

Roxanne Davies

From: Andrew Robinson <Andrew.Robinson@ppgroup.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 March 2021 08:41 p.m.
To: District Plan Submissions
Subject: Campbells Road Submission
Attachments: 2GP Variation 2 Submission McCabe.pdf; Scope Document.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Roxy

Hi, Please find attached, a submission from Barbara and Donald McCabe regarding 122 Campbells Road. They could not gain a trade advantage as a result of this submission. They would like to speak at a hearing and they would consider a joint submission.

Thanks, Andrew

VARIATION 2 – ADDITIONAL HOUSING CAPACITY

SUBMISSION FORM 5



CLAUSE 6 OF FIRST SCHEDULE, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

This is a submission on Variation 2 to the Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan (2GP). Your submission must be lodged with the Dunedin City Council by midnight on 4 March 2021. **All parts of the form must be completed.**

Privacy

Please note that submissions are public. Your name, organisation, contact details and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public, including publication on the DCC website, and will be used for processes associated with Variation 2. This information may also be used for statistical and reporting purposes. If you would like a copy of the personal information we hold about you, or to have the information corrected, please contact us at dcc@dcc.govt.nz or 03 477 4000.

Make your submission

Online: www.dunedin.govt.nz/2GP-variation-2 | **Email:** districtplansubmissions@dcc.govt.nz

Post to: Submission on Variation 2, Dunedin City Council, PO Box 5045, Dunedin 9054

Deliver to: Customer Services Agency, Dunedin City Council, Ground Floor, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin

Submitter details (You must supply a postal and/or electronic address for service)

First name: Barbara and Donald McCabe

Last name: Barbara and Donald McCabe

Organisation (if applicable):

Contact person/agent (if different to submitter): C/- Paterson Pitts Group

Postal address for service: PO Box 5933 Moray Place

Suburb:

City/town: Dunedin

Postcode: 9058

Email address: andrew.robinson@ppgroup.co.nz

Trade competition

Please note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through your submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4), Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act.

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you answered yes, you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission, please select an answer:

☐ Yes ☐ No

My submission relates to an effect that I am directly affected by and that:

a. adversely affects the environment; and

b. does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Submission

Submissions on Variation 2 can only be made on the provisions or mapping which are proposed to change, or alternatives that are clearly within the scope of the 'purpose of the proposals', as stated in the Section 32 report. Submissions on other aspects of the 2GP are not allowed as part of this process.

You must indicate which parts of the variation your submission relates to. You can do this by either:

- making a submission on the Variation Change ID (in which case we will treat your submission as applying to all changes related to that change topic or alternatives within the scope of the purpose of that proposal); **or**
- on specific provisions that are being amended.

The specific aspects of Variation 2 that my submission relates to are:

Variation 2 change ID (please see accompanying Variation 2 – Summary of Changes document or find the list on www.dunedin.govt.nz/2GP-variation-2)

A1, F1-6, F2-2,

For example: D2

Provision name and number, or address and map layer name (where submitting on a specific proposed amendment):

Enable and encourage on-site storm-water and wastewater management, Family Flats

For example: Rule 15.5.2 Density or zoning of 123 street name.

My submission seeks the following decision from the Council: (Please give precise details, such as what you would like us to retain or remove, or suggest amended wording.)

- ☐ Accept the change
- ☐ Accept the change with amendments outlined below
- ☒ Reject the change
- ☐ If the change is not rejected, amend as outlined below

Council is to be commended for seeking to provide additional housing capacity in the city. However, we are of the view that at least some of the required capacity could be provided by making use of under-utilized portions of the Rural-Residential 2 zone, provided that this is carefully managed to ensure that effects on the transport network and landscape are appropriately mitigated. We note that a number of Greenfields urban sites have been drawn from the RR2 zone. Whilst we don't support residential density development in our locality, we feel that there is some scope for additional dwellings in our area.

We oppose council's proposal to remove Policy 2.2.5.2 that currently encourages on-site wastewater disposal.

We also seek that the changes proposed with regard to the floor area and tenancy of Family Flats in the General Residential 1 and Township and Settlement Zone, be extended to all zones. We disagree that the risk of overlapping with current appeals is sufficient reason to disallow these well thought-out provisions to be extended to the Rural-Residential 2 zone.

Reasons for my views (you may attach supporting documents):

If you wish to make multiple submissions, you can use the submission table on page 3 or attach additional pages.

We own the property at 122 Campbells Road, and feel that this and surrounding properties could make a useful contribution to the housing capacity shortfall. Effects, including landscape and transportation effects could be managed via the Resource Consent process, to ensure that the character and amenity of the locality is maintained. Rezoning to either Rural-Residential 1 or Large Lot Residential (with structure plan) provide a sustainable land-use for our property without degrading the landscape values of the area. Neither this or the surrounding RR2 properties are used for commercial primary production.

The city's reticulated wastewater network has widely been reported as being under stress, and feel that using on-site treatment on larger properties will allow existing housing capacity to be created without placing additional strain on the reticulated wastewater network.

Aging in place has been identified by council as an important option. Being able to down-size to a well-presented minor dwelling on our property would allow us to plan for the sustainable long-term use of our property.

Hearings

Do you wish to speak in support of your submission at a hearing: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature:

Date: 28/2/2021

Multiple Submissions Table

Variation 2 change ID or provision name and number or address and map layer name	Decision Sought a. Accept the change b. Accept the change with amendments outlined c. Reject the change d. If the change is not rejected, amend as outlined	Reasons for my views

Submitter's Position in respect of 'Scope'.

A principal purpose of Variation 2 is to enable Dunedin City Council to meet its residential capacity obligations under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. It has been recognised by the Council that the existing housing capacity, as provided for by the 2GP, is currently insufficient. Variation 2 has been designed to address the identified shortfall through mechanisms such as new residential zone areas and adjustments to the density rules within existing residential zones.

Variation 2 has employed a 'selective' assessment method to narrow down the extent to which new residential zone areas have been identified. In support of this, the Council has stated:

Proposed changes have been informed by initial work on the next Future Development Strategy (Spatial Plan), which will look at how and where the city will grow over the next 30 years. A small number of areas were selected for more detailed evaluation as part of Variation 2. Other sites were suggested by landowners or Dunedin residents as part of the Planning for Housing survey in 2019 and key stakeholder consultation. That feedback aimed to help shape how and where the city should grow and has helped develop the proposed changes in Variation 2. All sites were evaluated against criteria including (but not limited to) natural hazards, the availability of 3 Waters infrastructure and access to services and public transport. The process involved ongoing discussions with key stakeholders and, for greenfield sites, landowners whose sites were evaluated as part of Variation 2.¹

Variation 2 is not a full review of the 2GP's residential section's rule framework or zoning across the city. A more comprehensive updated plan for the next 30 years will be developed separately as part of the next Spatial Plan, which will be jointly prepared with the Otago Regional Council (ORC).²

The 2GP is still in the appeal phase and re-opening large parts of the plan to a new variation will slow the progress towards making the plan fully operative. Until the 2GP is operative, parts of the 2006 District Plan continue to apply along with the 2GP provisions, which increases the complexity and costs of processing consents. The changes proposed in Variation 2 are therefore as focussed as possible, and scope has been deliberately limited to avoid re-consideration of a wide range of provisions.³

Whilst the submitter applauds Council desire for the Variation 2 process to be implemented as quickly as possible, it is considered that the selective identification of assessment properties cannot be relied upon as a technique to identify the complete package of parcels of land that best achieves the principal objective of Variation 2. In this regard, the section 32 report, which assesses only the parcels that have been selectively identified, is considered to be incomplete.

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) sets out the requirements for preparation of a section 32 report (underlined text is author's emphasis)-

¹ https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/806182/Variation-2-General-Public-Fact-Sheet.pdf

² <https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/council/district-plan/2nd-generation-district-plan/plan-change-dis-2021-1-variation-2#doc>

³ https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/806182/Variation-2-General-Public-Fact-Sheet.pdf

- s32 *Requirements for preparing and publishing evaluation reports*
- (1) *An evaluation report required under this Act must—*
- (a) *examine the extent to which the objectives of the proposal being evaluated are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of this Act; and*
 - (b) *examine whether the provisions in the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives by—*
 - (i) *identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives; and*
 - (ii) *assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives; and*
 - (iii) *summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions; and*
 - (c) *contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal.*

The overarching objective of Variation 2 is to enable Dunedin City to meet its statutory residential capacity obligations. Section 32(1)(a) RMA requires that this objective is met in the manner that is most appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. Section 32(1)(b)(i) RMA requires the s32 evaluation to consider all reasonably practicable options for achieving the objective.

The purpose of the RMA is (underlined text is author's emphasis)-

- 5 *Purpose*
- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
 - (2) *In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being 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.*

It is submitted that the Council's decision to limit the scope of Variation 2 to only a selection of nominated land parcels presents a risk that the most appropriate method of achieving the objective of the variation may not be reached. It is clear that there are many parcels of land within the City have not had their potential for residential rezoning evaluated. Accordingly, it is the submitter's view that the s32 report completed in support of Variation 2 is currently incomplete and that the report may not be consistent with the expectations of the RMA, with particular regard to the consideration of 'other reasonably practicable options' as required by s32(1)(b)(i).

This matter is further complicated by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD), which requires (underlined text is author's emphasis)-

3.2 *Sufficient development capacity for housing*

- (1) *Every tier 1, 2, and 3 local authority must provide at least sufficient development capacity in its region or district to meet expected demand for housing:*
 - (a) *in existing and new urban areas; and*
 - (b) *for both standalone dwellings and attached dwellings; and*
 - (c) *in the short term, medium term, and long term.*
- (2) *In order to be sufficient to meet expected demand for housing, the development capacity must be:*
 - (a) *plan-enabled (see clause 3.4(1)); and*
 - (b) *infrastructure-ready (see clause 3.4(3)); and*
 - (c) *feasible and reasonably expected to be realised (see clause 3.26); and*
 - (d) *for tier 1 and 2 local authorities only, meet the expected demand plus the appropriate competitiveness margin (see clause 3.22)*

The expectation of the NPS-UD is that residential capacity is achieved in areas that are 'infrastructure-ready' and 'feasible and reasonably expected to be realised'. The RMA requires identification of the most appropriate options. It is not unreasonable to consider that there might well be any number of parcels of land within the City that have not been evaluated through the Variation 2 process, which may also present an appropriate option to satisfy the residential capacity obligations.

Until a further s32 evaluation process is undertaken (as per s32AA RMA), with a view to assessing the suitability of the submission land to contribute to the City's residential capacity, it is impossible to have confidence that the purpose of the RMA will be best served by Variation 2.

The submitter concludes the following-

1. The property referred to in the associated submission may offer an appropriate method to the City to increase its residential capacity.
2. The s32 evaluation undertaken as part of Variation 2 to-date is incomplete as this evaluation has not considered the submission property. A further s32 evaluation is necessary in respect of the submission property.
3. The submission cannot be considered 'out-of-scope' of Variation 2 as it seeks to provide for an outcome that achieves the City's obligations under the NPS-UD in a manner that is consistent with the purpose of the RMA.