

Section 32AA Evaluation

13 May 2025

The table below sets out a Section 32AA evaluation of the planning approach proposed for The Landing Development Area

| Proposed Planning Approach | | Alternative Options | Efficiency and Effectiveness | Costs and Benefits | Overall Appropriateness |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>It is proposed to provide for the planning provisions for The Landing through the use of the Development Area option.</p> <p>A development area spatially identifies and manages areas where plans such as concept plans, structure plans, outline development plans, master plans or growth area plans apply to determine future land use or development. When the associated development is complete the development area spatial layer is removed. A development area should be used where there is a spatial plan that directs specific growth or development outcomes for an area.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Option 1 – Overlays• Option 2 – Precincts• Option 3 – Specific Controls• Option 4 – Special Purpose Zone• Option 5 Do Nothing | <p>An assessment of the potential methods is provided below:</p> <p>(a) Overlays – These spatially identify distinctive values, risks or other factors which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions. These are generally used where there is a need for a more restrictive approach to provisions compared with the underlying zone. Given there are already several overlays that apply over The Landing and a more restrictive approach is not proposed, I do not consider the Overlay approach to be the most appropriate.</p> <p>(b) Precincts - A precinct spatially identifies and manages an area where additional place-based provisions apply to modify or refine aspects of the policy approach or outcomes anticipated in underlying zone(s). These are generally used where a different outcome is anticipated from the underlying zone – either more permissive or restrictive. In terms of The Landing, rural activities and landscape restoration, revegetation and protection still predominate. These activities will be complemented by residential lots scattered throughout the landholding. Therefore, while The Landing consent could be reflected through the Precinct approach, given that the underlying zone activities are still relevant and applicable, I do not consider this approach to be the most appropriate.</p> <p>(c) Specific Controls – A specific control spatially identifies where a site or area has provisions that are different from other spatial layers or district wide provisions (e.g. a verandah requirement). This approach applies to fairly narrow issues, whereas The Landing consent results in more than an amendment to a specific control and therefore I do not consider this method to be the most appropriate.</p> <p>(e) Special Purpose Zones – The evaluation criteria for SPZs are set out above and one of key criteria require the specific outcomes to be significant to the district, region and country and the outcomes are</p> | <p>The Development Area approach will result in greater benefits than costs. The PDP approach would require more difficult and expensive resource consent application for discretionary or non-complying activities to construct a dwelling which was previously a restricted discretionary activity. The more restrictive activity status and associated objectives and policies would result in greater costs to prepare applications and increase risk as to whether consent would be granted.</p> <p>The proposed approach simplifies the consent status for the construction of dwellings of lots that have already been approved for residential development.</p> <p>Therefore, the Development Area option has greater benefits than costs.</p> | <p>As a result, it is considered the proposed planning approach will result in the most appropriate planning provisions and is consistent with the current PDP strategic framework.</p> <p>This will maintain confidence in the consistent administration of the PDP and will result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment;• Protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;• Protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats;• Maintain and enhance public access to and along the coast;• Enhance the relationship with Maori;• Protect historic heritage. <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being while safeguarding the life supporting capacity of ecosystems.</p> <p>In summary, there is no risk of acting or not acting on insufficient or uncertain information and the proposed approach will result in the positive and sustainable outcomes.</p> |
| | | | | | |

| | | | <p>impractical to be managed through other measures. In this instance, the protection of significant areas of native bush and the Rangihoua heritage area are of significance, the subdivision of 46 residential lots is more specific to The Landing location. Therefore, I consider that the SPZ method is not the most appropriate for The Landing.</p> <p>Having considered the above I consider that the Development Area approach is the most appropriate method by which to reflect The Landing consent within the PDP.</p> <p>The Development Area approach will result in an efficient and effective way of providing for the consented development for The Landing, while ensuring environmental outcomes are also achieved. The Development Area method is more effective than the other options including the PDP provisions to enable the consented residential development to be completed.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Proposed Objectives O1 and O2 | | Alternative Options | Efficiency and Effectiveness | Costs and Benefits | Overall Appropriateness |
| <p>The proposed objectives are set out below:</p> <p>TLDA-O1 Subdivision, use and development of The Landing that integrates development with restoration and protection of natural character and landscape values.</p> <p>TLDA-O2 Rural farming activities (including associated buildings and structures) are enabled at The Landing.</p> | | <p>Option 1 – No nothing and retain PDP objectives</p> | <p>The alternative of retaining the PDP objectives only would result in an ineffective and inefficient planning approach, whereby previously consented development would be compromised thereby making it ineffective.</p> <p>Furthermore, the additional consent process would be inefficient.</p> <p>The proposed objectives give effect to the purpose of the RMA by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment;• Protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and• Ongoing provisions for farming activitiesProtection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats. <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their economic well-being.</p> | <p>The proposed objectives will result in greater benefits than costs. The PDP approach would require more difficult and expensive resource consent application for discretionary or non-complying activities to construct a dwelling which was previously a restricted discretionary activity. The more restrictive activity status and associated objectives and policies would result in greater costs to prepare applications and increase risk as to whether consent would be granted.</p> <p>The proposed approach simplifies the consent status for the construction of dwellings of lots that have already been approved for residential development.</p> <p>Therefore, the Development Area option has greater benefits than costs.</p> | <p>As a result, and on the basis of this evaluation, I consider that the proposed objectives are the most appropriate.</p> <p>I consider the proposed planning approach will result in the most appropriate planning provisions and is consistent with the current PDP strategic framework.</p> <p>This will maintain confidence in the consistent administration of the PDP and will result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appropriate preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment;• Protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;• Protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats;• Maintain and enhance public access to and along the coast;• Enhance the relationship with Maori;• Protect historic heritage. <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their social, economic and</p> |

| | | | | | <p>cultural well-being while safeguarding the life supporting capacity of ecosystems.</p> <p>In summary, there is no risk of acting or not acting on insufficient or uncertain information and the proposed approach will result in the positive and sustainable outcomes.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Proposed Policies P1 and P2 | | Alternative Options | Efficiency and Effectiveness | Costs and Benefits | Overall Appropriateness |
| <p>The proposed policies are set out below:</p> <p>TLDA-P1</p> <p>Provide for the subdivision, use and development of The Landing in accordance with TLDA Plan 1, by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Retaining the majority of the site in common title to be managed as a coherent landscape of open space (including farmland and vineyard and natural areas.Continuing with the restoration of natural areas consistent with the approved masterplan and ecological management plan.Continuing with the development of approved residential lots so that buildings are visually recessive.Limiting residential development on The Landing to 46 residential lots, each with an approved building location.Providing for the relocation of residential lots, where there is no increase in the number of residential lots and natural character and landscape values are acknowledged and respected.Enabling development on approved residential lots subject to design and landscaping that acknowledges and respects natural character and landscape | | <p>Option 1 – No nothing and retain PDP policies</p> | <p>The alternative of retaining the PDP policies only would result in an ineffective and inefficient planning approach, whereby previously consented development would be compromised thereby making it ineffective.</p> <p>Furthermore, the additional consent process would be inefficient.</p> <p>The proposed policies give effect to the objectives by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Residential development is restricted to that consented.Appropriate preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment;Protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;Continued restoration of natural areas; andOngoing provision of farming activities <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their economic well-being.</p> | <p>The proposed policies will result in greater benefits than costs. The PDP approach would require more difficult and expensive resource consent application for discretionary or non-complying activities to construct a dwelling which was previously a restricted discretionary activity. The more restrictive activity status and associated objectives and policies would result in greater costs to prepare applications and increase risk as to whether consent would be granted.</p> <p>The proposed approach simplifies the consent status for the construction of dwellings of lots that have already been approved for residential development.</p> <p>Therefore, the Development Area option has greater benefits than costs.</p> | <p>As a result, and on the basis of this evaluation, I consider that the proposed policies are the most appropriate.</p> <p>I consider the proposed planning approach will result in the most appropriate planning provisions and is consistent with the current PDP strategic framework.</p> <p>This will maintain confidence in the consistent administration of the PDP and will result in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Appropriate preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment;Protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development;Protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats;Maintain and enhance public access to and along the coast;Enhance the relationship with Maori;Protect historic heritage. <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their social, economic and</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| values. | | | | | cultural well-being while safeguarding the life supporting capacity of ecosystems. |
| TLDA-P2 Provide for the operation and development of rural farming (including viticulture) activities (including associated buildings and structures) at The Landing. | | | | | < |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>considered necessary to require consideration of the natural and coastal features sections of the PDP when assessing development at The Landing. To do so would duplicate planning assessments and lead to inefficiencies in planning processes.</p> <p>This will ensure people and communities can provide for their economic well-being.</p> | | <p>cultural well-being while safeguarding the life supporting capacity of ecosystems.</p> <p>In summary, there is no risk of acting or not acting on insufficient or uncertain information and the proposed approach will result in the positive and sustainable outcomes.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|