across the Whole Region</u> The issues surrounding growth and versatile land are not currently significant enough to warrant such policy guidance across the entire Region. The focus of research to-date has only been on known versatile land issues and pressures being experienced on the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.</p>		
<p>THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION</p>		
<p>There is sufficient information for Council to act, particularly in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.</p>		
<p>OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME</p>		
<p><i>Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policies POL UD1, POL UD2 and POL UD3 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.</i></p>		

POLICIES & METHODS TO ACHIEVE CONTAINMENT OF URBAN ACTIVITIES

ESTABLISHING URBAN LIMITS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD4.1

Within the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, district plans shall identify urban limits for those urban areas and settlements within which urban activities can occur, sufficient to cater for anticipated population and household growth to 2045.

GREENFIELD GROWTH AREA CRITERIA (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD4.2

In determining future Greenfield Growth Areas for inclusion within urban limits in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, the following general criteria shall apply:

- a) *Must form an extension contiguous with existing urban areas and settlements.*
- b) *Land is identified as having low versatility, and/or productive capacity has been compromised by:*
 - i. *size and shape of land parcels that mitigates against productive use;*
 - ii. *surrounding land uses and reverse sensitivity;*
 - iii. *lack of water and/or poor drainage.*
- c) *Clear natural boundaries exist, or logical greenbelts could be created to establish a defined urban edge.*
- d) *Supports compact urban form.*
- e) *Can be serviced at reasonable cost.*
- f) *Can be integrated with existing development.*
- g) *Can be integrated with the provision of strategic and other infrastructure (particularly strategic transport networks in order to limit network congestion, reduce dependency on private motor vehicles and promote the use of active transport modes).*
- h) *An appropriate separation distance from electricity transmission infrastructure should be maintained in order to ensure the continued safe and efficient operation and development of the electricity transmission network.*
- i) *Promotes, and does not compromise, social infrastructure including community, education, sport and recreation facilities and public open space.*
- j) *Further locational constraints that must be mitigated before a growth area can be considered for inclusion within the urban limits, are where:*
 - i. *there is projected sea level rise as a result of climate changes*
 - ii. *there is active coastal erosion and inundation*
 - iii. *stormwater infrastructure is unable to mitigate identified flooding risk*
 - iv. *flood control and drainage schemes are at or over capacity*
 - v. *there are active earthquake faults*
 - vi. *there is high liquefaction potential*
 - vii. *there are sensitive waterbodies nearby, susceptible to potential contamination from on-site wastewater systems or stormwater discharges*
 - viii. *there is currently no wastewater reticulation and the land is poor draining*
 - ix. *there are identified water short areas affecting the provision of adequate water supply.*

APPROPRIATE GREENFIELD GROWTH AREAS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD4.3

Within the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, areas where future residential greenfield growth for the 2015-2045 period has been identified as appropriate and providing choice in location, subject to further assessment referred to in POL UD10.1, POL UD10.2, POL UD10.3 and POL UD12, are:

- a) *Bay View*
- b) *Park Island/Parklands*
- c) *Taradale Hills*
- d) *Te Awa/The Loop*
- e) *Arataki Extension*
- f) *Haumoana/Te Awanga*
- g) *Havelock North Hills (lower extension)*
- h) *Howard Street*
- i) *Irongate Road/York*
- j) *Kaiapo Road*
- k) *Lyndhurst*
- l) *Lyndhurst Road extension*
- m) *Maraekakaho rural settlement*
- n) *Middle Road/Iona/Hills*
- o) *Murdoch Road/Copeland*
- p) *Omahu/Bridge Pa (marae-based)*
- q) *Waimarama*

The indicative locations of the above areas are shown in Appendix B.

INAPPROPRIATE FOR GREENFIELD GROWTH AREAS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD4.4

Within the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, areas where future greenfield growth has been determined as inappropriate, are:

- a) *Waipatiki Beach;*
- b) *Tangoio;*
- c) *Whirinaki;*
- d) *Puketapu;*
- e) *Jervoistown and Meeanee;*
- f) *Clive;*
- g) *East Clive;*
- h) *Ocean Beach – apart from the potential for appropriate growth of the existing Waipuka bach settlement on Maori land inland of areas at risk of coastal hazards*
- i) *Natural detention areas (50 year flood ponding areas)*

<p>CONTAINING URBAN ACTIVITIES WITHIN URBAN LIMITS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION) POL UD5 <i>Except as provided for in POL UD6 (provision for papakainga and marae-based activities), district plans shall include policies and methods to discourage or avoid inappropriate urban activities beyond urban limits established in accordance with POL UD4 within the Heretaunga Plains sub-region.</i></p>		
<p>METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Plans • Advocacy (MET UD1) • Monitoring & Review (MET UD2) • Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3) • Provision of Information and Service (MET UD5) 		
<p>COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES</p> <p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration costs incurred by individual territorial authorities through district plan policy development and resource consent processes. <p><u>BROADER ECONOMIC COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity cost of developing land suitable for urban purposes as opposed to rural purposes. <p><u>SOCIAL COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for growth in some communities/settlements will be restricted which may limit their ability to develop in line with landowner aspirations. 	<p>BENEFITS</p> <p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects natural character areas and sensitive water bodies through better containment and location of growth areas. • Integrity of the versatile land of the Heretaunga Plains resource maintained for continued primary production for current and future generations. • Land use patterns that result in less reverse sensitivity effects in rural productive environments. <p><u>SOCIAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential conflict between incompatible land uses is avoided. • Social well-being is enhanced through promoting social infrastructure. • Promotes social well-being by avoiding development subject to risk from natural hazards and/or reverse sensitivity effects between incompatible activities. <p><u>ECONOMIC BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better manages competing demands for land from rural production versus urbanisation. • Avoids land use patterns that could curtail rural productive activities. Commercial decisions to be made for primary production can therefore be made with higher degree of certainty. • Avoids economic cost by avoiding development subject to risk from natural hazards and incompatible activities. • Avoids economic cost of services in marginal areas. 	<p>EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?</p> <p><u>EFFICIENCY</u></p> <p>Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD4 and POL UD5 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Efficient</i></p> <p><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></p> <p>POL UD4 and POL UD5 and their methods are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Moderately/Highly Effective</i></p> <p>given that the purpose is to meet the growth needs in the sub-region through consolidation, whilst providing some flexibility for development outside of existing urban areas where such development would not undermine that purpose.</p> <p>The policies are particularly relevant to achieving OBJ UD1, OBJ UD2 and OBJ UD6 which seek to achieve a compact and strongly connected urban form that provides for growth needs in an integrated, planned manner.</p>
<p>ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>Alternative 1 – No Policies or Methods Guiding Spatial Development for the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region in the RPS</u></p> <p>Having no preferred spatial development pattern for the Heretaunga Plains means that urban growth management would be left to the territorial authorities to manage independently, with no guidance addressing issues at the regional or sub-regional level. Sporadic and unplanned urban development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region results in potentially significant land use change which can result in inefficient infrastructural investment and encroachment onto the valuable versatile land resource. This alternative therefore does not achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.</p> <p><u>Alternative 2 – Specify Urban Limits for the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region on Maps contained in the RPS</u></p> <p>Unlike other Regions, there is currently insufficient information to enable detailed mapping of urban limits and future greenfield growth areas in the RPS for the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.</p> <p><u>Alternative 3 - Apply Urban Limits Across Whole Region</u></p> <p>The focus of research to-date has only been on known versatile land issues and pressures being experienced on the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region. There is no detailed research or data into growth pressures for the rest of the region that would suggest specific policy at the regional level is warranted at this time. Therefore, there is no robust basis to apply urban limits policy to the entire region.</p> <p>Note: POL UD2 and POL UD3 do not preclude a local policy response at the district plan level by individual territorial authorities beyond the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region, in seeking to give effect to their own functions under the RMA.</p>		
<p>THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION</p> <p>There is sufficient information for Council to act, particularly in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.</p>		
<p>OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME</p> <p><i>Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policies POL UD4 and POL UD5 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.</i></p>		

<p>PROVISION FOR PAKAINGA AND MARAE-BASED DEVELOPMENT (REGION) POL UD6 <i>District plans shall enable papakainga and marae-based development outside existing urban areas and any urban limits, provided development:</i> <i>a) meets general criteria (e) to (j) in POL UD4.2; and</i> <i>b) within the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, is not one of the areas listed in POL UD4.4 as inappropriate (unless further assessment confirms otherwise).</i></p>		
<p>METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Plans • Advocacy (MET UD1) • Monitoring & Review (MET UD2) • Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3) • Provision of Information and Services (MET UD5) 		
<p>COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES</p> <p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration costs incurred by individual territorial authorities through district plan policy development and resource consent processes. <p><u>BROADER ECONOMIC COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially significant infrastructure services costs (sewerage, stormwater, potable water) generally associated with more remote development. <p><u>SOCIAL COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of unequal development opportunities, depending on land tenure. 	<p>BENEFITS</p> <p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of heritage values associated with ancestral lands, waahi tapu and other taonga. <p><u>SOCIAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides opportunity for tangata whenua housing needs and therefore for their social well-being. <p><u>ECONOMIC BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides development opportunity for tangata whenua on their ancestral land, away from hazards. <p><u>CULTURAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides opportunity to establish papakainga housing and marae-based development on ancestral land thereby meeting tangata whenua cultural relationship and traditional needs with their ancestral land. 	<p>EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?</p> <p><u>EFFICIENCY</u></p> <p>Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD6 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Efficient</i></p> <p><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></p> <p>POL UD6 and its methods are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Moderately/Highly Effective</i></p> <p>given that the purpose is to enable development of papakainga housing and marae-based development on ancestral land which will provide for the social, economic and cultural well-being of tangata whenua, so giving partial effect to section 6(e) of the RMA (being a matter of national importance). In doing so, it still sets environmental bottomline requirements but does recognise that some level of cost is inevitable (specifically associated with servicing more remote locations). The policy is particularly relevant to achieving OBJ UD1 which seeks to achieve quality built environments that provide for a range of housing choices and affordability and social resilience while retaining heritage values and values important to tangata whenua.</p>
<p>ALTERNATIVES</p> <p><u>Alternative 1 – No Specific Policy or Methods Providing for Papakainga and Marae-Based Development in the RPS</u></p> <p>Having no specific policy providing for papakainga and marae-based development provides little guidance in giving effect to section 6(e) matters in respect of urban development, and does not assist in achieving objective OBJ UD1 in terms of providing for a range of housing choices, retaining heritage values and values important to tangata whenua, and achieving built environments that recognise the importance of social resilience.</p>		
<p>THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION</p> <p>There is sufficient information for Council to act, particularly in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.</p>		
<p>OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME</p> <p><i>Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policy POL UD6 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.</i></p>		

POLICIES & METHODS ENCOURAGING INTENSIFICATION OF URBAN ACTIVITY

INTENSIFICATION IN EXISTING URBAN AREAS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD7

In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, district plans shall include objectives, policies and methods promoting intensification of redevelopment within existing urban areas.

DENSITY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AREAS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD8

In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, residential subdivision and development shall seek to achieve the following minimum net densities, averaged over the whole of a Greenfield Growth Area of intensification development area:

- a) *At least 15 lots or dwellings per hectare in Greenfield Growth Areas;*
- b) *At least 20 lots or dwellings per hectare for development within existing urban areas.*

METHODS

- *District Plans*
- *Advocacy (MET UD1)*
- *Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3)*

COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

- Administration costs incurred by individual territorial authorities through district plan policy development and resource consent processes.
- Data gathering and analysis for territorial authorities to identify suitable areas that have capacity for intensification.

BROADER ECONOMIC COSTS

- Redevelopment costs higher in terms of cost of existing established land being higher than greenfield to develop.
- Upfront development cost is higher for multi-unit development options.

SOCIAL COSTS

- Reduces options of locations for people to provide for the future well-being.
- Change in amenity for surrounding community due to higher density could be perceived as negative.

ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS

- Potential for increased traffic congestion.

BENEFITS

ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

- Intensification reduces effects of urban sprawl onto versatile land.
- Potential for reduced fossil fuel consumption with greater use of alternative non-motorised transport modes and proximity of social infrastructure.

SOCIAL BENEFITS

- Compact development better supports social infrastructure.
- Reinforces the function of existing towns and villages.
- Potential improved use of alternative non-motorised transport modes where there is higher density with local facilities nearby.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

- Robust, integrated and connected development through considered design, co-ordination and connectivity of development and infrastructure provides opportunity for financial cost savings.
- Efficient utilisation of existing and planned infrastructure investment.
- Compact, liveable urban neighbourhoods attract more people and business.
- Averaged over whole Greenfield Growth Area provides flexibility to respond to other constraints (e.g. natural hazard/topographical risks) and market demand for lot size options.
- Economic benefits derived from having knowledge and certainty as to the location and extent of infrastructural network requirements for an area.
- Appropriately sized and located services avoid future costs of retrofitting/upgrading infrastructure to accommodate urban growth.

EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?

EFFICIENCY

Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD7 and UD8 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:

Efficient

EFFECTIVENESS

POL UD7 and UD8 and its methods are considered to be:

Moderately Effective

given that the purpose is to achieve higher density development and the efficiencies associated with more compact development.

The policies are particularly relevant to achieving OBJ UD1 and OBJ UD2 which seek to achieve a compact and strongly connected urban form and provision for residential growth through higher density development.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 – No Policies or Methods Encouraging Intensification of Urban Activity in the RPS

Having no preferred intensification pattern for the Heretaunga Plains means that urban growth management would be left to the territorial authorities to manage independently, with no guidance addressing issues at the regional or sub-regional level. Sporadic and unplanned urban development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region results in potentially significant land use change which can result in inefficient infrastructural investment and encroachment onto the valuable versatile land resource. This alternative therefore does not better achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

Alternative 2 – Apply Policies Across Whole Region

The issues surrounding growth and versatile land are not currently significant enough to warrant such policy guidance across the entire Region. The focus of research to-date has only been on known versatile land issues and pressures being experienced on the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region. Note: POL UD7 & POL UD8 do not preclude a local policy response at the district plan level by individual territorial authorities beyond the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region, in seeking to give effect to their own functions under the RMA.

THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

There is sufficient information for Council to act, particularly in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.

OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME

Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policies POL UD7 & POL UD8 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

POLICIES & METHODS FOR ACHIEVING THE STRATEGIC INTEGRATION OF INFRASTRUCTURE WITH LAND USE

SEQUENCING (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD9.1

In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, district plans shall provide for the strategic integration of infrastructure and development through the staged release of new Greenfield Growth Areas.

SEQUENCING DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD9.2

In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, the sequencing of development for Greenfield Growth Areas shall be based on the following criteria:

- a) Availability and costs of infrastructure services (water, wastewater, stormwater and transport);*
- b) The operational capacity of strategic infrastructure (particularly strategic transport networks);*
- c) The accessibility and capacity of social infrastructure (particularly community, education, sport & recreation facilities and public open space);*
- d) The sustainable management of natural & physical resources;*
- e) Balanced supply and locational choice across the sub-region; and*
- f) The availability of employment opportunities in and near the Greenfield Growth Areas.*

STRUCTURE PLANS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD10.1

In the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, development of urban activities within Greenfield Growth Areas shall occur in accordance with a comprehensive Structure Plan. Structure Plans shall be prepared when it is proposed to amend the district plan, and shall be included in the district plan to provide for urban activities.

STRUCTURE PLANS (REGION)

POL UD10.2

Structure Plans for any area in the Region shall:

- a) Be prepared as a single plan for the whole of a Greenfield Growth Area;*
- b) Be prepared in accordance with the matters set out in POL UD12;*
- c) Show indicative land uses, including:

 - i. principal roads and connections with the surrounding road network and relevant infrastructure and services;*
 - ii. land required for stormwater treatment, retention and drainage paths;*
 - iii. any land to be set aside for business activities, recreation, community facilities, environmental or landscape protection or enhancement, or set aside from development for any other reason; and*
 - iv. pedestrian walkways, cycleways, and potential public passenger transport routes both within and adjoining the area to be developed;**
- d) Identify significant natural, cultural and historic or heritage features.*

POL UD10.3

In developing Structure Plans for any area in the Region, supporting documentation should address:

- a) The infrastructure required, and when it will be required to service the development area;*
- b) How development may present opportunities for improvements to existing infrastructure provision;*
- c) How effective provision is made for a range of transport options and integration between transport modes;*
- d) How provision is made for the continued use, maintenance and development of strategic infrastructure;*
- e) How effective management of stormwater and wastewater discharges is to be achieved;*
- f) How significant natural, cultural and historic or heritage features and values are to be protected and/or enhanced;*
- g) How any natural hazards will be avoided or mitigated; and*
- h) Any other aspects relevant to an understanding of the development and its proposed zoning.*

REZONING FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT (REGION)

POL UD11

Any rezoning for the development of urban activities within the Region should be accompanied by a Structure Plan for inclusion in the District Plan, in accordance with the matters in POL UD9.2 and POL UD9.3 (Structure Plans) and POL UD11 (urban design matters).

MATTERS FOR DECISION-MAKING (REGION)

POL UD12

In preparing or assessing any rezoning, Structure Plans, or other provisions for the urban development of land within the Region, territorial authorities shall have regard to:

- a) The principles of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (Ministry for the Environment, 2005);*
- b) New Zealand Standard NZS4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure, and subsequent revisions;*
- c) Good, safe connectivity within the area, and to surrounding areas, by a variety of transport modes, including motor vehicles, cycling, pedestrian and public transport, and provision for easy and safe transfer between modes of transport;*
- d) Location within walkable distance to community, social and commercial facilities;*
- e) Provision for a range of residential densities and lot sizes, with higher residential densities located within walking distance of commercial centres;*
- f) Provision for the maintenance and enhancement of water in waterbodies, including appropriate stormwater management facilities to avoid downstream flooding and to maintain or enhance water quality;*
- g) Provision for sufficient and integrated open spaces and parks to enable people to meet their recreation needs, with higher levels of public open space for areas of higher residential density;*
- h) Protection and enhancement of significant natural, ecological, landscape, cultural and historic heritage features;*
- i) Provision for a high standard of visual interest and amenity;*
- j) Provision for people's health and well-being through good building design, including energy efficiency and the provision of natural light;*
- k) Provision for low impact stormwater treatment and disposal;*
- l) Avoidance, remediation or mitigation of reverse sensitivity effects at the urban/rural interface on primary production activities;*
- m) Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on existing strategic and other physical infrastructure, to the extent reasonably possible;*
- n) Effective and efficient use of existing and new infrastructure networks, including opportunities to leverage improvements to existing infrastructure off the back of proposed development;*
- o) Location and operational constraints of existing and planned strategic infrastructure; and*
- p) Appropriate relationships in terms of scale and style with the surrounding neighbourhood.*

<p>SERVICING OF DEVELOPMENTS (REGION) POL UD13 <i>Within the Region, territorial authorities shall ensure development is appropriately and efficiently serviced for the collection, treatment, disposal or re-use of sewage and stormwater, and the provision of potable water by:</i></p> <p>a) <i>Avoiding development which will not be serviced in a timely manner to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on the environment and human health; and</i> b) <i>Requiring these services to be designed, built, managed or upgraded to maximise their ongoing effectiveness.</i></p>		
<p>METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>District Plans</i> • <i>Regional Resource Management Plan</i> • <i>Regional Coastal Environment Plan</i> • <i>Advocacy (MET UD1)</i> • <i>Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3)</i> • <i>Transportation Strategies (MET UD4)</i> • <i>Preparation and Review of Objectives, Policies and Methods in Regional Plans; and District Plans (MET UD6)</i> 		
<p>COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES</p> <p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration costs incurred by individual territorial authorities through district plan policy development and resource consent processes. <p><u>COMPLIANCE COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated with development of detailed structure plans. • Associated with detailed investigations and design of servicing of development at time of district plan change. <p><u>BROADER ECONOMIC COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible additional costs incurred by adopting energy efficient design and building materials and principles (although such costs are often more as a result of Building Act requirements). <p><u>SOCIAL COSTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that strategic infrastructure is given unwarranted priority over day to day and long term community aspirations. • Potential for undesirable social outcomes if not managed, or policy is not achieved. 	<p>BENEFITS</p> <p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure from sensitive land use activities. • Provides for operation and development of strategic infrastructure. • Recognition and protection afforded to significant natural resources in the region from the efficient operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of strategic infrastructure. • Through design and structure plans, important natural, physical and cultural resources can be managed or protected within any development. • Benefits derived from provision of highly integrated and permeable multi modal transport systems facilitating people movement. <p><u>SOCIAL BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and improve communities' health and safety through the provision of efficient and effective strategic infrastructure. • Social benefit derived from knowledge and certainty that levels of service of strategic infrastructure are maintained and where appropriate expanded and improved. • Through careful design, the day to day needs of people and communities can be met, therefore contributing to their social well-being. • Through design there is an opportunity to provide for and access new open space areas. • Structure planning provides opportunity for community facilities to be provided to meet community needs. • Community safety, health and well-being derived from having effective strategic and social infrastructure networks. <p><u>ECONOMIC BENEFITS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of infrastructure with land use provides the opportunity to identify and protect future development options. • Integrating infrastructure with land use ensures efficient infrastructure investment decisions. • Economic benefits derived from having knowledge and certainty as to the location and extent of network requirements for an area. • Investments and development decisions can be made with a high degree of understanding, expectation and less risk. • Appropriately sized and located services avoid future costs of retrofitting/upgrading infrastructure to accommodate urban growth. • Provides opportunity for strategic infrastructure/network utility providers to identify and protect future development options in advance. 	<p>EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?</p> <p><u>EFFICIENCY</u></p> <p>Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD9, POL UD10, POL UD11, POL UD12 and POL UD13 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Efficient</i></p> <p><u>EFFECTIVENESS</u></p> <p>POL UD9, POL UD10, POL UD11, POL UD12 and POL UD13 and their methods are considered to be:</p> <p><i>Highly Effective</i></p> <p>given that the purpose is to guide urban development in a way that ensures appropriate infrastructure is in place or planned in an efficient integrated manner.</p> <p>The policies are particularly relevant to achieving OBJ UD1, OBJ UD4, OBJ UD5 and OBJ UD6 which seek to achieve a compact, economically and socially resilient, and strongly connected urban form that is efficient and sustainable.</p>

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 – No Policies or Methods for Integrating Land Use with Infrastructure in the RPS

Having no policy around integrating land use with infrastructure means that infrastructure and land use planning would be left to the territorial authorities to manage independently, with no guidance addressing issues at the regional or sub-regional level. Sporadic and unplanned urban development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region results in potentially significant land use change which can result in inefficient infrastructural investment. This alternative therefore does not better achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6. This alternative could also be considered insufficient in Regional Council exercising its specific function in Section 30(1)(gb).

THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

There is sufficient information for Council to act, particularly in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.

OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME

Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policies POL UD9, POL UD10, POL UD11, POL UD12 and POL UD13 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

POLICIES & METHODS FOR MONITORING AND REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION

MONITORING (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD14.1

Information will be collected on development and infrastructure trends and pressures in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, so that these trends and pressures can be responded to appropriately and in a timely manner, to support further revisions of the Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy and so this information can be used to assess the need for changes to the settlement pattern in Policies UD4.1, UD4.2, UD4.3 and UD4.4.

REVIEWS (HERETAUNGA PLAINS SUB-REGION)

POL UD14.2

Hawke's Bay Regional Council will review Policies UD4.1, UD4.2, UD4.3 and UD4.4, including the extent, location and sequencing of land for development in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region, in collaboration with Napier City Council, Hastings District Council, the New Zealand Transport Agency and any other relevant parties, if any of the following situations occur:

- a) the reporting in POL UD14.1 recommends that a review is needed;
- b) household and population growth varies by more than 10% over 5 consecutive years from the household and population predictions in HPUDS;
- c) the HPUDS partners agree that insufficient land exists within the identified greenfield growth areas to cater for the growth anticipated within 10 years of the analysis; or
- d) the HPUDS partners agree that exceptional circumstances have arisen such that a review is necessary to achieve Objectives UD2, UD3 and UD4 in particular.

METHODS

- Advocacy (MET UD1)
- Monitoring & Review (MET UD2)
- Cross Boundary Liaison/Collaboration (MET UD3)
- Provision of Information and Services (MET UD5)

COSTS, RISKS & UNCERTAINTIES

- Costs associated with collecting and reporting information on development trends and pressures.
- Costs associated with any subsequent review of Policies POL UD2.1 to POL UD2.4.

BENEFITS

- The preferred settlement pattern for future growth in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region is based on certain assumptions about likely future development trends and requirements in the Heretaunga Plains sub-region. POL UD14 assists in informing future decision-making and enables better and more timely response to changes in development and infrastructure trends and pressures.

EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT?

EFFICIENCY

Following consideration of the costs and benefits of POL UD14 and supporting methods, these are considered to be:

Efficient

EFFECTIVENESS

POL UD14 and its methods are considered to be:

Highly Effective

given that the purpose is to ensure timely response to changing circumstances.

The policy is relevant to achieving all the objectives, OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 – No Policies or Methods for Monitoring and Review in the RPS

Having no policy to collect information and review urban limit policies for the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region leaves it to the local authorities concerned to agree collectively, and opting to collect and review such information. Making monitoring and review optional may preclude timely response to changes in trends, pressures or assumptions. This alternative therefore does not better achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

THE RISK OF ACTING OR NOT ACTING WHERE THERE IS UNCERTAIN OR INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

POL UD14 will act to reduce risk through ensuring up-to-date and relevant information is to hand, better enabling Council to respond appropriately should development and infrastructure trends, pressures or assumptions change in the Heretaunga Plains Sub-Region.

OVERALL EVALUATION OUTCOME

Having regard to efficiency and effectiveness, and taking into account the costs and benefits, policy POL UD14 and the associated methods are the most appropriate to achieve objectives OBJ UD1 – OBJ UD6.

7 Conclusion

In achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), section 32 requires an evaluation of alternatives, costs and benefits before a proposed plan, policy statement, change, variation, national policy statement or national environmental standard is publicly notified or other regulation is made.

Regional Policy Statements are policy-only documents prepared by Regional Councils under the RMA. In the Hawke's Bay setting, the RPS is published together with the Regional Resource Management Plan. Because an RPS is a high-level, policy-only document, it cannot contain rules.

Proposed Change 4 was initiated in response to the following drivers:

1. actions arising out of HPUDS;
2. legal requirements to implement relevant national policy statements relating to electricity infrastructure; and
3. the Regional Council's own initiatives to continually improve its plans to address urban environments and the strategic integration of infrastructure with land use across the Region.

Proposed Change 4 sets out to insert a new chapter into the existing RPS for Hawke's Bay and modify the glossary in the RPS. It is one of a series of plan changes currently under construction and does not represent a complete review of the RPS. The current RPS contains many policies for air, land and water resources and management of natural hazards, but contains little in terms of how urban development should occur and be managed in the region. These are new areas for coverage in the RPS for Hawke's Bay.

The development of Proposed Change 4 involved consideration of the issues driving the need to manage urban growth in Hawke's Bay (drawing on HPUDS), determining the desired outcomes, and constructing a policy framework that begins to both address the issues and deliver those outcomes.

The issues around urban development that specifically affect the Hawke's Bay region revolve more around:

- a) integrating land use and infrastructure decisions across the Region in response to moderate household growth, and
- b) the unique characteristics of the land and water resources of the Region and the competing demands for those resources.

The latter is particularly concentrated on the Heretaunga Plains, where a large proportion of the Region's population resides and works, and where the land and water resources have very high value for food production.

The overall approach adopted was to provide a regional policy backdrop that provides clear guidance as to the appropriate provision for urban growth and development throughout the Region, particularly the Heretaunga Plains sub-region. The aim was to enable the territorial authorities in the Region to respond collectively, collaboratively, and with some certainty,

but retaining sufficient autonomy to tackle the issues that are specific to their district with a degree of flexibility.

Proposed Change 4 proposes six (6) objectives to address the regionally significant issues identified. Section 32(3)(a) of the RMA requires an examination of the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

The preceding Section 32 evaluation concludes that the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA in the Hawke's Bay regional setting.

Proposed Change 4 then proposes fourteen (14) policies and six (6) methods to achieve the six proposed objectives in the new chapter. Section 32(3)(b) of the RMA requires an examination of whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.

The preceding Section 32 evaluation concludes that the proposed policies and methods are the most appropriate for achieving the stated objectives.

Bibliography

Bay of Plenty Regional Council (November 2010), '*Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement*'.

Bay of Plenty Regional Council (November 2010), '*Proposed Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement Section 32 Report – Urban Form & Growth Management*', Strategic Policy Publication 2010/10, ISSN 1176 4112.

Economic Solutions Limited (October 2009), '*Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Study Phase 2 Technical Analysis: Demographic and Economic Growth Outlook 2015-2045*'.

Environment Canterbury Regional Council (June 2011), '*Proposed Canterbury Regional Policy Statement*'.

Environment Canterbury Regional Council (June 2011), '*Proposed Canterbury Regional Policy Statement – Section 32 Report*'.

Environment Waikato (November 2011), '*Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement*'.

Hastings District Council, Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Napier City Council (August 2010), '*Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy*', August 2010.

Horizons Regional Council (August 2010), '*Proposed One Plan as Amended by Decisions - The Consolidated Regional Policy Statement, Regional Plan and Regional Coastal Plan for the Manawatu-Wanganui Region as Amended by Decisions*'.

HPUDS Joint Committee (5 August 2010), '*Report of the Joint Committee on Submissions to the Draft Heretaunga Plains Urban Development Strategy*'.

Page Bloomer Associates Ltd (14 June 2011), '*Versatile Soils – Productive Land, Report for Hawke's Bay Regional Council*'.

Ministry for the Environment website, n.d., Retrieved from <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/>

Ministry for the Environment, 'Quality Planning' website, Guidance Note '*Section 32 – Methods of Implementation*' (last updated December 2008), Guidance Note '*Writing Provisions for Regional and District Plans*' (last updated December 2009), Retrieved from <http://qualityplanning.org.nz/>

New Zealand Environment Court [1996], Canterbury Regional Council v Selwyn District Council (W142/96).

New Zealand Government (March 2008), '*National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008*'.

New Zealand Government (April 2011), '*National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011*'.

New Zealand Government (November 2010), '*New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010*'.

New Zealand Government (2011), '*Resource Management Act 1991 No 69 (as at 01 October 2011)*', Retrieved from <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1991/0069/latest/DLM230265.html>