

# Section 32 Evaluation Report

## Airport Related Qualifying Matters in the Christchurch District Plan

Document Control				
<b>Report Title</b>		Section 32 Evaluation Report – Inclusion of Christchurch Airport Noise Contours as an Existing Qualifying Matter		
<b>Client</b>		<b>Christchurch International Airport Limited</b>	<b>Client Contact/Approver</b>	Felicity Blackmore Environmental and Planning Manager
Rev	Date	Status	RMG Author/s	RMG Reviewer
1	9 May 2022	Draft	Mark Leggett – Senior Consultant	Darryl Millar – Principal
2	12 May 2022	Draft	Mark Leggett – Senior Consultant	Darryl Millar – Principal
3	13 May 2022	Draft	Mark Leggett – Senior Consultant	Darryl Millar – Principal
4	16 May 2022	Draft	Mark Leggett – Senior Consultant	Darryl Millar – Principal
	16 May 2022	Final	Mark Leggett – Senior Consultant	Darryl Millar – Principal
	8 July 2022	Final	Darryl Millar – Principal	
<b>Current Version</b>		Final 16 May 2022 Updated for AAOCB	Darryl Millar – Principal	

## 1.0 Introduction

This section 32 evaluation report (s32 report) is focused on determining whether the Christchurch Airport remodelled 50 dB Ldn Annual Average Outer Control Boundary noise contour (AAOCB) should be included in Christchurch City Council's Proposed Plan Change 14 (PC14) as an existing qualifying matter under s77K of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the RMA).

PC14 has been initiated by Christchurch City Council (the Council) in response to its obligations under the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the Enabling Housing Act) and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD). The Enabling Housing Act requires the Council to apply medium density residential standards (MDRS) to relevant residential zones to enable residential intensification.

The Council is entitled to make the MDRS provisions as imported into the District Plan by way of PC14 less enabling of development in order to accommodate one or more of the existing qualifying matters set out in s77I, if a suitable case can be made. These matters include, for example, (e): *'a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe and efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure'*, among others.

The preparation of this report is intended to satisfy the requirement in s77K(1)(c) to: *'identify in [a] report prepared under section 32 why the territorial authority considers that [one] or more existing qualifying matters apply to those areas [identified by location where an existing qualifying matter applies]'*. It has been prepared for Christchurch International Airport Ltd (CIAL) to support the Council's plan change process.

This s32 report should be read in conjunction with the background report to which it is appended. Appropriate reference to the background report is made in the body of this s32 report, particularly for background and contextual purposes.

## 2.0 Regulatory and policy direction

In carrying out a s32 analysis, an evaluation is required of how the proposal achieves the purpose and principles contained in Part 2 of the RMA.

Section 5 sets out the purpose of the RMA, which is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Sustainable management *'means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources to enable 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'*.

In achieving this purpose, all persons exercising functions and powers under the RMA also need to:

- Recognise and provide for the matters of national importance identified in s6
- Have particular regard to the range of other matters referred to in s7
- Take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi in s8.

### 2.1 Section 6

There are no s6 matters relevant to this topic.

## 2.2 Section 7

The s7 matters that are relevant to this topic are:

<b>Section</b>	<b>Relevant Matter</b>
s7(b)	<i>the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources</i> Christchurch International Airport (the Airport) is a physical resource.
s7(c)	<i>the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values</i> The AAOCB is intended, in part, to maintain the amenity values of residential areas and activities in the vicinity of the Airport.
s7(f)	<i>maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment</i> The AAOCB is intended, in part, to maintain the quality of the environment of residential areas and activities in the vicinity of the Airport.

## 2.3 Section 8

Section 8 is not relevant to this topic.

## 2.4 National Direction

### 2.4.1 National Policy Statements

There are five National Policy Statements (NPS) currently in force:

- NPS for Electricity Transmission 2008
- New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
- NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
- NPS for Freshwater Management 2020
- NPS on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD)

Only the NPSUD is relevant to this topic as outlined in the table below.

<b>NPS</b>	<b>Relevant Objectives / Policies</b>
NPSUD	<p>Includes, among others, Objective 1: <i>'New Zealand has well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.'</i> and Objective 6: <i>'Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are: (a) integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions'</i></p> <p>Includes, among others, Policy 3, which states, in part: <i>'In relation to tier 1 urban environments, regional policy statements and district plans enable: ... building heights of least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the following: (i) existing and planned rapid transit stops ...'</i> and Policy 4, which requires that <i>'regional policy statements and district plans applying to tier 1 urban environments modify the relevant building height or density requirements only to the extent necessary to accommodate a qualifying matter'</i>.</p> <p>Identifies in 3.32, as a <i>'qualifying matter'</i>, among others, <i>'any matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure'</i></p> <p>Defines <i>'nationally significant infrastructure'</i> as <i>'any airport (but not its ancillary commercial activities) used for regular air transport services by aeroplanes capable of carrying more than 30 passengers'</i></p>

In addition to the five NPSs currently in force there are also two proposed NPSs under development, noting that these are yet to be issued and have no legal effect:

- Proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land
- Proposed NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity

Neither of these NPS are relevant to the topic concerned.

#### 2.4.2 National Environmental Standards

In addition to the NPSs there are nine National Environmental Standards (NES) currently in force:

- NES for Air Quality 2004
- NES for Sources of Human Drinking Water 2007
- NES for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009
- NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
- NES for Telecommunication Facilities 2016
- NES for Plantation Forestry 2017
- NES for Freshwater 2020
- NES for Marine Aquaculture 2020
- NES for Storing Tyres Outdoors 2021

There are no NESs of direct relevance to this topic.

#### 2.4.3 National Planning Standards

The National Planning Standards 2019 (the Standards) specify an iconography for zones and overlays and zone names and descriptions. Definitions are mandated for such terms as 'amenity values', 'habitable room', noise metrics ( $L_{A90}$ ,  $L_{Aeq}$ ,  $L_{AF(max)}$ ,  $L_{dn}$ ,  $L_{peak}$ ), 'noise', 'noise rating level', 'residential activity', 'residential unit', and 'special audible characteristics'.

Finally, the Standards also mandate the application of New Zealand Standards (NZS) with respect to the measurement and assessment of noise.

#### 2.5 National Guidance Documents

There is no national guidance relevant to this topic.

#### 2.6 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (RPS)

The background report to which this s32 report is appended provides a commentary on the relevant RPS provisions where this topic is concerned (refer paragraphs 102-114). For completeness, the relevant RPS objectives and policies are set out in summary form in the following table.

<b>RPS Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
Objective 5.2.1	<p>Requires that development is located and designed so that it functions in a way that:</p> <p><i>enables people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety; and which: ...</i></p> <p><i>b. provides sufficient housing choice to meet the region's housing needs;...</i></p> <p><i>f. is compatible with, and will result in the continued safe, efficient and effective use of regionally significant infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>g. avoids adverse effects on significant natural and physical resources including regionally significant infrastructure, and where avoidance is impracticable, remedies or mitigates those effects on those resources and infrastructure;...</i></p>

<b>RPS Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<p><i>i. avoids conflicts between incompatible activities;</i></p> <p>Noting that the Airport is defined, and specifically listed, as ‘<i>regionally significant infrastructure</i>’ and ‘<i>strategic infrastructure</i>’ and that the latter is defined as including ‘<i>facilities, services and installations which are greater than local importance, and can include infrastructure that is nationally significant</i>’.</p>
Objective 6.2.1	<p>A land use and infrastructure framework that: ...</p> <p><i>9. integrates strategic and other infrastructure and services with land use development;</i></p> <p><i>10. achieves development that does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrade, and future planning of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs;</i></p> <p><i>11 optimises use of existing infrastructure; ...</i></p>
Objective 6.2.2	<p>Achieve consolidation and intensification of urban areas, by:</p> <p><i>2. providing higher density living environments including mixed use developments and a greater range of housing types, particularly in and around the Central City, in and around Key Activity Centres, and larger neighbourhood centres ...</i></p>
Objective 6.2.3	<p>Recovery and rebuilding is undertaken in Greater Christchurch that: ...</p> <p><i>4. provides a range of densities and uses;</i></p> <p><i>5. is healthy, environmentally sustainable, functionally efficient, and prosperous.</i></p>
Policy 6.3.5	<p><i>4. Requires that new development should only be provided for if it does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure, ‘including by avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA L<sub>dn</sub> airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport, unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area...’</i></p> <p><i>5. Focuses on: ‘Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs’</i></p> <p>The accompanying Principal reasons and explanation’ states: ‘<i>Strategic infrastructure represents an important regional and sometimes national asset that should not be compromised by urban growth and intensification... The operation of strategic infrastructure can affect the liveability of residential developments in their vicinity, despite the application of practicable mitigation measures to address effects... It is better to instead select development options where such reverse sensitivity constraints do not exist.</i>’</p>
Policy 6.3.7	<p>In relation to residential development opportunities in Greater Christchurch:</p> <p><i>1. Intensification in urban areas of Greater Christchurch is to be focused around the Central City, Key Activity Centres and neighbourhood centres commensurate with their scale and function, core public transport routes, mixed-use areas, and on suitable brownfield land; ...</i></p>
Policy 6.3.11	<p><i>1. The Canterbury Regional Council, in conjunction with the territorial authorities, shall undertake adequate monitoring to demonstrate both in the short term and the long term that there is an available supply of residential and business land to meet the Objectives and Policies of this Chapter.</i></p> <p><i>3. Prior to initiating a review of this chapter, for the purposes of information the Canterbury Regional Council may request the organisation or agency responsible for the operation</i></p>

<b>RPS Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<i>of Christchurch International Airport to undertake a remodelling of the air noise contours relating to the airport.</i>

## 2.7 District Plan Provisions

### 2.7.1 Introduction

The District Plan provisions relevant to this topic comprise the operative CDP provisions set out in section 2.7.2 and relate to housing supply, the location, density and amenity of residential development, the protection of strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and the maintenance of the health, safety and amenity of residents. Relevant District Plan provisions also comprise the contents of PC14 set out in section 2.7.3, relating to housing provision and urban intensification and Medium Density Residential Zones.

Together with the Part 2, NPSUD and RPS directives set out above, the operative District Plan and PC14 provisions constitute the settled objectives against which the proposal that is the subject of this s32 report will be evaluated.

### 2.7.2 Operative District Plan (District Plan) Provisions

The background report to which this s32 report is appended provides a commentary on the relevant District Plan provisions where this topic is concerned (refer paragraphs 115-132). For completeness, the relevant District Plan objectives and policies are set out in summary form in the following table.

<b>District Plan Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
Strategic Objective 3.3.1	<i>The expedited recovery and future enhancement of Christchurch as a dynamic, prosperous and internationally competitive city, in a manner that:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Meets the community's immediate and longer term needs for housing, economic development, community facilities, infrastructure, transport, and social and cultural wellbeing; and</i></li> <li><i>ii. Fosters investment certainty; and</i></li> <li><i>iii. Sustains the important qualities and values of the natural environment.</i></li> </ul>
Strategic Objective 3.3.4	<i>For the period 2018-2048, a minimum of 55,950 additional dwellings are enabled through a combination of residential intensification, brownfield and greenfield development ...</i>
Strategic Objective 3.3.7	<i>A well-integrated pattern of development and infrastructure, a consolidated urban form, and a high quality urban environment that: ...</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>iv. Increases the housing development opportunities in the urban area to meet the intensification targets specified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, Chapter 6, Objective 6.2.2 (1) ... in and around the Central City, Key Activity Centres (as identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement), larger neighbourhood centres, and nodes of core public transport routes ...</i></li> <li><i>ix. Promotes the safe, efficient and effective provision and use of infrastructure, including the optimisation of the use of existing infrastructure;</i></li> </ul>
Strategic Objective 3.3.12	<i>The social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits of infrastructure, including strategic infrastructure, are recognised and provided for, and its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrade, maintenance and operation is enabled; and</i>

<b>District Plan Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<p>Strategic infrastructure, including its role and function, is protected from incompatible development and activities by avoiding adverse effects from them, including reverse sensitivity effects. This includes:...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. avoiding new noise sensitive activities within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour and the 50dB Ldn Engine Testing Contour for Christchurch International Airport</li> <li>...</li> </ul>
Strategic Objective 3.3.14	<p>The location of activities is controlled, primarily by zoning, to minimise conflicts between incompatible activities; and</p> <p>Conflicts between incompatible activities are avoided where there may be significant adverse effects on the health, safety and amenity of people and communities.</p>
Objective 6.1.2.1	<p>Adverse noise effects on the amenity values and health of people and communities are managed to levels consistent with the anticipated outcomes for the receiving environment.</p>
Policy 6.1.2.1.5	<p>Require the management of aircraft operations and engine testing at Christchurch International Airport, so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. noise generated is limited to levels that minimise sleep disturbance and adverse effects on the amenity values of residential and other sensitive environments so far as is practicable;</li> <li>ii. where practicable, adverse noise effects are reduced over time.</li> </ul> <p>Mitigate adverse noise effects from the operations of the Christchurch International Airport on sensitive activities, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. prohibiting new sensitive activities within the Air Noise Boundary and within the 65 dB Ldn engine testing contour; and</li> <li>ii. requiring noise mitigation for new sensitive activities within the 55 dB Ldn air noise contour and within the 55 dB Ldn engine testing contour; and</li> <li>iii. requiring Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) to offer appropriate acoustic treatment in respect of residential units existing as at 6 March 2017 within the 65 dB Ldn Annual Airport Noise Contour, and within the 60 dB L dn engine testing contour.</li> </ul>
Objective 7.2.1	<p>An integrated transport system for Christchurch District: ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. that supports safe, healthy and liveable communities by maximising integration with land use;</li> </ul>
Policy 7.2.1.8	<p>Avoid or mitigate adverse effects and promote positive effects from new transport infrastructure and changes to existing transport infrastructure on the environment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>...</li> <li>iii. noise, vibration and glare;</li> <li>iv. amenity and effects on the built environment; ...</li> </ul>
Objective 7.2.2	<p>Enable Christchurch District's transport system to provide for the transportation needs of people and freight whilst managing adverse effects from the transport system.</p>
Policy 7.2.2.1	<p>To manage any adverse effects from the ongoing use, repair, and development of the strategic transport network, whilst recognising the national and regional scale and economic importance of this network, and the role of the strategic transport network in the recovery of Christchurch.</p>
Policy 7.2.2.3	<p>Manage the adverse effect(s) of an activity within the Transport Zone so that the effects of the activity are consistent with the amenity values and activity of adjacent land uses, whilst</p>

<b>District Plan Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<p><i>providing for the transport network, in particular the strategic transport network to function efficiently and safely.</i></p> <p><i>To ensure adjacent land uses are designed, located and maintained in such a way as to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the strategic transport network.</i></p>
Objective 8.2.3	<i>Subdivision design and development promotes efficient provision and use of infrastructure and transport networks ...</i>
Policy 8.2.3.5	<i>Ensure that the requirements of infrastructure, including their ongoing operation, development and maintenance, are recognised in subdivision design, including any potential for adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) from subdivision ...</i>
Objective 14.2.1	<p><i>An increased supply of housing that will:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. enable a wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities, in a manner consistent with Objectives 3.3.4(a) and 3.3.7;</i></li> <li><i>ii. meet the diverse needs of the community in the immediate recovery period and longer term, including social housing options; and</i></li> <li><i>iii. assist in improving housing affordability.</i></li> </ul>
Policy 14.2.1.1	<p><i>Provide for the following distribution of different areas for residential development, in accordance with the residential zones identified and characterised in Table 14.2.1.1a, in a manner that ensures: ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>iii. medium density residential development in and near identified commercial centres in existing urban areas where there is ready access to a wide range of facilities, services, public transport, parks and open spaces, that achieves an average net density of at least 30 households per hectare for intensification development;</i></li> </ul>
Objective 14.2.2	<p><i>Short-term residential recovery needs are met by providing opportunities for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. an increased housing supply throughout the lower and medium density residential areas;</i></li> <li><i>ii. higher density comprehensive redevelopment of sites within suitable lower and medium density residential areas.</i></li> </ul>
Policy 14.2.2.2	<p><i>Enable and incentivise higher density comprehensive development of suitably sized and located sites within existing residential areas, through an Enhanced development mechanism which provides:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. high quality urban design and onsite amenity;</i></li> <li><i>ii. appropriate access to local services and facilities;</i></li> <li><i>iii. development that is integrated with, and sympathetic to, the amenity of existing neighbourhoods and adjoining sites; and</i></li> <li><i>iv. a range of housing types;</i></li> <li><i>v. and which does not promote land banking, by being completed in accordance with a plan for the staging of the development.</i> <p><i>To avoid comprehensive development under the Enhanced development mechanism in areas that are not suitable for intensification for reasons of: ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>iv. reverse sensitivity effects on ... Christchurch International Airport ....</i></li> </ul> </li></ul>
Objective 14.2.3	<i>Development of sensitive activities does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, and development of Christchurch International Airport ...</i>
Policy 14.2.3.1	<i>Avoid reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure including:</i>

<b>District Plan Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<i>i. Christchurch International Airport;...</i>
Objective 14.2.4	<i>High quality, sustainable, residential neighbourhoods which are well designed, have a high level of amenity, enhance local character and reflect the Ngāi Tahu heritage of Ōtautahi.</i>
Policy 14.2.4.1	<i>Facilitate the contribution of individual developments to high quality residential environments in all residential areas (as characterised in Table 14.2.1.1a), through design: ...</i>  <i>iv. minimising noise effects from traffic, railway activity, and other sources where necessary to protect residential amenity; ...</i>
Policy 14.2.4.2	<i>Encourage innovative approaches to comprehensively designed, high quality, medium density residential development, which is attractive to residents, responsive to housing demands, and provides a positive contribution to its environment (while acknowledging the need for increased densities and changes in residential character), through:</i>  <i>i. consultative planning approaches to identifying particular areas for residential intensification and to defining high quality, built and urban design outcomes for those areas; ...</i>
Objective 15.2.4	<i>A scale, form and design of development that is consistent with the role of a centre, and which: ...</i>  <i>iii. recognises the functional and operational requirements of activities and the existing built form;</i>  <i>iv. manages adverse effects on the surrounding environment; ...</i>
Policy 15.2.4.5	<i>... Provide for the effective development, operation, maintenance and upgrade of strategic infrastructure and avoid adverse effects of development on strategic infrastructure through managing the location of activities and the design of stormwater areas. This includes but is not limited to, avoiding sensitive activities within commercial zones located within the 50 dB L<sub>dn</sub> Air Noise Contour and within the Lyttelton Port Influences Overlay Area.</i>

The zone and rule framework that follow on from the policy framework relating to the AAOCB are described in detail in paragraphs 124-132 of the background report to which this s32 report is appended.

In summary:

- areas that sit within the 50 dB L<sub>dn</sub> air noise contour (AAOCB) and which are subject to density controls comprise portions of the Residential Suburban (RS), Residential Suburban Density Transition (RSDT) and Residential New Neighbourhood (RNN) Zones;
- within these areas, residential activities and other sensitive activities which do not meet the permitted or controlled activity density standards, trigger **restricted discretionary activity** rules<sup>1</sup> requiring resource consent and enabling consideration of *‘the extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft, are proposed to be managed, including avoidance of any effect that may limit the operation, maintenance or upgrade of ... [the] Airport’ [and] ‘the extent to which appropriate indoor noise insulation is provided’;*

<sup>1</sup> 14.4.1.3 RD34 and 14.12.1.3 RD26 and the relevant permitted and controlled activity standards

- any applications triggering these rules are to be limited notified to CIAL (as a party identified as being adversely affected);
- within the above residential zones and under the AAOCB, standards apply to subdivision as a **controlled activity** and impose direct controls on density, via minimum net site areas;<sup>2</sup>
- sensitive activities (including residential activities) under the AAOCB and also within the Commercial Mixed Use (CMU), Commercial Office (CO), Commercial Core (CC) and Commercial Local (CL) Zones are **non-complying activities**;<sup>3</sup> and
- any new sensitive activities located within the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) are prohibited.<sup>4</sup>

Other provisions in the District Plan relate to Engine Testing Contours and also insulation requirements for habitable rooms, but are not the subject of this s32 report, as the former do not apply over residentially zoned land, and the latter do not directly relate to or directly constrain residential development densities in the way that the abovementioned rules do.

### 2.7.3 Plan Change 14 (PC14) Provisions

The background report to which this s32 report is appended provides a commentary on the relevant PC14 provisions where this topic is concerned (refer paragraphs 136-149). The Council anticipates that PC14 will be publicly notified in August 2022. For completeness, changes to relevant District Plan objectives and policies that would be effected by PC14 (as identified in pre-notification materials) are set out in summary form in the following table.

<b>PC14 Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
Strategic Objective 3.3.7	<p>Amend as follows (in part):</p> <p><i>A well-integrated pattern of development and infrastructure, a consolidated urban form, and a high quality urban environment that:...</i></p> <p><i>ii. <u>May develop and change over time, including amenity values ...</u></i></p> <p><i>iii. <u>Increases the housing intensification <del>development</del> opportunities in the urban area to;</u></i></p> <p><i>A. <u>give effect to Policies 3 and 4 and other urban intensification provisions of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and sections 77F(1) and (6) and section 77(G) of the Act; and</u></i></p> <p><i>B. <u>meet the intensification targets specified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, Chapter 6, Objective 6.2.2 (1); particularly:</u></i></p> <p><i>1. <u>in and around the Central City, Key Activity Centres (as identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement), <u>Town centres and larger Local neighbourhood centres</u>, and nodes of core public transport routes; ...</u></i></p> <p><i>xii. <u>Promotes the safe, efficient and effective provision and use of infrastructure, including the optimisation of the use of existing infrastructure extent, <u>except to the that this could not be justified to limit the intensification required to be enabled in Policies 3 and 4 and other urban intensification provisions of the National Policy</u></u></i></p>

<sup>2</sup> 8.6.1 Table 1.a, 8.6.1 Table 1.e and 8.6.11 Table 8, also Appendix 8.10.28 and Appendix 8.10.23

<sup>3</sup> 15.8.1.5, 15.4.1.5 and 15.5.1.5, noting that where the CMU is concerned, there is no equivalent operative rule as the operative ANC does not apply over the zone (whereas the remodelled AAOCB will (in this respect, refer to the footnote on page 22).

<sup>4</sup> 6.1.7.1 and 6.1.7.2

<b>PC14 Provision</b>	<b>Relevant matters</b>
	<i>Statement on Urban Development and sections 77F(1) and (6) and section 77(G) of the Act; ...</i>
Objective 15.2.4	Amend as follows (in part):  <i>A scale, form and design of development that is consistent with the role of a centre, and intended built form outcomes for mixed use areas and which: ...</i>  <i>iii. recognises the functional and operational requirements of activities and the <u>anticipated</u> <del>existing</del> built form;</i>  <i>iv. manages adverse effects (<u>including reverse sensitivity effects</u>) on the <u>site and surrounding environment</u>, <u>including effects that contribute to the impacts of climate change</u>; and ...</i>
MRZ-O1, MRZ-P1	New objective and policy relating to the Medium Density Residential Zone purpose and low density transition.
MRZ-O2, MRZ-P2 to P5	New objective and policies relating to medium density housing variety, built form, height, wind assessment and wind environment.
MRZ-O3, MRZ-P6 to P20	New objective and policies relating to quality design of medium density residential developments, quality developments, passive surveillance, resident's needs, residential design principles, on-site communal living space, outdoor living areas, ground floor residential units, shading, privacy, building dominance, accessory building location, front boundary treatment, on-site waste and recycling storage, landscaping, water and fire-fighting capacity, rainwater capture and green infrastructure.
HRZ-O1, HRZ-P1	New objective and policy relating to the High Density Residential Zone purpose and low density transition.
HRZ-O2, HRZ-P2	New objective and policy relating to high density intensification and location of high density
HRZ-O3, HRZ-P3 to P6	New objective and policies relating to built form of high density, site layout and building location, high density heights, location for increased heights and criteria for increased heights.
HRZ-O4, HRZ-P7 to P17	New objective and policies relating to high quality density environments, application of high density residential design principles, high quality residential environment quality developments, outdoor living areas, ground floor residential units, shading, privacy, building dominance, accessory building location, front boundary treatment, on-site waste and recycling storage and landscaping
HRZ-O5, HRZ-P18 to P20	New objective and policies relating to stormwater management, water and fire-fighting capacity, rainwater capture and green infrastructure.

As noted in the background report to which this s32 report is appended PC14 would insert planning tools into the District Plan to achieve intensification outcomes required by the Enabling Housing Act in Medium Residential Zones. These tools include increased thresholds for standards relating to density and building height, more flexible recession plane standards, reduced building setback standards, increased site coverage rules and reduced subdivision standards.

Overall, the PC14 provisions would establish a significantly more enabling residential development regime and thus a notable increase in potential development density and built form compared to the operative District Plan.

Documentation prepared by the Council in support of PC14 acknowledges that the operative District Plan provisions restricting the scale of residential activities with the 50 dB air noise contour likely meet the prerequisites of a qualifying matter under s771, although a definitive position in this respect is *'dependent on supplementary evidence and consultation with CIAL'*.<sup>5</sup>

## 2.8 Other relevant legislation or regulations

The following additional legislative / regulatory requirements are also relevant to this topic:

<b>Legislation / Regulation</b>	<b>Relevant Provisions</b>
Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS)	<p>As noted elsewhere in this report, the Enabling Housing Act requires the Council to apply MDRS to relevant residential zones to enable residential intensification. The provisions of PC14 provide the vehicle for that obligation to be met.</p> <p>In inserting obligations relating to provision for MDRS in district plans, s771 the Enabling Housing Act entitled councils to be less enabling of development to the extent necessary to accommodate one or more of the following qualifying matters that are relevant in a Christchurch context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>(a) a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6:</i></li> <li><i>(b) a matter required in order to give effect to a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD) or the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010: ...</i></li> <li><i>(e) a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure:</i></li> <li><i>(f) open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space:</i></li> <li><i>(g) the need to give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to land that is subject to the designation or heritage order:</i></li> <li><i>(h) a matter necessary to implement, or to ensure consistency with, iwi participation legislation:</i></li> <li><i>(i) the requirement in the NPS-UD to provide sufficient business land suitable for low density uses to meet expected demand:</i></li> <li><i>(j) any other matter that makes higher density, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77L is satisfied.</i></li> </ul>
New Zealand Standard 6805:1992 'Airport Noise Management and Land Use Planning' (the Standard)	<p>As noted in the background report to which this s32 report is appended, the Standard introduced the Air Noise Boundary (ANB) and Outer Control Boundary (OCB) concept to New Zealand planning framework.</p> <p>Between the ANB and the OCB, the Standard recommends that, as a minimum, new noise sensitive land uses should ideally be prohibited (and if the District Plan permits such uses, they should be provided with sound insulation). The overall approach set in the Standard is to first and foremost avoid noise sensitive activities within the OCB wherever possible.</p> <p>Consistent with the Standard, the District Plan adopts an ANB within which insulation requirements are imposed and new sensitive activities are prohibited.</p>

<sup>5</sup> *Scope of Qualifying Matters: MDRS & NPS-UD Plan Change*, Christchurch City Council, undated, page 2

### 3.0 Resource Management Issues Analysis

#### 3.1 Evidence Base - Research, Information and Analysis undertaken

The operative District Plan and technical advice and assistance commissioned from various internal and external experts to assist with setting the plan framework for PC14 have been reviewed for the purpose of preparing this s32 report. This work has been used to inform the identification and assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the provisions. This advice includes the following:

<b>Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Brief synopsis</b>
<p><i>Christchurch International Airport</i></p> <p><i>Airport Safeguarding at Christchurch International Airport</i></p> <p>14 June 2022</p>	Airbiz	<p>This report outlines the role of the Airport and quantifies the scale, nature and extent domestic and international freight and passenger movements. It also considers the potential impact of capacity constraints on Airport operations. The key findings of the report are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Airport has regional, national and international significance as a passenger and freight hub.</li> <li>• It has a key function in non-scheduled operations</li> <li>• Long term planning frameworks are the key to preserving this significance, the amenity of those living beneath the AAOCB, avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on the Airport, and potential capacity constraints.</li> <li>• The Airport is a “slot taker”, meaning that flight scheduling times are dictated by the network operation of the carrier overseas and timing (slot) availability at major overseas destinations.</li> <li>• Evidence from case studies illustrate the impacts on airports from poor land use planning provisions and ineffective airport safeguarding techniques.</li> </ul>
<p><i>International and Domestic Freight Trends</i></p> <p>June 2022</p>	Richard Paling Consulting	<p>This report outlines the key trends in international and domestic freight trends, and the significance that plays in the Airports operations, the important role in the movement of air freight and its connectiveness to the freight network, and its contribution to the South Island economy.</p>
<p><i>Potential Economic Impacts of Operational Constraints on Christchurch Airport</i></p> <p>May 2022</p>	Property Economics Ltd	<p>This report provides a relevant summary (using up to date figures) of the economic significance of Christchurch International Airport. This evidence addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The significance of the Airport as an employer, as a conduit for freight and passenger movement and therefore commerce and tourism;</li> <li>• The consequential contribution to the Canterbury and wider South Island and New Zealand economy; and</li> <li>• The risks to the above associated with reverse sensitivity effects, absent the AAOCB provisions.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Christchurch International Airport</i></p> <p><i>Land Use Planning</i></p> <p>23 May 2022</p>	Marshall Day Acoustics	<p>This report provides a summary of the acoustic effects arising from development within the 50 dB contour.</p> <p>The report finds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of appropriate land use planning around airports can cause significant numbers of people to be exposed to airport noise and has, in many cases, resulted in operational constraints on airports.</li> </ul>

Title	Author	Brief synopsis
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Canterbury there is a strong regional and district planning framework controlling noise sensitive activities inside the contours.</li> <li>• Aircraft noise inside the 50 dB L<sub>dn</sub> contour causes adverse effects on people and this is not a desirable environment in which to increase residential density.</li> <li>• Even if sound insulation is required to be fitted to dwellings within this 50 dB L<sub>dn</sub> noise environment, this will not eliminate all adverse effects.</li> <li>• Accordingly, it is preferable to avoid noise sensitive activities from locating in areas where they will experience adverse effects from aircraft noise from the outset.</li> <li>• Where there is alternative land outside of the contours available to locate residential intensification, this should be preferred.</li> </ul>
<p><i>The Enabling Act – Influence on People Affected by Aircraft Noise</i>, 8 July 2022</p>	<p>Marshall Day Acoustics for CIAL</p>	<p>This report considers the implications of the Enabling Housing Act in the context of the AAOCB relating to noise effects from aircraft using the Airport.</p> <p>The report finds that control of noise sensitive land use (including residential activity) within the AAOCB is important to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure people are protected from establishing sensitive land uses in areas that are exposed to levels of aircraft noise which might disturb them or affect their quality of life resulting in adverse amenity and health outcomes; and</li> <li>• protect the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, enabling airport operations to continue to support and benefit communities.</li> </ul>
<p><i>New Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS): Assessment of Housing Enabled in Christchurch City</i>, January 2022</p>	<p>The Property Group for Christchurch City Council</p>	<p>This report provides an analysis of the impact of the recent policy direction for urban growth under the NPSUD and in particular the new MDRS for Christchurch City, with a view to understanding how those changes will impact the location and type of housing development that is enabled across the City.</p> <p>The report finds that the catchments of Addington, Fendalton/St Albans, Greater Hornby, Addington, Northlands/Papanui, Riccarton, Shirley/Edgeware, Somerfield, St Martins and Sydenham show the feasible medium density development.</p> <p>The analysis has not incorporated consideration of those areas that would not be subject to the MDRS as a result of qualifying matters (including Airport protection measures).</p>
<p><i>New Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS): Review of the Property Group Assessment of Housing Enabled</i> May 2022</p>	<p>Colliers for CIAL</p>	<p>The report comprises a review of The Property Group’s assessment referred to directly above.</p> <p>The report also undertakes an analysis of the likely loss in feasible dwelling capacity.</p> <p>The report finds that this loss of development potential equates to 7% or approximately 4,000 dwellings.</p> <p>Overall, the report concludes there is sufficient remaining development capacity.</p>

<b>Title</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Brief synopsis</b>
		It is important to state that the Colliers assessment used the outer envelope contour. Given that the AAOCB is spatially less extensive, the Colliers conclusions will overestimate the impact on housing capacity.
2021 Christchurch International Airport Expert Update of the Operative Plan Noise Contours for review by Environment Canterbury's Independent Expert Panel	Prepared for CIAL	<p>This report introduces the background and context for the remodelling of the Christchurch International Airport (the Airport / CIA) air noise contours.</p> <p>Accompanied by technical reports as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Christchurch Airport Aircraft Noise Contours Update: Ultimate Runway Capacity Report, AirBiz, October 2021</li> <li>• Christchurch Airport Air Traffic Projections, Airways / AirBiz</li> <li>• Christchurch Airport Flight Track Assumptions, Airways / AirBiz</li> <li>• Christchurch Recontouring Noise Modelling Report, Marshall Day Acoustics</li> </ul> <p>The report recommends updated noise contours that are a different shape and size than the operative plan noise contours, to reflect changes in aviation practices and operations since 2008, and also reflect refinements made in the underlying assumptions. The overall outcome is the contours generally shift slightly to the west.</p> <p>The inputs, assumptions, and outcomes of the remodelling are currently being peer reviewed by Environment Canterbury's Independent Expert Panel.</p>

### 3.2 Analysis of District Plan provisions relevant to this topic

As noted in section 2.7.1, together with the Part 2, NPSUD and RPS directives set out above, the operative District Plan and PC14 provisions constitute the settled objectives against which the proposal that is the subject of this s32 report will be evaluated. The relevant operative District Plan and PC14 provisions are set out in sections 2.7.2 and 2.7.3, respectively.

### 3.3 Summary of Relevant Resource Management Issue

Based on the research, analysis and consultation outlined above the following issue has been identified:

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Potentially significant adverse effects on the amenity and health of residents and continued viability of the Airport arising from a MDRS uplift in residential densification via PC14.	Absent the continued imposition of AAOCB as a qualifying matter, a significant increase in the number of residents arising from an uplift in residential development density in areas in the vicinity of to the Airport and subject to airport-related noise, is likely to have a significantly adverse impact on the amenity and health of those new residents, resulting in a volume of complaints that in turn would significantly adversely affect the continued viability of the Airport in its current location (i.e., a reverse sensitivity effect).	The proposal to which this s32 report relates involves the application of AAOCB as a qualifying matter over areas subject to residential densification via PC14.

## 4.0 Evaluation of the Proposal

This section of the report evaluates the objectives of the proposal to determine whether they are the most appropriate means to achieve the purpose of the RMA, as well as the associated policies, rules and standards relative to these objectives. It also assesses the level of detail required for the purposes of this evaluation, including the nature and extent to which the benefits and costs of the proposal have been quantified.

### 4.1 Scale and Significance

Section 32(1)(c) of the RMA requires that this report contain a level of detail that corresponds with the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.

The level of detail undertaken for this evaluation has been determined by assessing the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects anticipated through introducing and implementing the AAOCB, as a qualifying matter, relative to a series of key criteria.

Based on this the scale and significance of anticipated effects associated with this proposal are identified below:

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
Basis for change	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of MDRS provisions is a mandatory requirement of the Enabling Housing Act, commensurate with the NPSUD.</li> <li>The facility to consider qualifying matters is explicitly provided for in the RMA.</li> </ul>
Addresses a resource management issue		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council is obliged to address housing supply issues under the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.</li> <li>The amenity and health of people (including residents) is a relevant resource management issue under Part 2.</li> <li>The efficient use and development of physical resources (and the continued viability of strategic infrastructure such as the Airport in this regard) is a relevant resource management issue under Part 2.</li> </ul>
Degree of shift from the <i>status quo</i>	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted above, the RMA explicitly provides for the consideration of qualifying matters with respect to the implementation of MDRS.</li> <li>The proposed application of the AAOCB as a qualifying matter does not therefore represent a significant shift from the <i>status quo</i>.</li> <li>The AAOCB is predicted to reduce MDRS yield relative to uplift across the City as a whole by a maximum of 7% (or less) or approximately 4,000 dwellings.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Scale/Significance			Comment
	Low	Medium	High	
Who and how many will be affected/ geographical scale of effect/s		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 'effect' of the proposal, in negative terms, would be experienced by property owners and developers of sites subject to the AAOCB in the absence of the MDRS provisions, in terms of the reduced prospects for redevelopment and realising value from densification.</li> <li>However, the alternative of allowing medium density residential development within the areas currently subject to the AAOCB would expose a significantly larger number of existing residents to aircraft noise, thereby adversely affecting their health and amenity and inevitably leading to negative consequences with respect to the viability of the Airport.</li> </ul>
Degree of impact on or interest from iwi / Māori	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues relating to residential intensification, the amenity and health of residents and the continued viability of the Airport are no more or less relevant to iwi / Māori than the general population.</li> </ul>
Timing and duration of effect/s		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AAOCB would apply as a qualifying matter over areas subject to the MDRS provisions upon notification of PC14 and, subsequent to that, without 'end', and therefore the effects (both negative, in terms of reducing development capacity, and positive, in terms of protecting residential health and amenity and the continued viability of the Airport) would be experienced over the long-term.</li> </ul>
Type of effect/s		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As indicated above the 'effects' of the proposal can be expressed both negatively and positively.</li> <li>Negative in the sense that some property owners and developers of sites subject to the AAOCB provisions would incur reduced prospects for redevelopment and the realisation of value from densification.</li> <li>Positive in the sense a significantly larger number of existing residents are not exposed to aircraft noise, thereby protecting their health and amenity and consequently protecting the continued viability of the Airport.</li> </ul>
Degree of risk and uncertainty	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AAOCB provisions are long-standing, clear in their intent and certain in their application.</li> </ul>

Overall, the scale and significance of the proposed provisions are considered to be low to medium for the following reasons:

- The proposal would reduce development capacity in areas subject to the MDRS provisions over the long term to a defined and limited degree.
- However, the proposal would ensure that the health and amenity of occupants in residential areas within the AAOCB remains protected (and exposure of a potentially significant number of additional people to airport noise is avoided) together with, consequently and ultimately, the continued viability of the Airport.

Consequently, a high-level evaluation of these provisions has been identified as appropriate for the purposes of this report.

## **4.2 Quantification of Benefits and Costs**

Section 32(2)(b) requires that, where practicable, the benefits and costs of a proposal are to be quantified.

Based on the assessment of the scale and significance of the proposed provisions in section 4.1, further specific quantification of the benefits and costs in this report is considered neither necessary, beneficial nor practicable in relation to this topic for the following reasons:

- The extent to which the proposal would reduce development capacity in areas subject to the MDRS provisions is reasonably well-understood (refer section 4.1 above)
- The evidence base described in section 3.1 provides a reasonably robust qualitative assessment of the impact that would occur were the proposal not to be effected (i.e., on the amenity and health of future residents in the vicinity of the Airport and, extrapolating from that, on the continued viability of the Airport in its current location).
- It is neither practicable nor appropriate to attempt to quantify the impact of not pursuing the proposal on the amenity and health of future residents in the vicinity of the Airport.

Instead, this report identifies more generally where any additional costs or cost may lie.

## **5.0 Overview of Proposal**

The 'proposed' provisions relevant to this topic are set out after the end of the table on pages 9 to 10 of this s32 report. These provisions, together with the remodelled contours, comprise the 'existing qualifying matter' to which the proposal relates.

With respect to the remodelling exercise, and as noted in the last row of the table on page 5 under section 2.6, through RPS Policy 6.3.11 Environment Canterbury (ECan) may request that CIAL undertake a remodelling of the ANC.

That request was issued in September 2021; CIAL has since completed the task and a report has been prepared that, as noted in the table under section 3.1, recommends updated noise contours that are a different shape and size than the operative plan noise contours, to reflect changes in aviation practices and operations since 2008, and also reflect refinements made in the underlying assumptions. The overall outcome is the contours generally shift slightly to the west. Some residential properties would now fall within the remodelled contours when they did not do so under the operative provisions, whereas other properties would no longer be subject to the contours.

The inputs, assumptions, and outcomes of the remodelling await review by an expert panel assembled by Environment Canterbury. This peer review report may be available for incorporation into PC14, but the timing is not certain. An explanation as to why the remodelled

contours form part of the proposed package and a description of the areas subject to the remodelled contours is contained in the background report to which this s32 report is appended (refer paragraphs 1 and 2, and to **Appendix One**).

For practical purposes, then, the remodelled contours form part of the proposal package that is the subject of the evaluation set out in this report.

## 6.0 Evaluation of Proposed Objective

### 6.1 Introduction

Section 32(1)(a) of the RMA requires that the evaluation report examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

An examination of the proposed objective along with reasonable alternatives is included below, with the relative extent of their appropriateness based on an assessment against the following criteria:

1. Relevance (i.e., Is the objective related to addressing resource management issues and will it achieve one or more aspects of the purpose and principles of the RMA?)
2. Usefulness (i.e., Will the objective guide decision-making? Does it meet sound principles for writing objectives (i.e., does it clearly state the anticipated outcome?)
3. Reasonableness (i.e., What is the extent of the regulatory impact imposed on individuals, businesses or the wider community? Is it consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes?)
4. Achievability (i.e., Can the objective be achieved with tools and resources available, or likely to be available, to the Council?)

### 6.2 Evaluation of Objective

While not specifically required under s32, it is appropriate to also consider an alternative objective, so as to ensure that the proposed objective is the most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.

For the purposes of this evaluation, two potential objectives have been considered:

1. The proposed objective, which is: ***To achieve a balance in enabling housing supply and residential intensification, while protecting strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and maintaining the health, safety and amenity of residents, through the imposition of the AAOCB as a qualifying matter over areas subject to MDRS provisions.***
2. A reasonable alternative objective which is: ***To enable housing supply and residential intensification, through MDRS provisions, without imposing the AAOCB as a qualifying matter, while retaining operative District Plan objectives and policies intended to promote consideration of the protection of strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and maintenance of the health, safety and amenity of residents.***

<b>Proposed objective:</b> <i>To achieve a balance in enabling housing supply and residential intensification, while protecting strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and maintaining the health, safety and amenity of residents, through the imposition of the AAOCB as a qualifying matter over areas subject to MDRS provisions.</i>		
<b>Alternative objective:</b> <i>To enable housing supply and residential intensification, through MDRS provisions, without imposing the AAOCB as a qualifying matter, while retaining operative District Plan objectives and policies intended to promote consideration of the protection of strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and maintenance of the health, safety and amenity of residents.</i>		
	<b>Preferred objective</b>	<b>Alternative objective</b>
<b>Relevance:</b>		
Addresses a relevant resource management issue	Enabling housing supply (and therefore the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities), the amenity and health of people (including residents) and the efficient use and development of physical resources (and the continued viability of strategic infrastructure such as the Airport in this regard) are relevant resource management issues within the context of Part 2.	Enabling housing supply (and therefore the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities), the amenity and health of people (including residents) and the efficient use and development of physical resources (and the continued viability of strategic infrastructure such as the Airport in this regard) are relevant resource management issues within the context of Part 2.
Assists the Council to undertake its functions under s31 RMA	The balance sought by the proposal reflects the Council's obligations under s31 to achieve integrated management of physical resources ((1)(a)), sufficient capacity in respect to housing demand ((1)(aa)), the control of adverse effects ((1)(b)) and the mitigation of the effects of noise ((1)(d)).	The alternative addresses the Council's obligation under 31(1)(aa) to ensure sufficient capacity in respect to housing demand, but the lack of means (beyond policy references) to address other obligations to control adverse effects ((1)(b)) and mitigate the effects of noise ((1)(d)) would in turn fail to achieve the integrated management of physical resources ((1)(a)).
Gives effect to higher level documents	Assists the Council in addressing housing supply issues under the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.  Assists the Council in meeting its obligations under the RPS with respect to housing demand, urban consolidation and intensification, and the protection of regionally significant infrastructure, including the Airport.	Assists the Council in addressing housing supply issues under the Enabling Housing Act and NPSUD.  Assists the Council in meeting its obligations under the RPS with respect to housing demand, urban consolidation and intensification, but the lack of means (beyond policy references) to protect regionally significant infrastructure, including the Airport suggests the alternative would not fully address relevant RPS imperatives in this regard.
<b>Usefulness:</b>		
Guides decision-making	Establishes a clear intent through a combination of policy direction and consent status. In mapping areas to which they apply and imposing appropriate consent status, the AAOCB 'heads off' conflicts that might otherwise arise between 'enabling' and 'effects' oriented policies.	The lack of means to bring objectives relating to the protection of regionally significant infrastructure and the amenity and health of people to bear would mean they do not find sufficient purchase in the decision-making process.

Meets best practice for objectives	The objectives are specific and state what needs to be achieved.	The objectives are specific and state what needs to be achieved. However, the achievement of objectives relating to the protection of regionally significant infrastructure and the amenity and health of people would be undermined by the lack of means to bring them to bear through the decision-making process.
<b>Reasonableness:</b>		
Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community/parts of the community	The proposal will impose some justifiable costs on property owners and developers of sites subject to both the AAOCB and MDRS provisions, in terms of the reduced prospects for redevelopment and realising value from densification.	The proposal will impose unjustifiable costs on future residents of new dwellings on sites subject to both the AAOCB and MDRS provisions, in amenity and health-related terms. Ultimately, it will also impose unjustifiable costs on future users of the Airport and could result in wider economic costs.
Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk	The proposal provides a suitable level of certainty, as the AAOCB provisions provide a clear vehicle for the achievement of objectives. The risk profile is low as the provisions are well-established and their operation and effect is understood.	The alternative is uncertain, in that the manner in which policy references are interpreted and factored into decision-making is likely to be inconsistent. The risk profile is high given the likely impact on future resident amenity and health and the viability of the Airport.
<b>Achievability:</b>		
Consistent with identified tangata whenua and community outcomes	The proposal, in balancing the community's expectations with respect to housing supply, residential amenity and continued use of the Airport, is likely consistent with those expectations.	The alternative will go some way to meeting the community's expectations with respect to housing supply, but not residential amenity or continued use of the Airport.
Realistically able to be achieved within the Council's powers, skills and resources	The objective can be achieved through ongoing management of consent processes and monitoring of plan and consent outcomes and the state of the environment.	The objective can be achieved through ongoing management of consent processes and monitoring of plan and consent outcomes and the state of the environment.
<b>Summary</b>		
<p>The above analysis suggests that the proposed (preferred) objective is the most appropriate means to implement the NPSUD, RPS and in turn, the purpose of the Act and the intent of recent amendments to the Act to improve housing supply and enable residential intensification. Those amendments countenance the adoption of qualifying matters, and the AAOCB directly address the facility accorded in s771(e) i.e., <i>a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure</i>. Further, the retention or effective 'rollover' of the ANC (albeit in a remodelled form) as a qualifying matter in applicable areas also subject to MDRS provisions best aligns with the existing District Plan policy framework relating to health, amenity and Airport outcomes, which PC14 does not propose to alter.</p> <p>By contrast, the alternative proposal would provide limited direction to decision-makers, and only gives partial effect to the RMA and higher order direction including the RPS, as in the absence or practical means to trigger wider policy considerations, it would be overly focused on housing provision at the expense of balancing this with the maintenance of the amenity and health of residents and the protection of the continued viability of the Airport. As such, it would undermine the existing District Plan policy framework relating to health, amenity and Airport outcomes, which PC14 does not propose to alter.</p>		

## **7.0 Evaluation of Reasonably Practicable Options and Associated Provisions**

### **7.1 Introduction**

Under s32(1)(b) of the RMA, reasonably practicable options to achieve the objective associated with this proposal need to be identified and examined. This section of the report evaluates the proposed provisions, as they relate to the associated objective.

Along with the proposed provisions, the Council has also identified through the research, consultation, information gathering and analysis undertaken in relation to this topic a reasonably practicable alternative option to achieve the objective.

The technical input used to inform this process is outlined in section 3 of this report.

### **7.2 Evaluation method**

For each potential approach an evaluation has been undertaken relating to the costs, benefits and the certainty and sufficiency of information (as informed by section 3 of this report) in order to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the approach, and whether it is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objective.

This evaluation is contained in the following sections.

### **7.3 Provisions to achieve Objective**

For the purpose of this evaluation, the following potential options have been considered:

1. Retain the current Residential Suburban (RS), Residential Suburban Density Transition (RSDT) and Residential New Neighbourhood (RNN) zoning and related subdivision provisions applying to land beneath the AAOCB (referred to as the 'proposed approach')<sup>6</sup>.
2. A reasonable alternative, involving the rezoning of land beneath the AAOCB to Medium Density Residential Zones (referred to as the 're-housing option').

---

<sup>6</sup> This option also involves extending the application of the AAOCB provisions (and a consequential non-complying activity status applied to sensitive activities) over those portions of the new Commercial Mixed Use Zone that are located beneath the AAOCB.

<b>Objective:</b>			
To achieve a balance in enabling housing supply and residential intensification, while protecting strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and maintaining the health, safety and amenity of residents, through the imposition of the AAOCB as a qualifying matter over areas subject to MDRS provisions.			
<b>Option 1: Proposed approach (recommended)</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions</b>
Retain the current Residential Suburban (RS), Residential Suburban Density Transition (RSDT) and Residential New Neighbourhood (RNN) zoning and related subdivision provisions applying to land beneath the AAOCB.	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct and indirect environmental costs have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct economic costs have been identified.</li> <li>No indirect economic costs (e.g., on economic growth or employment) have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect social costs have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect cultural costs have been identified.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct and indirect environmental benefits have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan users are familiar with the current zoning arrangements, related subdivision provisions and associated AAOCB triggers for consideration.</li> <li>Plan users would not be put to the time and costs required to understand a different approach.</li> <li>The Council (and ratepayers) will be faced with a reasonably manageable plan change exercise and the limited costs associated with that.</li> <li>No indirect economic benefits (e.g., on economic growth or employment) have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect social benefits have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect cultural benefits have been identified.</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that there is certain and sufficient information on which to act as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the existing zoning arrangements, related subdivision provisions and associated AAOCB triggers for consideration are well understood.</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness and efficiency</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>		<b>Efficiency</b>
	The retention of existing AAOCB triggers for consideration will ensure that objectives relating to the protection of strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and the maintenance of the health, safety and amenity of residents will continue to be effectively achieved.		As the current zoning arrangement beneath the AAOCB would be retained, these portions of the District Plan will remain integrated with the bulk of the District Plan. The proposed approach minimises the risk of anomalies arising, as the plan change would be limited as to its scope.
<b>Overall evaluation</b>	Option 1 is the most appropriate approach to achieving the related objective as it involves the least degree of change to the current zoning and planning framework and consequently entails the least risk of unintended consequences (e.g., anomalies) arising.		
<b>Option 2: Re-housing option</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Risk of Acting / Not Acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions</b>
The rezoning of land beneath the AAOCB to Medium Density Residential Zones..	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct and indirect environmental costs have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least initially, plan users would not be familiar with the new zoning arrangements and associated AAOCB triggers for consideration.</li> <li>It will be difficult for plan users to identify areas where different standards apply if these are not shown clearly on planning maps (this in itself would require a complex iconography or other visual method).</li> <li>Plan users would be put to the time and costs required to understand the new zoning arrangements.</li> <li>The Council (and ratepayers) will be faced with a relatively complex plan change exercise relating to the rezoning of land</li> </ul>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct and indirect environmental benefits have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct economic benefits have been identified.</li> <li>No indirect economic benefits (e.g., on economic growth or employment) have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect social benefits have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural</b></p> <p>No direct or indirect cultural benefits have been identified.</p>	<p>It is considered that there is some risk associated with acting that are not outweighed by the risks of not acting as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the complexities associated with this option are such that unintended consequences (e.g., anomalies) may arise.</li> <li>by way of example, the zones concerned cater for a range of activities not limited to residential activities and there is considerable risk that these elements would be overlooked during a rehousing exercise.</li> </ul>

	<p>and integration of relevant standards, including the AAOCB related triggers within those zones, and the costs associated with that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No indirect economic costs (e.g., on economic growth or employment) have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect social costs have been identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural</b></p> <p>No direct or indirect cultural costs have been identified.</p>		
<b><u>Effectiveness and efficiency</u></b>	<p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The retention of existing AAOCB triggers for consideration will ensure that objectives relating to the protection of strategic infrastructure including the Airport from reverse sensitivity effects, and the maintenance of the health, safety and amenity of residents will continue to be effectively achieved.</p>	<p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p>The rezoning of land subject to the AAOCB as Medium Residential Zones and the integration of relevant standards associated with the current zoning, including the AAOCB related triggers within those zones, is a relatively complex planning exercise, and essentially involves the creation of a 'mini-plan', with the associated risk of anomalies arising, as the plan change would be less limited as to its scope.</p>	
<b><u>Overall evaluation</u></b>	<p>Option 2 is the less appropriate approach to achieving the related objective as it involves a greater degree of change to the current planning framework and consequently entails a greater risk of unintended consequences (e.g., anomalies) or drafting errors arising.</p> <p>There is no mandate to adopt the Medium Density Zone nomenclature or to implement a blanket rezoning of all relevant residential land to a single / universal zone as part of addressing the Council's obligations to bring the MDRS into the District Plan. Such an exercise is best left to a future, full review of the District Plan.</p>		

## 8.0 Conclusion

This evaluation has been undertaken in accordance with section 32 of the RMA in order to identify the need, benefits and costs and the appropriateness of the proposal having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency relative to other means in achieving the purpose of the RMA.

The evaluation demonstrates that the proposal to impose the AAOCB as a qualifying matter over areas subject to MDRS provisions is the most appropriate objective for achieving the purpose of the RMA as it:

- represents a valid qualifying matter in respect of s771(e);
- does not unreasonably frustrate the Council's implementation of its obligations under the NPSUD, RPS and in turn, the purpose of the Act and the intent of recent amendments to the Act to improve housing supply and enable residential intensification; and
- best aligns with the existing District Plan policy framework relating to health, amenity and Airport operational outcomes, which PC14 does not propose to alter.

Further, having settled the above, the option of retaining the current residential zoning and related provisions applying to land beneath the AAOCB, is considered the most appropriate means of implementing the objective associated with the proposal, as it:

- involves the least degree of change to the current zoning and planning framework; and
- consequently entails the least risk of unintended consequences or errors (e.g., anomalies) arising.