

## Michaela Groenewegen

---

**From:** finn@generationzero.org.nz  
**Sent:** Thursday, 4 March 2021 06:30 p.m.  
**To:** District Plan Submissions  
**Subject:** Variation 2 submission  
**Attachments:** Submission-to-the-2nd-Generation-District-Plan-Variation-2-2.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

### Submission Form Submitted

Reference number 808663

**Submitter name**  
Findlay Campbell

**Organisation**  
Generation Zero (Dunedin)

**Contact person/agent**

**Postal address**  
69 Signal Hill Road Opoho Dunedin 9010

**Email**  
finn@generationzero.org.nz

**Contact phone number**  
0272215677

**I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission**  
No

**If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please select an answer**  
No

**Variation 2 change ID**  
See File

**Provision name and number, or address and map layer name**  
See File

**My submission seeks the following decision from the Council**  
Multiple submission points/decisions outlined below

**Details**  
See File

**Reasons for my views**  
See File (may have accidentally not attached file, if there is duplicate submission both with a file attached - please ignore.

**Supporting documents** (file name/s)

Submission-to-the-2nd-Generation-District-Plan-Variation-2-2.pdf, type application/pdf, 58.7 KB

**Do you wish to speak in support of your submission at a hearing**

Yes

**If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing**

No

The Generation Zero Dunedin submission to the 2nd Generation District Plan Variation 2:

Written: Finn Campbell  
Contact: [finn@generationzero.org.nz](mailto:finn@generationzero.org.nz)  
0272215677

Would I like to submit: Yes

Would I like to joint submit: No

Key points:

- 1) Support the increases in density, where appropriate, to encourage more housing in the city and to provide housing that reflects the need for more than one reasonably available transport option.**
- 2) Reject the greenfield rezoning as applied to Dunedin. As it is not a reflection of best urban design principles or practice; and is limiting in transport choice.**

Points relating to change ID as found in:

[https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/804958/Variation-2-Additional-Housing-Capacity-Summary-of-Changes.pdf](https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/804958/Variation-2-Additional-Housing-Capacity-Summary-of-Changes.pdf)

[A2, A3, B1, B3, B4, B6, E9] Accept. We support in principle the provisions for an increase of density in appropriate areas. Support in principle these changes to the "Inner City," "Inner Suburbs," and "Mosgiel". Support conditionally these changes in the "Outer Suburbs" when density increases are built around the public transport network (to encourage the "outer satellites / 15 minute city" of public transport accessible density).

[B5] Accept. Support the removal of character and amenity as limiting design principles, and support the concept of using appropriate standards to guide development (setback, height, etc).

[C1] Accept with changes. We support the need for more social housing and the change to a more appropriately designated activity. Accept with change: add "General Residential 2" and "Inner City Residential" to the current "General Residential 1" and "Township and Settlement".

General Residential 1 and township and settlement are too restrictive a category and openly (in your own definitions) lack the access to critical transport and social infrastructure necessary to avoid undue negative social and transport outcomes.

[D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA2-15, E5] Reject all. Do not support the greenfield rezoning as a whole concept as applied to Dunedin.

Reasons for not support the Greenfield rezoning.

- 1) The distance of the Greenfield rezonings is incompatible with sustainable transportation.
- 2) Dunedin already has excessive city limits and a bloated suburban periphery of a city of its size. This city has the urban form of a pancake, we need to be building higher and not

wider as this urban crepe (read as creep) unnecessarily strains transport, water, lines infrastructure.

- 3) Greenfield rezoning is an inefficient use of rates and infrastructure as it saddles the rest of the city in paying for expensive road and water maintenance.

The greenfield rezoning areas are restrictive in the transport choices they enforce because they are in the distance ranges that car / motor vehicle transportation is required to make trips to supermarkets, retailers, and medical or social service providers. These distances are car only distances and there is little room for adaptation to climate change when these (600 homes with an average of two cars per household) 1200 cars need to be taken off the road. Which does not reflect a support best practice urban design outcomes for transportation variety, density, or considering the hidden costs and lost co-benefits (cost of living improvements) of making longer term decisions. (referring to change ID: D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15, E5)

[D2] Support in principle the inclusion of alternative transportation infrastructure. The practical implementation and likelihood of alternative transportation being appropriate (used or imposed as a conditions) in subdivisions that are potentially a 1 hour bike ride out of town is unlikely without a push for "satellite town/ 15 minute city" infrastructure and zoning to reflect smaller pockets of density and access to nearby business.

[E1] Accept. We support the Residential Zone Description changes.

[E7] Accept. We support the inclusion of alternative housing types. We are also of the mind that this type of activity needs the appropriate (in terms of scale, cost, permanent piping) 3 water infrastructure.

[GF01 to GF17] Reject all changes from Rural X to Residential X.

The greenfield rezoning areas are restrictive in the transport choices they enforce because they are in the distance ranges that car / motor vehicle transportation is required to make trips to supermarkets, retailers, and medical or social service providers. These distances are car only distances and there is little room for adaptation to climate change when these (600 homes with an average of two cars per household) 1200 cars need to be taken off the road. Which does not reflect a support best practice urban design outcomes for transportation variety, density, or considering the hidden costs and lost co-benefits (cost of living improvements) of making longer term decisions.

[IN01 to IN13] Accept all changes.

## Roxanne Davies

---

**From:** Liz Lightbourne  
**Sent:** Friday, 16 April 2021 02:06 p.m.  
**To:** 2GP Support Team  
**Subject:** To add to copy of submission 177 online and in spoken

**Categories:** Roxanne dealing with

Hello,

Could I please get you to add the below response to Generation Zero's submission in the electronic copies and on Spoken – (177)?

Thanks

Liz Lightbourne  
**POLICY PLANNER**  
**CITY DEVELOPMENT**

*Please note I work from 7.30am until 2.30pm*

P 03 477 4000 | DD 03 474 3714 | E [liz.lightbourne@dcc.govt.nz](mailto:liz.lightbourne@dcc.govt.nz)

Dunedin City Council, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin  
PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054  
New Zealand  
[www.dunedin.govt.nz](http://www.dunedin.govt.nz)

**From:** Finn Campbell  
**Sent:** Friday, 16 April 2021 1:20 p.m.  
**To:** Liz Lightbourne  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Variation 2 submission

Hi Liz,

Sorry I have been super busy. I hope this is not too late.

*"I note that in your submission you support the Changes A2, A3, B1, B3, B4, B6 and E9 which are the changes to the minimum site size and density standards in the General Residential 1 Zone (GR1) and serviced Township and Settlement Zone (T&S). Am I correct in stating that you support the density changes to the GR1 zone (these are generally located in the inner city, inner suburbs and Mosgiel) but that you "accept with amendments" the changes proposed to the serviced T&S zone (generally outer suburbs?) which are existing settlements located further out, for example, MacAndrew Bay, Port Chalmers and areas such as Brighton, Allanton, Outram etc. Also does the 'support conditionally' mean 'accept with amendments' (the amendments being that the density changes occur provided that they required to have good accessibility to the public transport network)?"*

**Yes you are correct.**

*"You have supported the changes associated with D2. Was there a particular provision? The proposal includes adding policy direction on when Council will require new roads to be provided and add assessment guidance related to the existing policy framework for design considerations for roads (amend Policy [2.2.2.4](#) to add a new clause x, add new Policy 6.2.3.y and amend Rule [6.11.2.7](#) and [6.11.2.8](#))."*

**I don't have a particular provision sorry.**

I hope that is enough and sorry for holding you up for so long.

Regards,

Finn