

REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES UNDER SECTION 32 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to meet Council's requirements under Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA), by recording Council's assessment of alternative land use options for managing the effects of future development in the Motueka area.

This report supports Council's Plan Change No 43: Motueka West Development, to the Tasman Resource Management Plan.

2. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, by 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; and*
- 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.*

The RMA requires that when changes to statutory documents are notified, a Section 32 evaluation is also to be made publicly available. This evaluation is to consider the alternatives, benefits and costs of the proposed changes in achieving the purpose of the Act. A further evaluation is to occur before the local authority makes a decision on the proposed changes.

Section 32 sets out what the evaluation must do:

(3) An evaluation must examine-

- a) the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and
- b) whether, having regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies, rules, or other methods are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives.

(4) For the purposes of this examination, an evaluation must take into account-

- The benefits and costs of policies, rules or other methods; and
- The risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the policies, rules or other methods.

The RMA does not include definitions of "efficiency" or "effectiveness". Efficiency is taken to mean the benefits will outweigh the costs, either immediately or over time.

Effectiveness is a measure of how successful a policy, rule or other method is in achieving an objective.

2. PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1 Summary

The following table outlines the process leading towards proposed Change No 44.

Table 1: Motueka Plan Change 43 Planning Context	
Date	Planning Activity
December 2007	Motueka Commercial and Industrial Land Supply Report Telfer Young
January 2008	Motueka and Environs Industrial and Commercial Land Assessment Property Economics Report
February 2009	Publication of the Motueka West and Central Community Consultation Paper
July 2009	Council discusses feedback on Motueka West and Central Consultation Paper
December 2009	Motueka Transportation Study for NZTA/TDC released
December 2010	Council recommends the release of the Motueka West and Central draft plan change
March 2011	Report REP 11/03/04 provides an update on consultation with Wakatu and Motueka Community Board
August 2011	Report REP11/08/03 provides a proposed plan change for Motueka West and Central- with 5 options considered
November 2012	Council workshop on Motueka West and Central plan change
March 2013	Update of Commercial and Industrial Land Assessment

2.2 Key Planning Issues

2.2.1 Infrastructure

In the early stages of planning for the future development of Motueka township the Council received a request to provide for a medium density housing development in WildmansRd / High St South area. The difficulties of providing services in that area became apparent with the site being distant from the Motueka wastewater plant. There is a back log of services to be provided in Motueka:

Stormwater

Some parts of Motueka stormwater infrastructure eg part of King Edward St, Monahan St are unable to convey stormwater from the two year storm event. Most of Motueka is quite low lying with a relatively flat grade. Land is generally higher on the west side of High St. Eastern parts of the town are likely to be subject to increasing tidal influences which make stormwater disposal more complex..

Water

Motueka's water comes from a large number of wells that tap the Motueka Gravel Aquifer beneath the town. The aquifer is vulnerable to spillages and contaminated runoff from overlying land uses. It is intended to provide a new reticulated water supply subject to receipt of a satisfactory government subsidy.

Wastewater

The main wastewater treatment plant at Thorp Street is programmed to be upgraded as well as several pump stations.

Roading

State Highway 60 passes through the town centre of Motueka which causes congestion at times. Key intersections on SH60 have been identified for upgrade. The road network on the western side of Motueka is relatively undeveloped compared to the eastern side of High St. West of High St is characterized by ribbons of urban development with few cross connections. The pattern limits accessibility and tends to concentrate all traffic on to High St.

2.2.2

Productive Land

Public responses to the draft variations in 2005, the community consultation paper in 2009 and the draft plan change in 2011? show some concern about the spread of urban development onto adjacent highly productive horticultural land.

However there are limited geographical options for providing for urban development in Motueka – largely due to flood hazard constraints to the north, the aerodrome location to the west and low lying coastal land to the east. Loss of some productive land is therefore inevitable if the demand for new urban development is to be met.

The allocation of a large residential / industrial area close to Motueka town centre will give certainty for protection of surrounding areas for primary production.

2.2.3

Urban Density

A range of urban density is supported in Motueka to make more efficient use of land and to provide for changing household size.

2.2.4

Affordable Housing

Public responses support the provision of low cost housing options in future development areas.

3. ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

OPTION 1: STATUS QUO

Description: No further planned development

Benefits / Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
No direct or immediate cost to Council	Could cause unexpected future costs especially for services	Ad hoc and unplanned development may occur and result in poor urban design outcomes. Unexpected cross boundary effects.	Allowing ad hoc development is not an acceptable way forward.

OPTION 2: DISPERSED DEVELOPMENT NODES

Description: Discrete development node/s in rural hinterland

Benefits/ Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Land availability May meet some landowners aspirations	Could cause immediate costs especially for services. Distance to town centre facilities.	Risk of disruption to existing urban service programmes. Disruption of rural production through reverse sensitivity effects. Adverse effects on rural amenity.	Allowing discrete nodes of development in the rural area is not an acceptable way forward. Likely to be publicly unacceptable.

OPTION 3.1: CONSOLIDATION RESIDENTIAL

Description: Consolidation of business and residential between Whakarewa, Queen Victoria and King Edward Sts. Redevelop existing industry by estuary for arts centre retail. Includes a new neighbourhood centre and residential intensification. (refer to Boffa Miskell Plan).

Benefits / Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Economical in use of land and services. Close to existing town centre	Private costs to relocate industry from the estuary location. Loss of rural production	Some residential intensification may be acceptable but there is limited support for significant amounts of intensification. There is a risk that existing industry may chose not to relocate.	While this option has strong servicing benefits it may have limited market appeal. Intensification is not an effective option for meeting all future demand for residential growth.

OPTION 3.2: CONSOLIDATION COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL

Description: Large format retail on High Street south of existing town centre. Mix of Light and Heavy Industrial.
Small area of residential south of Motueka High School (refer to Robin Simpson plan)

Benefits and Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Generous supply of land for business opportunities close to existing town centre	<p>This option has only a limited supply of residential land. Aerodrome places some constraints on buildings and structures in north west part of block.</p> <p>Loss of rural production</p>	<p>Oversupply of land for business opportunities may result in scattered development with poor urban design outcome.</p> <p>That the mix of activities is adequately located to not detract from the town centre.</p> <p>Reduces the amount of prime land available for residential development.</p> <p>Some lease land may not become available.</p>	This option does not provide for a balanced mix of activities on prime land close to the town centre.

OPTION 3.3: CONSOLIDATION RESIDENTIAL/BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL

Description: Mix of Residential (several densities), Mixed Business, Industrial, Papakainga west of High Street. Small extension of CBD

Benefits and Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
More balanced mix of activities than option 3.1. Provides for papakainga to expand. Residential within walking and cycling distance of town centre and employment opportunities.	<p>Some buffering required between different activities. Aerodrome places some constraints on buildings and structures in north west part of block.</p> <p>Loss of rural production</p>	<p>That the mix of activities is adequately located to not detract from the town centre.</p> <p>Some lease land may not become available.</p>	This option provides for a balanced mix of activities on prime land close to the town centre.

OPTION 3.4: CONSOLIDATION OF INDUSTRIAL ON KING EDWARD ST (NORTH SIDE)

Description: Rezone existing house and sheds on north side of King Edward St to industrial

Benefits and Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Gain 3.8ha industrial land Makes efficient use of existing roading and services w/o deferments	Loss of 44 residentially zoned properties.	Residential owners may not accept change so only limited sites become available for industry.	This option does not provide for an appropriate mix of activities on land close to the town centre.

OPTION 3.5: CONSOLIDATION OF RESIDENTIAL ON KING EDWARD ST (NORTH SIDE)

Description: Extend the Residential Zone in central section of King Edward St further northwards.

Benefits and Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Gain 6.5 ha residential land Makes efficient use of existing roading and services.	Opportunity cost of not having some relatively easy to develop sites for industry. Part of the land needs to be deferred zoning.	Some lease land used for production may not become available for some time.	This option can provide for an appropriate mix of activities on land close to the town centre.

OPTION 3.6: RURAL ZONE BUFFER AT END OF AERODROME RUNWAY

Description: Retain block of Rural 1 Zone to northeast of Motueka aerodrome runway

Benefits and Opportunities	Costs and Constraints	Risks and Uncertainties	Summary of Council Assessment
Allows rural production to continue	Some lost urban development opportunities	Retains a low risk to property and personnel from aerodrome incidents.	This option provides for an appropriate range of activities close to the runway.

