



SECOND GENERATION DISTRICT PLAN

Variation 2 – Additional Housing Capacity

Out-of-Scope Submissions

Revised Recommendations

7 May 2021

CONTENTS

- Primary Author 3
- 1 Summary 4
- 2 Responses from Submitters 4
 - 2.2 Purpose of Variation 2 in the context of NPS-UD and s32 4
 - 2.3 Clarity over scope limitation of Variation 2..... 5
 - 2.4 Site selection process 5
 - 2.5 Relevance of wider research undertaken 6
 - 2.6 Relevance of changes to strategic directions..... 7
 - 2.7 Submissions encompass similar amendments with like effect 7
 - 2.8 Alleviating prejudice through further submissions 7
- 3 Revised Recommendations 8
 - 3.2 The Joint Response 10
 - 3.3 Other Responses 17

Appendix A – Marked up Assessment Tables

Appendix B – Variation 2 Initiation Report

PRIMARY AUTHOR

Name: Ms Emily McEwan

Qualifications: MPlan, University of Otago; BSc (Geography), Massey University; DipHort (Landscape), Massey University.

Experience: I have approximately three years planning experience, including preparing and processing resource consent applications and developing policy. I have been employed by the Dunedin City Council as a Policy Planner since May 2019 and have primarily worked on Variation 2 to the 2GP since then.

Code of Conduct: I confirm that I have read, and agree to comply with, the Environment Court Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (Practice Note 2014).

1 SUMMARY

1. This report provides revised recommendations regarding the scope of submissions addressed in the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report of 16 April 2021 and Addendum of 4 May 2021, based on the responses received from submitters.
2. I still consider that the tests that have been applied to determine if submissions are out of scope are appropriate. Very few submitters have sought to reduce the scope of their submissions in order to better meet those tests.
3. Many of the responses received seek for the submissions to be retained in full and progress to the hearings process. If the Panel are of a mind to grant this relief, in whole or in part, it would present significant issues for natural justice. Of note, there will be members of the public who have chosen not to submit on Variation 2 at all because they understood and accepted that it is limited in scope. Should others then have their out-of-scope submissions considered, this would be unfair to those who did not submit. These people should have the opportunity to participate if others do.
4. On this basis, if a decision is made that substantially deviates from the recommendations made, it would be necessary to either renotify Variation 2 without the scope limitation or withdraw it in full or in part to give time to properly assess the entire City and associated residential provisions to provide for housing into the long term. This is more appropriately done through the development of the Future Development Strategy, which is required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). This situation would detract from providing a boost in housing development capacity in the short to medium terms, which is undesirable.
5. Overall, the responses received have not substantially changed the original recommendations. However, some changes to recommendations have been made for some types of submissions, as set out in Section 3 below.

2 RESPONSES FROM SUBMITTERS

6. Responses were lodged by, or on behalf of, 72 different submitters. Of these, 62 were the subject of a single joint legal response lodged c/o Derek McLachlan of Gallaway Cook Allan (the 'joint response').
7. **Appendix A** provides marked-up versions of the two original assessment tables from the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report and Addendum of 4 May 2021 to show which submissions were the subject of a response.
8. Broad matters raised in the responses from submitters are outlined in the sections below, with some background information provided and a brief commentary on whether these may affect the decision at hand.

2.2 Purpose of Variation 2 in the context of NPS-UD and s32

9. Some responses have asserted that the requirement to provide additional housing capacity to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) means that consideration of any option that might assist in doing so should be considered in scope and should have formed part of the Section 32 assessment.

10. Firstly, I reiterate my statements from the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report regarding the purpose and development of Variation 2 (see Section 2.1 of that report) and regarding the Section 32 Report and how ‘most appropriate’ is interpreted (Section 4.1.1).
11. Secondly, I draw attention to Subpart 4 of the NPS-UD. This requires that a Future Development Strategy (FDS) is prepared in conjunction with the Otago Regional Council, through Local Government Act 2002 processes, to identify long term (between 10 and 30 years) development capacity for housing and businesses, associated development infrastructure and constraints on development. The purpose of an FDS is “to promote long-term strategic planning...” (Section 3.13(1)(a)). The first FDS must be made publicly available in time to inform the 2024 Long Term Plan.
12. In my view, broadening Variation 2 to include all possible options that could increase housing capacity would inappropriately pre-empt the impending FDS project required under the NPS-UD.

2.3 Clarity over scope limitation of Variation 2

13. Some responses have asserted that Council was unclear about the limited scope nature of Variation 2.
14. I reiterate my statements from the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report regarding how the scope of Variation 2 has been made clear (see Section 2.3 of that report).
15. In addition, I have reviewed the document by which the Planning and Environment Committee initiated Variation 2 on 12 February 2019 (see **Appendix B**). This sets out some details as to how Variation 2 would be undertaken and states:

“The identification and evaluation of options will involve collaboration between City Development, Transport, and 3 Waters to identify options that are cost-effective to service. This will also ensure integration between land use and infrastructure planning documents, including the 2GP and Infrastructure Strategy.

Once initial options are developed, consultation with landowners will be undertaken to ascertain the likelihood that areas would be developed if enabled. Broader public consultation will also support the evaluation of other aspects of the feasibility of development, and the assessment against the 2GP policy criteria.

*The plan change will then involve formal submissions **on the preferred areas.**”*
(**emphasis added**; paras 15-17)

16. As such, it was clear that the intention from the outset was for Variation 2 to be limited in scope and that a broader screening process would be used to identify the preferred areas.

2.4 Site selection process

17. The site selection process is outlined at Section 20.3 of the Section 32 Report and outlines the broad screening process that was undertaken using GIS to identify land that could potentially meet the criteria in 2GP Policy 2.6.2.1 (for new residential zoning). The report states that this assessment was “limited to identifying sites that were most likely to meet these criteria and so best placed to provided capacity for the medium term” (para. 672).

18. The Section 32 Report also outlined that, in addition to this screening exercise, “a wide range of sites were identified through consultation with stakeholders, including local planners, surveyors, and developers. A key benefit of this approach was the knowledge that these sites were likely to get developed if rezoned” (para. 676).
19. Some responses assert that the site suggestion process (referred to above as “consultation with stakeholders”) was not made clear by Council. I set out the process that was followed below:
 - a. An email was sent from a Council Policy Planner on 5 April 2019 to people from across the development sector whose contact details were held in the City Development database. This gave background to the Variation 2 process that was being undertaken and said, “We are also happy to receive suggestions for areas that may be appropriate to rezone as Residential, or ‘upzone’ for more intensive residential use...”. No deadline for feedback was given.
 - b. People who received that email started to send in suggestions and this was ongoing. Site suggestions continued to be added to the work programme for Variation 2 until work being undertaken by a consultant regarding 3 Waters infrastructure was too far advanced to include new sites.
 - c. From approximately June 2020 onwards, people were advised in response to suggestions received that they were too late for Variation 2 but that they would be kept on file for future processes. This included emails to most of the consultants who are party to the joint response received on scope.
 - d. Consultants informed of this continued to send in site suggestions.
20. In addition, the public consultation undertaken in 2019 through the *Planning for Housing Survey* provided the general public the opportunity to suggest areas that might be suitable for additional housing. Most submitters made general submissions in reference to broad locations or types of locations. Where submitters made specific submissions for the rezoning of their properties, these were included in the Variation 2 process. As such, this public consultation process gave an opportunity for anybody to put forward ideas through a process that was publicised and had clear deadlines.

2.5 Relevance of wider research undertaken

21. Some responses have asserted that, because the Council has undertaken research that was not spatially limited, this means Variation 2 is not spatially limited as assessment of broader areas has been undertaken and not included in the Section 32 report.
22. The DCC has undertaken broad research on the provision of housing in Dunedin, including *The Housing We’d Choose* survey and the *Planning for Housing* survey, both undertaken in 2019 and included in Section 32 Supporting Documents. Results from this research have been used for Variation 2 but were also intended to inform wider projects regarding housing capacity, such as the Future Development Strategy (i.e. they were not exclusively undertaken for Variation 2).
23. For the avoidance of doubt, the *Planning for Housing Survey Report* states “Results from the Planning for Housing Survey will contribute to the approach Council takes in responding to

housing-related issues, including through Variation 2 to the 2GP **and future plan changes and policy development.**” (emphasis added; p. 5).

24. The Housing We’d Choose report states that:

“the work is expected to support:

- *Responses to appeals on the Second Generation District Plan (2GP) seeking rezoning of land to residential or rural residential.*
- *A broader analysis of future housing demand that is being done to meet the DCC’s monitoring and capacity assessment obligations under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).” (p. 7)*

2.6 Relevance of changes to strategic directions

25. The joint response asserts that changes to Policy 2.6.2.1.a and Objective 2.6.2 made under Change H1 in Variation 2 provide broad scope to consider all rezoning submissions that have been assessed as out of scope. This is because the ‘purpose of proposal’ statement references a purpose of aligning with the NPS-UD.

26. I disagree with this assertion because the ‘purpose of proposal’ statement for Change H1 is specific to changes for Policy 2.6.2.1.a and Objective 2.6.2, not for any other changes. Removing the ‘cap’ on provision of housing capacity through changes to these provisions does not obligate Council to provide a large excess of housing capacity through Variation 2. It must simply “ensure provision of at least sufficient housing capacity to meet expected demand over the short and medium term” and this is achievable within the scope of Variation 2.

2.7 Submissions encompass similar amendments with like effect

27. Responses (including that on behalf of S268 Ōtākou Health Limited) raised that the submission points included in the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report encompass ‘any similar amendments with like effect’ and that this provides for the submission points to be modified in a way that can be considered within scope.

28. I disagree with this conclusion because the purpose of the change requested remains the same and this purpose is not encompassed by any changes that are within the scope of Variation 2. Similarly, just because a provision is being amended in Variation 2 does not mean that it can be amended for any purpose, if that purpose is not within scope (e.g. Rule 15.5.2 Density).

2.8 Alleviating prejudice through further submissions

29. The joint response asserts that any prejudice to third parties can be alleviated through the further submission process.

30. I disagree with this assertion because further submissions do not afford the submitter the same rights as an original submission would; they are limited to opposing or supporting the content of an original submission and cannot expand on it.

31. This is particularly problematic where members of the public have chosen not to submit on Variation 2 at all because they understood and accepted that it is limited in scope. Should those who have made out-of-scope submissions have their submission retained in Variation 2 for consideration, this is prejudicial to the interests of those that did not submit but would have if the scope of Variation 2 was wider.
32. Case law addressed in the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report (at Section 2.4) includes a reference to cases regarding scope and natural justice and the methodology for assessing whether submissions are in scope or not reflecting that case law. I still consider this appropriate.

3 REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS

33. The responses received have been reviewed and the original assessment and recommendations reconsidered for each of the affected submissions. Where changes to recommendations have been made, these have been applied consistently across all submitters with similar submission points, whether or not they lodged a response.
34. Overall, there have not been significant changes to the original recommendations. However, some changes have been made for the following types of submissions:
 - a. Submissions seeking large extensions to greenfield rezoning areas included in Variation 2 which were assessed as being out of scope and recommended for strike out. It is now recommended that we identify the extent of additional rezoning that we would consider to meet the tests to be deemed in scope and contact the submitters to see if they agree to reducing the scale of their submission to this so their submission point can be retained. It is likely that the size of the rezoning areas requested would need to be substantially reduced. This assessment is yet to be carried out so it would be necessary for the Panel to defer the decision on these submission points, possibly until 18 May 2021, to allow the further submission period to continue as planned on 19 May 2021. This affects the following submissions and rezoning areas:
 - (a) S89.001 (Paddy Bleach) regarding 50 Stevenson Road, which is adjacent to GF08 at Concord;
 - (b) S132.001 (Custom Investments Ltd) regarding 50 Stevenson Road, which is adjacent to GF08 at Concord;
 - (c) S240.001 (Invermark Investments Ltd) regarding part of 225 Gladstone Road South and all of 100 Main South Road, which is adjacent to GF02 at East Taieri;
 - (d) S147.001 (Tony Purvis) regarding parts of 63, 71 and 85 Wakari Road and 32 Larkins Street, which is adjacent to GF10 at Wakari;
 - (e) S166.001 (Malcolm Owens) regarding parts of 63, 71 and 85 Wakari Road and 32 Larkins Street, which is adjacent to GF10 at Wakari.
 - b. Submissions seeking large extensions to greenfield sites that were assessed and rejected as part of Variation 2, which were assessed as being out of scope and recommended for strike out. There are now two options recommended for these

submission points. Either, retain the original assessment to consider them out of scope, or take the same approach as for (a) above.

I note that as these submissions relate to rejected sites, directly affected landowners have not yet been notified of the potential for these areas to be included in Variation 2. For this reason, there are different natural justice issues at play than for the submissions on extensions of greenfield sites that were included in Variation 2. All relevant rejected sites are subject to submissions to rezone them and so letters will be sent to persons likely to be directly affected prior to the further submission process. There is a likelihood that other neighbouring landowners would want to suggest inclusion of their sites, but they will be unable to do so through the further submission process. As such, I prefer the first option to retain the original recommendation.

This affects the following submissions and rezoning areas:

- (a) S156.001 (Richard Muir) regarding 124, 130, 134, 142, 144, 150, 152, and 154 Bush Road and 164 Riccarton Road West, Mosgiel, which are adjacent to rejected site RS014;
 - (b) S191.001 (Roger and Janine Southby) regarding the properties bounded by the Silverstream to the north, Riccarton Road West to the west, Bush Road to the south and the existing residential zoned part of Mosgiel to the east, which is adjacent to rejected site RS014;
 - (c) Consequential changes would need to be made to the recommendation for S168.001 (Alec Cassie) based on the outcome for the above two submissions;
 - (d) S238.001 (Willowcroft Limited) regarding part of 60 Huntly Road, Outram, which is adjacent to rejected site RS175;
 - (e) S228.001 (Wendy Campbell) regarding 45 McMeakin Road and part of 188 North Taieri Road, Abbotsford, which is within the same property as rejected site RS014.
- c. Submissions where the submitter has narrowed the scope of their submission and this is considered to remove the issues regarding scope. This affects the following submissions:
- (a) S128.003 (Mark Geddes);
 - (b) S234 (Kāinga Ora) for all points in the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report.
35. The revised recommendations are addressed in more detail in two sections below; one regarding the joint response and one regarding all other responses. As for the original Out-of-Scope Submissions Report, the recommendation is to strike out any points that are assessed as out of scope, in accordance with Section 41D(1)(b) of the RMA.
36. For any submission points that are not expressly addressed in the following sections, my recommendations remain unchanged.

3.2 The Joint Response

37. The table below summarises the revised recommendations for submission points that are covered by the joint response received. This response does not seek to narrow the scope of any of the submissions it encompasses to assist in changing the outcome of the assessment on scope and disagrees with the recommendations made (except presumably not in the case of recommendations to consider some of the points in scope).

38. Overall, the joint submission seeks the following relief:

In light of these considerations, we consider the following approach to be an appropriate solution for submitters seeking rezoning outside of the areas identified within Appendix 4:

(a) The Panel do not exercise their authority to strike out submissions pursuant to section 41D; and

(b) Sites that have sought residential zoning through original submissions (but not identified within Appendix 4) are to be publicly notified and subject the further submission process."

(c) Given the scale of scope concerns, the Panel provides submitters with an opportunity to be heard directly through this process (as opposed to progressing 'on the papers').

39. I do not recommend accepting this relief, in whole or in part, as to do so would have significant impacts on natural justice. Of note, there will be members of the public who have chosen not to submit at all because they understood and accepted that Variation 2 is limited in scope. Should others then have their out-of-scope submissions considered, this would be unfair to those who did not submit. These people should have the opportunity to participate if others do.

40. On this basis, if a decision is made that substantially deviates from the recommendations made, it would be necessary to either renotify Variation 2 without the scope limitation or withdraw it in full or in part to give time to properly assess the entire City and associated residential provisions to provide for housing into the long term. This is more appropriately done through the development of the Future Development Strategy, which is required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). This situation would detract from providing a boost in housing development capacity in the short to medium terms, which is undesirable.

41. The request for a hearing would also cause further delay to Variation 2 process and provision of additional housing capacity.

42. I note that there appears to be some errors in Appendix A to the joint response in the row numbers given for the submitters listed. These are the row numbers for Mitchell Daysh clients, which should be rows 16 and 103 for Rochelle & Tony McFarlane (S190) and rows 22 and 70 for Lisa Jolly (S210).

43. I also note that row 61, which addresses a submission point from Ben and Raewyn Waller (s236) is also to be considered part of the joint submission, as per the email received from Derek McLachlan.

44. The submission points are considered in groups by type of submission, using the same grouping as for the original assessment of scope.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
3 to 5	91.001 (Deane Mason), 215.001 (Richard Anderson), 275.001 (Maree Scott)	Submissions seeking non-residential rezoning which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope	Retain original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
6, 7, 10, 13 to 17, 19 to 20, 22, 24 to 40, 42 to 44, 46 to 48, 50, 58 to 59, 61 to 64.	<p>206.001 & 206.002 (Paterson Pitts Group), 50.001 (Tony McAuliffe), 31.001 (Murray Wilson & Paula Parker - Wilpark Trust), 253.001 (Lloyd Michael Albert McGinty & Sally Ann Dicey), 250.001 (Meghan Mills), 190.001 (Rochelle and Tony McFarlane), 255.001 (Elliot and Dudzai MacKenzie), 257.001 (Barbara and Donald McCabe), 168.001 (Alec Cassie), 210.001 (Lisa Jolly);</p> <p>ALL SUBMISSIONS ON 231 SIGNAL HILL ROAD: 81.001 (Ari Jakobs), 136.001 (Chia Tzu Hsu), 135.001 (Han Wolsink), 120.001 (Hilary Calvert), 138.001 (Stuart Hardisty), 161.001 (Jane Bokser), 162.001 (Kent Centers), 211.001 (Hamish Mander), 212.001 (Victoria Broad), 254.001 (William Layland), 258.001 (Kennedy Building Limited), 134.002 (Judith Layland), 280.001 (Alistair Broad), 80.001 (Grandview 2011 Limited), 287.002 (Jakobs Farm Trust), 297.001 (Harry Harding), 109.001 (Julie Mander);</p> <p>ALL SUBMISSIONS ON 327, 329 AND 331 BIG STONE ROAD: 285.002 (Christopher and Mark Lawrence), 261.001 (Hans Joachim & Renate Scholz), 303.001 (Jason and Bronwyn Cockerill - Seaview Ridges Limited);</p> <p>260.001 (Lloyd Morshuis - Morclark Developments), 209.001</p>	Submissions seeking residential zoning that is not contiguous with areas assessed in Variation 2, which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope	Retain original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
	(Sovereign Park 2003 Limited - John Latta), 270.001 (Doug Hall), 117.001 (Allan Johnston), 251.001 (Brendon Murray), 228.002 (Wendy Campbell), 236.001 (Ben and Raewyn Waller), 179.001 (Hamish and Rebecca Miller), 293.001 (Michael David Byck & Nicola Andrea O'Brien), 93.001 (Gary Cole & Sacha Grey).			
68, 71 to 72	240.001 (Invermark Investments Ltd), 132.001 (Custom Investments Ltd), 89.001 (Paddy Bleach).	Submissions seeking extensions to greenfield rezoning areas which were initially assessed as out of scope and which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.	Discuss with the submitters the possibility of reducing the size of the rezoning extension they are seeking so that the tests that must be passed to be considered in scope can be met. Extend this opportunity to all similarly affected submitters (147.001 Tony Purvis, 166.001 Malcolm Owens). Defer the decision on affected submission points.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
69	204.001 (Ron Balchin)	Submission seeking extension to a greenfield rezoning area which was initially assessed as in scope and which is part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission should be considered in scope but adjoining landowners (and others considered directly affected) should be notified directly of submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.	Retain the original recommendation to consider the point in scope.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
88, 89, 91	156.001 (Richard Muir), 191.001 (Roger and Janine Southby), 238.001 (Willowcroft Limited).	Submissions seeking extension of rejected sites assessed in Variation 2 which were initially assessed as out of scope and which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope...	Two options are presented to the Panel for consideration, either: Retain the original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged; or Discuss with the submitters the possibility of reducing the size of the rezoning extension they are seeking so that the tests that must be passed to be considered in scope can be met and extend this opportunity to all similarly affected submitters (228.001 Wendy Campbell). Consequential changes to the assessment for 168.001 (Alec Cassie) may be needed depending on the outcome of this process, so a decision on his submission would need to be deferred. Defer the decision on these submission points.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
92	219.005 (Gladstone Family Trust)	Submission seeking extension of a rejected site assessed in Variation 2 which was initially assessed as in scope and which is part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.	Retain the original recommendation to consider the point in scope.
94 to 99	150.001 (Giler and Katherine Wynn-Williams), 296.001 (Jason and Margaret Hewlett), 290.001 (Victoria Jane and Pera Paul Manahera Eden), 76.001 (Christopher Connor & Tina Prendergast), 79.001 (Glenelg Street Trust Board Incorporated), 291.001 (Margaret Charles & Marguerita Lazar).	Submissions seeking rezoning where mapped areas have been amended in Variation 2, or where already in a transition zone, which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope...	Retain original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.

Rows in report	Submissions	Description of submissions	Original assessment	Revised recommendation
101 to 105	219.001 (Gladstone Family Trust), 251.002 (Brendon Murray), 190.002 (Rochelle and Tony McFarlane), 288.001 (Flat Iron Group), 259.001 (Midas Limited).	Submissions seeking changes to mapped areas or overlay zones not being amended in Variation 2 which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope...	Retain original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
126 to 127, 162, 170, 172 to 173, 176 to 179.	219.002 (Gladstone Family Trust), 233.005 (Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth), 233.006 (Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth), 210.002 (Lisa Jolly), 248.001 (David Leslie Meyer & Christine Raywin Cordell), 256.001 (Tony Steven McFadgen - Ocean Park Trust), 248.002 (Davide Leslie Meyer & Christine Raywin Cordell), 256.002 (Tony Steven McFadgen - Ocean Park Trust), 257.002 (Barbara and Donald McCabe), 233.001 (Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth).	Submissions seeking changes to plan provisions that are not within 'purpose of proposal and scope of change' statements and which are part of the joint legal response from GCA.	Submission is out of scope...	Retain original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.

3.3 Other Responses

45. The table below summarises the revised recommendations for submission points that are the subject of individual responses. It is noted that some of these submission points are also covered by the joint response above, but the recommendations are the same in each case.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
16	190.001 Rochelle and Tony McFarlane	Submission is out of scope	Disagrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
103	190.002 Rochelle and Tony McFarlane	Submission is out of scope, as is the associated rezoning request.	Disagrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
55	128.003 Mark Geddes	Submission is out of scope	Disagrees	Yes - substitute the following paragraph for the paragraph under section A3 of the initial submission: <i>A3 - I think the changes to Gen Residential 1 and 2 are positive and the council should be commended on these moves in the areas outlined on the maps. I do, however, feel that the extent of the mapping falls short. I am not permitted to say any more on this due to the scope document for this Variation 2 process.</i>	Amend the submission point as requested to be in support of Change A3. Scope no longer in question.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
71	132.001 Custom Investments Limited	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.	Disagrees	No	Discuss with the submitter the possibility of reducing the size of the rezoning extension they are seeking so that the tests that must be passed to be considered in scope can be met. Defer the decision on this submission point.
83	15.001 Mike and Claire Cowan	Submission point should be considered in scope, as it represents a minor extension to IN08 and any additional directly affected parties can be notified.	Agrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider the point in scope. Additional sites suggested in the response have been rejected as a late submission.
84	61.001 Daniel Anfield	Submission is out of scope	Disagrees	No	Retain the original recommendation to consider the point out of scope as the late submission with additional sites has been rejected as a late submission.
85	123.001 Fletcher Glass	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.	Does not comment on recommendation	Submitter would like to clarify that the higher density residential zoning sought is General Residential 2 zone.	Retain original recommendation to consider the point in scope; clarification has no substantive effect.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
86	123.002 Fletcher Glass	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.	Does not comment on recommendation	No	Retain original recommendation to consider the point in scope.
88	156.001 Richard Muir	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.	Disagrees	No	Two options are presented to the Panel for consideration. Either, retain the original recommendation to consider these points out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged; or Discuss with the submitters the possibility of reducing the size of the rezoning extension they are seeking so that the tests that must be passed to be considered in scope can be met and extend this opportunity to all similarly affected submitters (228.001 Wendy Campbell). Consequential changes to the assessment for 168.001 (Alec Cassie) may be needed depending on the outcome of this process, so a decision on his submission would need to be deferred. Defer the decision on this submission point.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
20	168.001 Alec Cassie	Submission is out of scope	Disagrees	No	If the panel is of a mind to follow the second option above for Richard Muir, defer the decision on this submission point in anticipation of any consequential changes that may be required.
144	58.001 Richard Farry	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to manage subdivision for effects on heritage character outside of heritage precincts).	Disagrees	No	Retain the original recommendation to consider the point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged. In particular, there are no purpose of proposal statements that encompass the changes sought. Change B5 is only to review the appropriateness of managing density for character and amenity reasons. The rule change sought does not relate to density (a land use performance standard), it relates to subdivision.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
145	268.001 Ōtākou Health Limited	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to extend provisions related to papakāika housing).	Disagrees	Yes - amend the relief sought: (a) Amend the scope of Change C1 to provide for amendments to Rule 15.5.2(4)(a) underlined in red below: <i>Standard residential activity that contravenes the performance standard for density is a non-complying activity, except <u>contravention of the following standards only is a</u> are restricted discretionary activities: {Change E9}</i> <i>"a. papakaika that contravenes the performance standards for density <u>and standard residential activity advanced by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (and its interests) on land under its ownership;</u>"</i>	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged as a result of the change to the submission.
146	268.002 Ōtākou Health Limited	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to extend provisions related to papakāika housing).	Disagrees	Any similar amendments with like effect. Any consequential amendments...	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged as a result of the change to the submission.

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
167	266.001 James Sunderland and Megan Justice	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.	Disagrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
93	266.003 James Sunderland and Megan Justice	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA change.	Disagrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope as matters relevant to determine if the submission is in scope are unchanged.
174	144.001 Douglas Warhurst	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.	Agrees	No	Retain original recommendation to consider point out of scope.
Various	234 Kāinga Ora	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A all submission points in the Out-of-Scope Report have been withdrawn.
185 to 188	189.001, 189.004, 189.007, 189.011 Ryman Healthcare Limited	Submission is out of scope...	Feedback is to be provided by noon 11 May 2021.	N/A	Deferred as per extension by the Panel

Row in Report	Submission point	Original assessment	Response agrees or disagrees?	Narrows submission?	Revised recommendation
148, 117, 119, 149	205.001, 205.004, 205.007, 205.011 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Submission is out of scope...	Preliminary legal response provided by Chapman Tripp. Will consider once final feedback is received by noon 11 May 2021.	N/A	Deferred as per extension by the Panel

APPENDIX A – MARKED UP ASSESSMENT TABLES

1. This appendix includes marked-up versions of the two assessment tables from the Out-of-Scope Submissions Report and Addendum of 4 May 2021 to show the following:
 - a. All submissions which are the subject of the joint legal response c/o Derek McLachlan of Gallaway Cook Allan, highlighted in 'peach'
 - b. All submissions from Kāinga Ora (S234), struck out in accordance with the letter recording the partial withdrawal of their submission. I also note that Appendix D of the Out-of-Scope Submission Report is no longer relevant and should be ignored
 - c. All submissions from Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand and Ryman Healthcare Limited, highlighted in 'grey' for consideration by the Hearing Panel after their response deadline of noon Tuesday 11 May 2021, as granted by the Panel on 4 May 2021.
 - d. All submissions which are the subject of any other response, highlighted in 'purple'
 - e. Submissions which are the subject of both the joint legal response and another response have both peach and purple highlighting.

Assessment of Rezoning & Mapping Requests

2. The original assessment of rezoning and mapping requests is provided in the table on the following pages. This has been updated to show which submissions a response on scope has been received for.
3. Submissions are grouped by type, so are not in numerical or alphabetical order. To find a submission point, please use the search function (CTRL>F) and type in a name or submitter number.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING NON-RESIDENTIAL REZONING								
1	7.001 Andrew Nailard	Rezone all land zoned Rural Residential 1 to Rural Residential 2.	No	N/A	N/A	Rezoning to rural residential zones is not part of Variation 2.	No	Submission is out of scope
2	68.001 Angela and Gerard Koopman	Rezone 185 Mount Grand Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a rural residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Rezoning to rural residential zones is not part of Variation 2.	No	Submission is out of scope
3	91.001 Deane Mason	Rezone 40 Halfway Bush Road from Rural Taieri Plain zone to Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Rezoning to rural residential zones is not part of Variation 2.	Yes	Submission is out of scope
4	215.001 Richard Anderson	Rezone 270 Chain Hills Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Rezoning to rural residential zones is not part of Variation 2.	Yes	Submission is out of scope
5	275.001 Maree Scott	Rezone 265 Double Hill Road from Rural Coastal zone to Rural Hill Slopes zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Rezoning to rural zones is not part of Variation 2.	No	Submission is out of scope
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING RESIDENTIAL REZONING THAT IS NOT CONTIGUOUS WITH AREAS ASSESSED IN VARIATION 2								
6	206.001 Paterson Pitts Group	Add a Residential Transition Overlay Zone to the land between Abbotsford, Halfway Bush and Wingatui (as identified in the submitter's map), or otherwise identify this land as a future urban development area.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
7	206.002 Paterson Pitts Group	Add a Residential Transition Overlay Zone to the land between Tomahawk and Highcliff Road (as identified in the submitter's map), or otherwise identify this land as a future urban development area.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
8	178.001 Kennedy McHoull	Retain Rural Residential 2 zoning for 6 Park Road, Warrington.	No	N/A	N/A	No rezoning is proposed at this property as part of Variation 2.	No	Submission is out of scope
9	19.001 David Macmillan	Rezone 7 Riccarton Road East and adjacent similar properties from Large Lot Residential 1 zone to another residential zone to provide for more housing (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
10	50.001 Tony McAuliffe	Rezone 8 Camp Street, Broad Bay, from Rural Residential 2 zone to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
11	149.001 Ann Jones	Rezone 8 Camp Street, Broad Bay, from Rural Residential 2 zone to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
12	234.074 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Rezone 15 Church Street, Mosgiel, from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope
13	31.001 Murray Wilson & Paula Parker (Wilpark Trust)	Rezone 26 Camp Street, Broad Bay, from Rural Residential 2 zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
14	253.001 Lloyd Michael Albert McGinty & Sally Ann Dicey	Rezone 26 Centre Road, Tomahawk, and surrounding properties, from Rural Peninsula Coast zone to General Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
15	250.001 Meghan Mills	Rezone 29 John Street, Ocean View, from Rural Residential 1 zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
16	190.001 Rochelle and Tony McFarlane	Rezone 32 and 34 Manuka Street, Ravensbourne, from Rural Hill Slopes zone to General Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
17	255.001 Elliot and Dudzai MacKenzie	Rezone 49 Christie Street, Abbotsford, from Rural Residential 1 zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
18	231.001 Barry Douglas & Fiona Lynn Armour	Rezone 70 Green Island Bush Road and surrounding Rural Residential 1 zoned properties to Large Lot Residential 2 zone and require on-site wastewater provisions (subject to appropriate landscape controls).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope?')
19	257.001 Barbara and Donald McCabe	Rezone 122 Campbells Road and surrounding Rural Residential 2 zoned properties from Rural Residential 2 zone to Rural Residential 1 zone or a Large Lot Residential zone, and apply a structure plan mapped area.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
20	168.001 Alec Cassie	Rezone 130 Bush Road Mosgiel, and adjacent properties, from Rural Taieri Plain zone to Low Density Residential zone, Large Lot Residential 1 zone, or another alternative.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
21	262.001 Peter and Michelle Thomson	Rezone 155 Chain Hills Road, and the surrounding properties as shown in the map provided by the submitter, from Rural Hill Slopes zone, to a new 'Rural Lifestyle Zone' with a minimum site size of 7,000m ² , or to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
22	210.001 Lisa Jolly	Rezone 192 Chain Hills Road, and the surrounding properties as shown in the map provided by the submitter, from Rural Residential 1 zone to a new 'Rural Lifestyle Zone' with a minimum site size of 7,000m ² , or to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
23	213.001 James and Katherine Cotter	Rezone 197 Chain Hills Road, and the surrounding properties as shown in the map provided by the submitter, from Rural Residential 1 zone to a new 'Rural Lifestyle Zone' with a minimum site size of 7,000m ² , or to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
24	81.001 Ari Jakobs	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
25	136.001 Chia Tzu Hsu	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
26	135.001 Han Wolsink	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
27	120.001 Hilary Calvert	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
28	138.001 Stuart Hardisty	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
29	161.001 Jane Bokser	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
30	162.001 Kent Centers	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
31	211.001 Hamish Mander	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
32	212.001 Victoria Broad	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
33	254.001 William Layland	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
34	258.001 Kennedy Building Limited	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
35	134.002 Judith Layland	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
36	280.001 Alistair Broad	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
37	80.001 Grandview 2011 Limited	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
38	287.002 Jakobs Farm Trust	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
39	297.001 Harry Harding	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
40	109.001 Julie Mander	Rezone 231 Signal Hill Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone to to a residential zone, possibly a Large Lot Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
41	78.001 Trevor Scott	Rezone 259 Upper Junction Road, Sawyers Bay, from Rural Residential 1 zone to Township and Settlement zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
42	285.002 Christopher and Mark Lawrence	Rezone 327, 329 and 331 Big Stone Road from Rural Coastal zone to General Residential 1 zone, Large Lot Residential 1 zone, or Large Lot Residential 2 zone, or alternatively Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
43	261.001 Hans Joachim & Renate Scholz	Rezone 327, 329 and 331 Big Stone Road, from Rural Coastal zone to General Residential 1 zone, Large Lot Residential 1 zone or Large Lot Residential 2 zone, or alternatively to Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
44	303.001 Jason and Bronwyn Cockerill (Seaview Ridges Limited)	Rezone 327, 329, and 331 Big Stone Road from Rural Coastal zone to General Residential 1 zone, Large Lot Residential 1 zone, or Large Lot Residential 2 zone, or alternatively Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
45	226.001 John Williamson	Rezone 479 Riccarton Road West, Mosgiel, and the surrounding area, from Rural Residential 1 zone to a new 'Rural Lifestyle Zone' with a minimum site size of 7,000m ² , or to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
46	260.001 Lloyd Morshuis (Morclark Developments)	Rezone 500A Kaikorai Valley Road from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
47	209.001 Sovereign Park (2003) Limited (John Latta)	Rezone 540 Dukes Road North from Rural Taieri Plain zone to a residential zone and apply a new development mapped area to identify it for future residential development.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
48	270.001 Doug Hall	Rezone 636 North Road from Rural Hill Slopes zone, Rural Residential 1 zone or Rural Residential 2 zone, to General Residential 1 zone or, alternatively, rezone parts to Rural Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
49	100.001 Jeffery Pearce	Rezone 729 North Road, Normanby, from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Residential Transition Overlay Zone to transition to a residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
50	117.001 Allan Johnston	Rezone 749 East Taieri-Allanton Road, 6 Peel Street, 12, 24, and 28 Ralston Street, and 4 & 12 Allanton Scroggs Hill Road, Allanton, from Rural Coastal zone to a residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
51	313.001 Simon Roberts	Rezone 808A Brighton Road from Rural Residential 1 zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
52	312.001 Justine Ragg	Rezone 810 Brighton Road from Rural Residential 1 zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
53	71.007 Andrew Rutherford	Rezone areas around rail corridors from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
54	71.002 Andrew Rutherford	Rezone areas of Dunedin where there are no heritage buildings from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
55	128.003 Mark Geddes	Rezone areas with 4-10 house lots where good servicing exists and building platforms could be more readily developed from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
56	234.073 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Rezone land in the vicinity of Factory Road and Glenbrook Drive, Mosgiel, (as shown in the submitter's map) from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope
57	234.072 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Rezone land in the vicinity of Reid Avenue, Murray Street, Lorne Street, and Ross Street, Mosgiel (as shown in the submitter's map) from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope
58	251.001 Brendon Murray	Rezone part of 14 and 18 Centre Road, Tomahawk, and surrounding properties with rural zoning but residential land use, from Rural Peninsula Coast zone to General Residential 1 zone or a Large Lot Residential zone, and apply a structure plan mapped area.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
59	228.002 Wendy Campbell	Rezone part of 188 North Taieri Road in the vicinity of Abbotts Hill Road and Mount Grand Road (as shown in the submitter's maps) from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a mixture of zones in accordance with the submitter's proposed structure plan, including General Residential 1 zone and Low Density Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
60	87.001 Jan Tisdall	Rezone part of 31 Huntly Road (Pt Lot 2 DP 5966), Outram, (as shown on the submitter's map) from Rural Taieri Plains zone to Township and Settlement zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
61	236.001 Ben & Raewyn Waller	Rezone part of 457 Purakaunui Road from Rural Coastal zone to Township and Settlement zone in accordance with the submitter's proposed draft structure plan.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
62	179.001 Hamish And Rebecca Miller	Rezone part of 54 Bell Street, Outram and neighbouring sites, from Rural Taieri Plain zone to a residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
63	293.001 Michael David Byck & Nicola Andrea O'Brien	Rezone the Rural Coastal zoned part of 23 John Street, Waldronville, to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
64	93.001 Gary Cole & Sacha Grey	Rezone the Rural Hill Slopes zoned part of 8A Flower Street, and 46 Flower Street (currently Rural Residential 2 zone), Fairfield, to General Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING EXTENSIONS TO GREENFIELD REZONING AREAS								
65	249.001 Ross McLeary & COF Ltd & Scroggs Hill Farm Ltd	Extend Change GF01 (rezoning part of 155 and 252 Scroggs Hill Road, Brighton, from Rural Residential 1 zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone) to include further areas within these properties (also extends rejected change RS160), including land currently in the Rural Coastal zone, to zones as shown in the submitter's proposed structure plan.	Yes (GF01 & RS160), except for addition of Recreation Zone.	Yes	Yes, the additional area is part of the same property that has already been assessed as part of Variation 2.	The property has also been assessed as part of work to establish a position on a 2GP appeal that is still live.	No	Submission should be considered in scope but adjoining landowners (and others considered directly affected) should be notified directly of submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
66	30.001 Sonia & Karl Thom	Extend Change GF02 (rezoning of 201, 207 and 211 Gladstone Road South from Rural Taieri Plain zone to General Residential 1 zone) to include rezoning of 195 and 197 Gladstone Road South from Large Lot Residential 1 zone to General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	Yes	Yes, there are only a small number of additional properties that border this extended area.	The sites are already in a residential zone (Large Lot Residential 1 zone).	No	Submission should be considered in scope but adjoining landowners (and others considered directly affected) should be notified directly of submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
67	99.001 Peter and Jillian Hogan	Extend Change GF02 (rezoning 201, 207 and 211 Gladstone Road South from Rural Taieri Plain zone to General Residential 1 zone), to include rezoning of 195 and 197 Gladstone Road South from Large Lot Residential 1 zone to General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	Yes	Yes, there are only a small number of additional properties that border this extended area.	The sites are already in a residential zone (Large Lot Residential 1 zone).	No	Submission should be considered in scope but adjoining landowners (and others considered directly affected) should be notified directly of submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
68	240.001 Invermark Investments Ltd	Extend Change GF02 (rezoning 201, 207 and 211 Gladstone Road South, East Taieri, from Rural Taieri Plain zone to General Residential 1 zone) to include part of 225 Gladstone Road South and all of 100 Main South Road in accordance with the submitter's map, and apply a structure plan mapped area.	Yes	No, the additional area contains High Class Soils mapped area and is adjacent to SH1.	No, this would be a large extension to GF02, up to approximately 500m away and could probably generate broader interest than could be managed through letters just to adjoining landowners.		No	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
69	204.001 Ron Balchin	Extend Change GF05 (rezoning from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 zone at part of 353 Main South Road, Fairfield) so that a single building platform is provided on the remaining part of 353 Main South Road.	Yes, is within the same property, although a different development pattern is sought.	Not necessarily, land instability hazards in this general area are variable and a site level assessment is required.	Yes, this is a small extension to the area under consideration.		No	Submission should be considered in scope but adjoining landowners (and others considered directly affected) should be notified directly of submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
70	234.078 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Extend Change GF05 (rezoning of part of 353 Main South Road, Fairfield, from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 zone) to include the remaining part of 353 Main South Road, 333 Main South Road, 36 Severn Street, and the Rural Residential 2 zoned parts of 15 Miller Street and 6A Thomson Street.	Yes	Not necessarily, land instability hazards in this general area are variable and a site level assessment is required.	No, this would be a large extension to GF05, up to approximately 325m away.	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.
71	132.001 Custom Investments Ltd	Extend Change GF08 (rezoning 19 Main South Road, Concord, from Rural Hill Slopes zone to General Residential 1 and 2 zones) to include the property at 50 Stevenson Road (inferred not stated).	Yes	No, Hazard 2 (land instability) overlay zone and High Class Soils mapped area apply on this site.	No, this would be a large extension to GF08, up to approximately 700m away.		No	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.
72	89.001 Paddy Bleach	Extend Change GF08 (rezoning from Rural Hill Slopes zone to General Residential 1 and 2 zone at 19 Main South Road, Concord) to rezone 50 Stevenson Road, from Rural Hill Slopes to General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	No, Hazard 2 (land instability) overlay zone and High Class Soils mapped area apply on this site.	No, this would be a large extension to GF08, up to approximately 700m away.		Yes	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
73	147.001 Tony Purvis	Extend Change GF10 (rezoning of 45 Honeystone Street (in part) and 32 Honeystone Street from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone) to include the Rural Hill Slopes zoned portions of 63, 71 and 85 Wakari Road and 32 Larkins Street.	Yes	No, National Grid Corridor mapped area over the Wakari Road properties.	No, this would be a large extension to GF10, up to approximately 400m away.		No	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.
74	166.001 Malcolm Owens	Extend Change GF10 (rezoning of 45 Honeystone Street (in part) and 32 Honeystone Street from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Large Lot Residential 1 zone) to include the Rural Hill Slopes zoned portions of the properties at 63, 71 and 85 Wakari Road, and 32 Larkins Street.	Yes	No, National Grid Corridor mapped area over the Wakari Road properties.	No, this would be a large extension to GF10, up to approximately 400m away.		No	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.
75	154.001 Gillian Thomas	Extend Change GF11 (rezoning of selected properties on Wakari Road from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 zone) to include part of 297 Wakari Road at its southernmost end, as shown in the diagram provided by the submitter.	Yes	No, Significant Natural Landscape overlay zone applies in this location.	Yes, the additional area is part of GF11 - most of the driveway. Unlikely to directly affect any additional persons.		No	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
76	154.002 Gillian Thomas	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Landscape overlay zone at 297 Wakari Road to reflect the natural boundary provided by the creek and tree line and the requested extension to the General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	No, Significant Natural Landscape overlay zone applies in this location.	Yes, the additional area is part of GF11 - most of the driveway. Unlikely to directly affect any additional persons.		See above	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
77	154.003 Gillian Thomas	Amend the extent of the High Class Soils mapped area over 297 Wakari Road to reflect the requested extension to the General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	Yes	Yes, the additional area is part of GF11 - most of the driveway. Unlikely to directly affect any additional persons.		See above	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
78	154.004 Gillian Thomas	Extend Change GF11 (application of the new development mapped area over the properties proposed for residential rezoning at Wakari Road) to include part of 297 Wakari Road to reflect the requested extension to the General Residential 1 zone.	Yes	No, Significant Natural Landscape overlay zone applies in this location.	Yes, the additional area is part of GF11 - most of the driveway. Unlikely to directly affect any additional persons.		See above	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING EXTENSIONS TO INTENSIFICATION REZONING AREAS								
79	3.001 Alana Jamieson	Extend Change IN02 (rezoning from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone at Burgess Street, Green Island) to rezone part of 41 Burgess Street (Lot 4 DP 23545), Green Island, from Rural Coastal zone to General Residential 2 zone.	Yes	Yes, albeit the area is currently Rural Coastal zone	Yes, few properties affected		No	Submission should be considered in scope, as it represents a minor extension to IN02 and any additional directly affected parties can be notified.
80	234.080 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Extend Change IN03 (rezoning from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone in the vicinity of Church Street, Green Island) to include 41 Burgess Street, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34 and 36 Kirkland Street, and 74, 76, 78, 80 and 82 District Road, some of which are currently zoned Rural Coastal zone.	Yes (IN02 & IN03)	No, Hazard 1 (land instability) overlay zone applies in this area.	No, this would be a large extension to IN03 and IN02, up to approximately 150m away from each rezoning area.		Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
81	234.089 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Extend Change IN04 (rezoning from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone in the vicinity of Mulford Street, Concord) to include land in the vicinity of Stenhope Crescent, as shown in the submitter's map.	Yes	No, 3 Waters issues are likely to apply in this area.	No, this change would potentially affect many additional persons.		Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification
82	234.092 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Extend Change IN05 to include the wider area in the vicinity of Rosebery Street, Mornington as shown in the submitter's map. This point excludes the reinstatement of rejected Change RS87, which is addressed in a separate point.	Yes	No, Windle Settlement Residential Heritage Precinct, two scheduled heritage buildings and multiple character contributing buildings apply in this area.	No, this change would potentially affect many additional persons.	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification
83	15.001 Mike and Claire Cowan	Extend Change IN08 (rezoning from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone at Roslyn north) to include the properties at 16 Wright Street and 37 Tyne Street, Roslyn.	Yes (IN08 and RS097)	Yes	Yes, few properties affected		No	Submission point should be considered in scope, as it represents a minor extension to IN08 and any additional directly affected parties can be notified.
84	61.001 Daniel Anfield	Extend Change IN13 (rezoning from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone at Andersons Bay) to the property at 125 Tomahawk Road.	No	N/A	N/A	While not contiguous with IN13, it is within 50m. It would represent a 'spot zoning' as no other sites are within scope.	No	Submission is out of scope

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING EXTENSION OF REJECTED SITES ASSESSED IN VARIATION 2								
85	123.001 Fletcher Glass	Rezone 35 Watts Road from General Residential 1 zone to a higher density residential zone (inferred not stated).	Yes (RS206)	Yes, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	Yes, any additional landowners could be notified as part of notifying regarding the inclusion of RS206.	This site was suggested early in the assessment process and was omitted in error. Part of this property has already been assessed.	No	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
86	123.002 Fletcher Glass	Rezone parts of 309 North Road, shown as areas 'B' and 'C' on the submitter's map, from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone (inferred not stated).	Yes (RS77 & RS206)	Yes, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	Yes, any additional landowners could be notified as part of notifying regarding the inclusion of RS206.	This site was suggested early in the assessment process and was omitted in error. Part of this property has already been assessed.	No	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
87	234.104 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Rezone 20 Noyna Road, 7 Brick Hill Road and PT SEC 1037R Brick Hill Road, Sawyers Bay from Rural Residential 1 zone to General Residential 1 zone. This point excludes sites covered by rejected Change RS171, which is addressed in a separate point.	Yes (RS171)	Yes, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	Yes, any additional landowners could be notified as part of notifying regarding the inclusion of RS171.	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.
88	156.001 Richard Muir	Rezone 124, 130, 134, 142, 144, 150, 152, and 154 Bush Road, and 164 Riccarton Road West and consider Low Density Residential zone or other alternatives. This point excludes sites covered by rejected Change RS212, which is addressed in a separate point.	Yes (RS212), Large Lot Residential 1 zone falls within "other alternatives"	No, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	No, the extension is large and may be of interest to residents beyond 50m.	Addition of these sites would make connection with the existing residential area, which is not achieved by RS212 alone.	No	Submission is out of scope as it would require further s32 assessment and renotification

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
89	191.001 Roger and Janine Southby	Rezone all properties bounded by the Silverstream to the north, Riccarton Road West to the west, Bush Road to the south and the existing residential zoned part of Mosgiel to the east (excludes sites covered by RS212, as this is addressed in a separate point) from Rural Taieri Plain zone to General Residential 1 zone, Low Density Residential zone and/or General Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	RS212 was assessed for Large Lot Residential 1 zone.	No	Submission is out of scope
90	228.001 Wendy Campbell	Rezone 45 McMeakin Road and part of 188 North Taieri Road, Abbotsford, as outlined in the submitter's maps, (except for the area covered by rejected Change RS014, which is addressed in a separate point) from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a mixture of zones in accordance with the submitter's proposed structure plan, including General Residential 1 zone, Low Density Residential zone and Recreation zone.	Yes, is within the same property as RS014, although a different development pattern is sought.	No, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	No, as while any additional landowners could be notified as part of notifying regarding the inclusion of RS014, the extension is large and may be of interest to wider residents.	RS014 was assessed for General Residential 1 zone.	No	Submission is out of scope, as including it would require renotification.
91	238.001 Willowcroft Limited	Rezone part of 60 Huntly Road, Outram, from Rural Taieri Plain zone to Township and Settlement zone and apply a structure plan mapped area but not a new development mapped area.	No	N/A	N/A	Adjacent to rejected site RS175.	No	Submission is out of scope
92	219.005 Gladstone Family Trust	Rezone parts of 100 Irwin Logan Drive from Rural Hill Slopes zone to Recreation zone in accordance with the submitter's proposed structure plan and include 3-20 Jocelyn Way, 38 and 40-43 Irwin Logan Drive, and 25-27 Pinfold Place within the structure plan mapped area.	Yes, adjacent to RS153 and generally relates to a proposal for that area.	Yes, albeit that RS site assessments are not complete assessments of all issues.	Yes, any additional landowners could be notified as part of notifying regarding the inclusion of RS153.	The submitter seeks changes on additional adjacent areas, with a structure plan mapped area proposed that covers the entire area.	No	Submission should be considered in scope, but any additional directly affected persons should be notified directly of the submission and advised of the opportunity to make a further submission.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING REZONING WHERE MAPPED AREAS HAVE BEEN AMENDED IN VARIATION 2								
93	266.003 James Sunderland & Megan Justice	Remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone from the Balmacewen Golf Course and retain the Rural Hill Slopes zone or rezone to Recreation zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA09.	No	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA change.
94	150.001 Giler and Katherine Wynn-Williams	Rezone the Large Lot Residential 1 zoned part of 15 Dunedin-Waitati Road (and covered by Change NDMA03 and NWRA7) to General Residential 1 zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA03 and NWRA7.	Yes	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA or NWRA changes.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING REZONING WHERE ALREADY IN TRANSITION ZONE (WANT TO BE TRANSITIONED)								
95	296.001 Jason and Margaret Hewlett	Rezone 32 Salisbury road from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA15.	No	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.
96	290.001 Victoria Jane and Pera Paul Manahera Eden	Rezone the Rural Hill Slopes zoned portion of 34 Ettrick Street to General Residential 1 zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA14.	No	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.
97	76.001 Christopher Connor & Tina Prendergast	Rezone 41 Glenelg Street, 34 Bradford Street and 5 Ronay Street from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 Zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA04.	Yes	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope'?)
98	79.001 Glenelg Street Trust Board Incorporated	Rezone 41 Glenelg Street, 34 Bradford Street and 5 Ronay Street from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 Zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA04.	Yes	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.
99	291.001 Margaret Charles & Marguerita Lazar	Rezone 41 Glenelg Street, 34 Bradford Street and 5 Ronay Street from Rural Residential 2 zone to General Residential 1 Zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA04.	Yes	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.
100	83.001 Eleanor Linscott	Rezone part of 68 Montague Street, Opoho, as outlined by Change NDMA07, from Rural Hill Slopes zone to a residential zone and remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone (inferred not stated).	No	N/A	N/A	Area affected by application of NDMA07.	No	Submission is out of scope as not responding to the purpose of proposal for the NDMA overlay (changes D1, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, NDMA 2-15) or Change H2 which reviewed the housing capacity trigger only.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING CHANGES TO MAPPED AREAS OR OVERLAY ZONES NOT BEING AMENDED IN VARIATION 2								
101	219.001 Gladstone Family Trust	Add a structure plan mapped area to the properties at 90, 98 and 100 Gladstone Road North, Mosgiel, to enable residential activity at a higher density than provided in the underlying Low Density Residential zone.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope
102	251.002 Brendon Murray	Amend the extent of the Outstanding Natural Landscape overlay zone at 14 and 18 Centre Road, Tomahawk, and surrounding properties with rural zoning but residential land use, to follow the contour of the land and the periphery of the mature vegetation.	No	N/A	N/A	An associated request for rezoning has been made by this submitter - see above for assessment.	Yes	Submission is out of scope, as is the associated rezoning request.
103	190.002 Rochelle and Tony McFarlane	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Landscape overlay zone so it no longer extends over the properties at 32 and 34 Manuka Street, Ravensbourne.	No	N/A	N/A	An associated request for rezoning has been made by this submitter - see above for assessment.	No	Submission is out of scope, as is the associated rezoning request.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	(1) Is the submission on a change to a management regime that is being amended for an area included in V2? (e.g. is the area contiguous with a V2 area and is the same zoning sought?) (Yes/No)	(2) If Yes to (1), is it likely the existing s32 assessment applies to this area in a closely similar way? (Yes/No)	(3) If Yes to (1), can natural justice issues be reasonably managed (e.g. only a small number of additional landowners would need to be notified)?	Other things to consider	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment (is the submission 'in scope?')
104	288.001 Flat Iron Group	Amend the extent of the Urban Biodiversity Mapped Area at 179 and 183 Mornington Road so that it follows the extent of existing forest cover.	No	N/A	N/A		Yes	Submission is out of scope
105	259.001 Midas Limited	Amend the extent of the Urban Biodiversity Mapped Area over 179 and 183 Mornington Road so that it follows the extent of the existing forest cover.	No	N/A	N/A		No	Submission is out of scope

Assessment of Plan Provision Requests

4. The original assessment of requests for additional changes to provisions is provided in the table on the following pages. This has been updated to show which submissions a response on scope has been received for.
5. Submissions are grouped by type, so are not in numerical or alphabetical order. To find a submission point, please use the search function (CTRL>F) and type in a name or submitter number.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO THE POLICY APPROACH TO RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY & ACTIVITY							
106	234.032 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Policy 2.2.2.4 to "ensure consistency with national direction under the NPS-UD", including to promote active transport and to "allow the highest development densities in the most accessible locations, being the central city and suburban centre zones, as well surrounding existing or planned rapid transit services;"	Yes, clause (X) is being added under Change D2 (transportation connectivity at subdivision) & Change E4 (minor changes to remove duplication).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of the proposal for Change E4 or D2 which affect this provision but have very limited scope. It is not within the scope of any other changes' purpose of proposal.
107	234.034 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Policy 2.2.2.X(b)-(d) "as it is restrictive and needs to be more enabling of development and to ensure better consistency with the NPS UD". This points covers substantive changes proposed regarding providing a mix of housing typologies, the approach to the outdoor living space rules, and the approach to height in relation to boundary to better align it with the NPS UD and provide some flexibility (see submission for proposed drafting).	Yes, Policy 2.2.2.X is being added under Change D5 (solar access in large greenfield subdivisions) & Change E4 (minor changes to remove duplication).	No	The main rule changes only relate to GR1 and T&S zones and the purpose only extends to changes to manage any adverse effects of increased density.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of the proposal for Change E4 or D5 which affect this provision but have very limited scope. It is not within the scope of any other changes' purpose of proposal.
108	234.036 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Delete Policy 2.2.4.3 clauses (b) and (c) as the policy "is confusing and appears to be inconsistent to the approach of managing future urban growth in the City and national direction. Kāinga Ora recommends that this policy be deleted as the outcomes sought are better managed through Policy 2.2.4.4".	Yes, clause (a)(ii) is being amended under Change H2 (housing capacity release trigger for RTZ).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of the proposal for Change H2 which affects this provision but has a very limited scope. It is not within the scope of any other changes' purpose of proposal.
109	160.006 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.6.2.1 to provide for access to nearby existing or planned cycleways or shared paths and connections to centres in a similar way as c iii provides for public transport.	Yes, clause (a) is being amended under Change H1 (housing capacity and demand criteria).	No	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope, so provide for similar relief, but to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of proposal for Change H1. This purpose statement said that review of aspects of Policy 2.6.2.1 other than clause (a) are expressly excluded from V2.
110	234.050 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Policy 2.6.2.1(b) (d) as "Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of the proposed amendments to the policy and seeks further amendments to ensure consistency with national direction under the NPS-UD...".	Yes, clause (a) is being amended under Change H1 (housing capacity and demand criteria).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of proposal for Change H1. This purpose statement said that review of aspects of Policy 2.6.2.1 other than clause (a) are expressly excluded from V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
111	160.007 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.6.2.3 to actively encourage demand for carbon neutral infrastructure upgrades and prioritise them.	Yes, clause (b) is being amended under Change F3-3 (renaming ICMA) & Change F2-7 (addition of SCMA method); clause (c)(ii) is being amended under Change E4 (minor changes to remove duplication).	No	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope, so provide for similar relief, but to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission point is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of the proposal statements for changes to Policy 2.6.2.3.
112	234.051 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Policy 2.6.2.3 as "Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of references to and use of 'medium-density' and 'high-density' terms..." and make other changes to this policy [that do not relate to the purpose of proposals for any changes to this policy] (see submission for proposed drafting).	Yes, clause (b) is being amended under Change F3-3 (renaming ICMA) & Change F2-7 (addition of SCMA method); clause (c)(ii) is being amended under Change E4 (minor changes to remove duplication).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission point is out of scope as it is not within the scope of the purpose of the proposal statements for changes to Policy 2.6.2.3.
113	234.022 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend and add provisions to "ensure the ZGP is consistent with the NPS-UD and give effects to the intent of the PV2 and Kāinga Ora submission". This point relates to amendments sought for delivering housing choice and housing typologies (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend or add the following provisions: Policy 2.2.2.X Policy 2.6.1.2 New Objective 15.2.X, policies 15.2.XX (x2) 15.2.4.2	Yes, some changes are being made to strategic directions on housing choice (policies under Objective 2.6.1 – changes A1, A2, C1, D2, D4, E5). No policies on housing choice are proposed for Section 15. Note – Policy 2.2.2.X.b is not being amended from the existing wording in 2.2.5.3.b, it is merely being relocated.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission point is out of scope because: Change to Policy 2.2.2.X.b: as this clause is only being relocated and no substantive changes are proposed; Change to Policy 2.6.1.2: as the change sought does not respond to the reasons the policy is being changed; The new objective and policies: as they seek to provide for changes to the plan that are not part of the management regimes under review in Variation 2.
114	234.066 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Add provisions "so that greater weighting is given towards the matters addressed in the proposed objective [Objective 15.2.4, which the submitter also seeks to amend] when assessing activities within the residential zone. This amendment will ensure the ZGP is consistent with the NPS-UD..." (see submission for proposed drafting). Add the following provisions: New policies 15.2.4.X (x3)	No, changes to policy or rules on height, bulk, visual dominance, the benefits of higher density development, façade design, fencing, landscaping or access design are not proposed.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
115	234.127 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to delete "references to and use of 'medium density' and 'high density' terms in relation to the General Residential 1 and General Residential 2 zones."	Yes, reference to the density classification of residential zones is made in changes to the residential zone descriptions (Section 15.1.1).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
116	234.033 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions "to align with national direction sought under the NPS-UD". This point relates to provisions that refer to the maintenance and enhancement of neighbourhood residential character and amenity, future residential character, or rural character and visual amenity to instead refer to planned urban built form and amenity values or planned form and visual amenity (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 2.2.4.4 2.4.1.5 2.6.2.1 15.2.3.3 15.2.4 15.2.4.1 15.2.4.6 15.2.4.7 15.10.4.(1)(3)(4)(7)(8)(9)(10)(11) 15.11.2.1(c)(d) 15.11.4.1 16.10.2.1 16.11.2.(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) 17.10.4.1	Yes, in some cases but the changes requested are not responding to the change proposed in the Variation rather they are focussed on an entirely different purpose that is not being addressed in Variation 2.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
117	205.004 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Amend provisions throughout the Residential chapter of the 2GP, including (but not limited to) the following, to remove the focus on 'maintaining' the character and amenity of the area and better reflect that 'amenity' is a dynamic concept that will change over time [this submission point excludes Change B5 to Policy 15.2.4.2 etc. and Change A1 to Policy 15.2.4.3 etc., which have separate points]: Introduction of 15.1 Policy 15.2.1.6 Objective 15.2.3 Policy 15.2.3.4 Objective 15.2.4 and its associated policies Rule 15.11.2.5(b)	Yes, Policy 15.2.4.2 is proposed to be deleted under Change B5 and Policy 15.2.4.3 is proposed to be amended under Change A1.	No, as Change B5 and Change A1 are excluded from this point.	The submitter has other submission points which provides scope for consideration of Change B5 and Change A1.	Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
118	234.126 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend the approach to residential zones "to provide for a hierarchy of zoning, heights and density of urban form (as required by Policy 5 of the NPS-UD)...or commit to a plan change process (subsequent to 2GP becoming operative) to address the policy / NPS-UD misalignment...".	It is possible provisions relevant to this request are being amended in Variation 2, but not to an extent relevant to the request.	No	This point is relevant to the rezoning sites assessed as part of Variation 2. It does not align with the purpose of the rezoning proposals, which is only for identified sites to be assessed (rather than a complete review of the approach to zoning).	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
119	205.007 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Add a new objective and policy in Section 15.2 on well-functioning urban environments and to recognise that changes in amenity values are not of themselves an adverse effect (to give effect to the NPS-UD - see submission for proposed drafting at para.s 48.4 and 48.7.	No	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
120	234.062 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions for the new development mapped area so that "any and all future urban area (including future greenfield and development areas) identified in a District Plan is identified and regulated through the application of a Future Urban Zone as opposed to an Overlay or Precinct. This is to ensure national consistency with the Planning Standards. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks the proposed approach and amendments are reviewed to comply with the Planning Standards and NPS-UD" (see submission for proposed drafting). Include amendment to the following provision: 12.1 Introduction	Yes (all NDMA changes)	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
121	234.048 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions for the transition zones so that "any and all future urban area (including future greenfield and development areas) identified in a District Plan is identified and regulated through the application of a Future Urban Zone as opposed to an Overlay or Precinct. This is to ensure national consistency with the Planning Standards. Kāinga Ora therefore seeks the proposed approach and amendments are reviewed to comply with the Planning Standards and NPS-UD" (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 2.6.2 2.6.2.1 12.1 Introduction 12.3.1	Yes, for example Change H2, E3 and E5 to the transition zone provisions.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
122	224.001 Spark New Zealand Trading Limited & Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Amend policies 12.2.1.1, 12.2.2.1 and 12.2.3.1 so that the certification process to transition the transition zones to live urban zoning must consider the method, timing and funding of all necessary infrastructure to support urban growth, including telecommunications and mobile networks, not just public infrastructure, and the outcome of consultation with relevant network operators.	Yes, Policy 12.2.1.1 only.	No		No	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
123	234.024 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Retain policies 12.2.1.2 and 12.2.1.3.	No	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope insofar as these provisions are not being amended and it is not clear what change ID the submitter considers might affect them.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO RESIDENTIAL RULES							
Approach to Density of Land Use							
124	234.128 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to "review the approach to differentiate residential activities from standard residential units versus multi-unit development." This is interpreted to mean review the approach to density so that it controls development (the construction of residential units) in a similar way to the multi-unit development provisions, rather than managing intensity of land use (the number of people per land area).	It is possible provisions relevant to this request are being amended in Variation 2, but not to an extent relevant to the request.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
125	234.012 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend the definition of habitable room because "The definition is confusing and open to personal interpretation as to what could be used as a bedroom. Kāinga Ora seek that the notified definition be deleted and replaced with a more definitive interpretation of what a habitable room is to be deemed. This should align with the definition of a habitable room in the National Planning Standards. Amend the definition of habitable room to align with the definition in the National Planning Standards and remove matters open to interpretation."	Yes, consequential to Change A1, reference to 'ancillary residential units' is added.	No	May have some relevance to broader changes to Rule 15.5.2 (density) as the definition affects how this rule applies. However, it also affects performance standards for outdoor living space, papakāika in rural zones, residential activity in CMU zones and car parking in the Campus zone (yet to be removed from the Plan), most of which are out of scope.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope. The appropriateness of the definition and its alignment with the National Planning Standards is not subject to any proposal within Variation 2. A minor consequential change is proposed in Change A1, but the submission made is not responding to that proposal.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
126	219.002 Gladstone Family Trust	Amend provisions "so that townhouse and duplex type housing is permitted on existing vacant sections in any residential zone provided there is infrastructure capacity and performance standards for this type of housing (to be developed) can be met". This submission point relates only to residential zones other than General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone where serviced for wastewater, as these zones are covered by a separate submission point.	Yes, Change A2 amends Rule 15.5.2 (density) to permit duplexes in the General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone (where serviced for wastewater).	No, Change A2 only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	No	Submission is out of scope as it does not fall within the purpose of Change A2 (which specifically relates to duplexes in the GR1 and T&S zones only). Changes to density for other residential zones are not proposed in V2.
127	233.005 Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth	Extend provisions permitting duplexes to apply to the General Residential 2 zone.	Yes, Change A2 amends Rule 15.5.2 (density) to permit duplexes in the General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone (where serviced for wastewater).	No	Duplexes are already permitted in the General Residential 2 zone due to the habitable room approach to density.	Yes	Submission is out of scope as it does not fall within the purpose of Change A2 (which specifically relates to duplexes in the GR1 and T&S zones only). Changes to density for GR2 are not proposed in V2.
128	234.013 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed definition [of 'maximum development potential'] and the proposed use of a dual approach to controlling residential density in Residential Zones as notified under PV2. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of the definition and further amendments are required to the Residential Zone provisions in Section 15 of the Plan" (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: Delete 'maximum development potential' definition Amend Rule 15.5.2 (density) and associated provisions to remove the 'maximum development potential' method.	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.5.2 (density) are proposed.	No	Application of this relief sought for changes that are within scope (changes A1 and A2) is included in separate submission points.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the submission seeks a change to management regime (the use of a maximum development potential method) that is not being reviewed or addressed in any proposal in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
129	234.112 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed approach to density across residential zones as notified in PV2...the control of a maximum number of residential units per site area is overly restrictive. Rather, a permitted number of residential units per site, regardless of size is preferred" (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point only relates to residential zones other than General Residential 1 and Township & Settlement zone where serviced for wastewater, as these zones are covered by a separate submission point. Amend Rule 15.5.2 (density) to remove the minimum site area method and rely on the minimum site size performance standard for subdivision.	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.5.2 (density) are proposed.	No, as the rule change package only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the submission seeks a change to management regime (the use of a maximum number of residential units per site area) that is not being reviewed or addressed in any proposal in Variation 2.
130	234.113 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed approach to the density standard as notified and seeks amendments". This submission point relates to the proposed deletion of Rule 15.5.2.3 (density – the requirement for compliance with listed performance standards for more than one residential building per site), as this applies to zones other than GR1 and T&S wastewater serviced zones (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: Rule 15.5.2.3 Rule 15.10.3.1.a.iv	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.5.2 (density) are proposed, including Change E9 relevant to Rule 15.5.2.3 (to clarify its activity status in Rule 15.5.2.4), and Change A1 (consequential change for family flats).	No, as the rule change package only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
131	234.110 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions "regarding the avoidance of residential intensification in areas subject to capacity constraints...Kāinga Ora considers that a more appropriate way in which to address this issue is to treat the spatial data of the capacity constraints in the three waters infrastructure network as a non-statutory layer...". This submission point relates to the removal of the South Dunedin mapped area method from the Plan as it relates to Rule 15.5.2 (density – see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 15.5.2.1.b	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.5.2 (density) are proposed.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope, as it applies to the GR2 zone, where density is not proposed to change as part of V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
132	234.057 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions so that "Any infringements to [residential land use and development] performance standards are treated as a restricted discretionary activity on a non-notified basis..." (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point applies to all performance standards other than density for the General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone where serviced for wastewater (these are covered by a separate point). Amend the following provisions: 6.10.3.3 15.4.4.Y 15.5.2 15.10.3.1 15.13.5.1	Yes, but only for selected performance standards such as Rule 15.5.2 (density) and Rule 15.5.14 (family flats). No for most other performance standards.	No, as the rule change package only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	Contravention of most performance standards in the residential section is already restricted discretionary. The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
Approach to Development Rules							
133	234.069 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Rule 15.3.4.2 (development activity status table) so that the performance standards only apply to new buildings (see submission for proposed drafting).	No	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.
134	234.067 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "A blanket building footprint control of 300m ² is considered to be inappropriate as this limits development potential on larger sites in residential zones. Rather a control that is relative to the net site area should be incorporated into the Plan." (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 15.2.4.8 15.3.4.5 15.11.3.1	Yes, Change C1 amends this rule so that the multi-unit development aspect applies in all residential zones, not just ICR and GR2 zones.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.
135	71.005 Andrew Rutherford	Amend Rule 15.6.6.2 (maximum height in Residential zones) to increase height limits, especially in gully areas.	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No, the rule change package only includes "consequential changes to Plan rules necessary to manage any adverse effects of increased density...", not to increase the potential for adverse effects.	Maximum height in the Inner City Residential zone is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-280 Barry Smill)	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
136	234.002 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora are of the view that the maximum building heights for the residential zones should be amended to reflect a legible hierarchy between residential zones as they become more intensive across the City...Kāinga Ora seeks the following amendments to the maximum building heights...General Residential 2: 11m" (currently 9m, see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 15.1.1.2 15.6.6.2	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No, the rule change package does not apply to GR2 zone.	Maximum height in the Inner City Residential zone is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-280 Barry Smaitl)	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
137	234.001 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora are of the view that the maximum building heights for the residential zones should be amended to reflect a legible hierarchy between residential zones as they become more intensive across the City...Kāinga Ora seeks the following amendments to the maximum building heights...Inner City Residential: 15m [but drafting and other parts of the submission show 16m]" (currently 12m, see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point also covers the removal of the requirements for Inner City Residential zone to meet any density standard under Rule 15.5.2. Amend the following provisions: 15.1.1.3 15.2.3.3 15.5.2.1 15.6.6.2	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No, the rule change package does not apply to ICR zone.	Maximum height in the Inner City Residential zone is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-280 Barry Smaitl)	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
138	234.114 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Remove the height limit for ancillary residential units in Rule 15.6.6.2 (maximum height).	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No, the purpose of Change A1 is only to review family flat provisions in Rule 15.5.2 and 15.5.14. Alternative A1 Alt1 only examines whether additional design controls should be added.	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
139	107.004 Penny Turner	Amend Rule 15.6.6.2 Maximum height by removing height rules for ancillary residential units and just apply the building height rules for the zone	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No, the purpose of Change A1 is only to review family flat provisions in Rule 15.5.2 and 15.5.14. Alternative A1-Alt1 only examines whether <u>additional</u> design controls should be added.		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.
140	234.115 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Remove the height limits for garages and carports in road boundary setbacks from Rule 15.6.6.2 (maximum height).	Yes, Change A1 makes a consequential change to the name of family flats.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (height limits) that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.
Approach to Minimum Site Size for Subdivision							
141	234.117 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions so that the minimum site size performance standard (Rule 15.7.4) only applies to vacant sites, not resultant sites (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point only relates to residential zones other than the General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone where serviced for wastewater (as those zones are covered by a separate submission point). Amend the following provisions: 15.3.4.1 15.7.4.2	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.7.4 (minimum site size) are proposed.	No, as the rule change package only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
142	234.121 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora seeks a discretionary activity consenting pathway for subdivision not meeting minimum site size requirements. This is to make the 2GP more enabling of residential growth and enabling, while providing a framework for minimum site size infringements where an adequate assessment of effects is provided to ensure that infringements can be considered as acceptable" (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point only relates to residential zones other than the General Residential 1 zone and Township & Settlement zone where serviced for wastewater (as those zones are covered by a separate submission point). Amend the following provisions: 15.7.4.2 15.13.5.4	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.7.4 (minimum site size) are proposed.	No, as the rule change package only relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. as it relates to GR1 and T&S (serviced) zones) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.
143	234.119 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Rule 15.7.4 (minimum site size) to reduce the minimum site size for the General Residential 2 zone from 300m ² to 200m ² .	Yes, multiple changes to Rule 15.7.4 (minimum site size) are proposed but not in the part of the rule being sought to be amended in this submission.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking changes to a management regime within the Plan (minimum site for GR2 where it is 300m ²) that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.
144	58.001 Richard Farry	Amend Rule 15.11.4.1. by adding a new clause (e) 'Whether the subdivision maintains, enhances, detracts from or detrimentally affects a heritage precinct or scheduled heritage item.'	Yes, Change F2-3 amends this provision with regard to stormwater management (but the submission relates to adding a new clause in respect to a matter of discretion)	No	The submitter has another submission point which provides scope to consider managing effects on heritage precincts or scheduled heritage items as part of large greenfield subdivisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to manage subdivision for effects on heritage character outside of heritage precincts).
Other Residential Provisions							

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
145	268.001 Ōtākou Health Limited	Extend Change C1 (social housing) "to also include 'papakāika' housing on land owned by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (and its interests) including land secured through the Right of First Refusal (RFR) process advanced under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act in the residential zones."	Yes, papakāika assessment rules are being amended as part of Change F3-4 (removal of effects on health and safety).	No, Change C1 only applies to social housing and is a separate activity to papakāika.	Papakāika provisions apply in zones other than residential zones and amending them may overlap with unresolved appeals (e.g. on Rule 16.5.2 rural density) and cause delays to the 2GP appeal process.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to extend provisions related to papakāika housing).
146	268.002 Ōtākou Health Limited	"Amend the definition of 'Papakāika' to provide for housing that is advanced by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (and its interests) and is sited on land that is fully or partly owned by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (and its interests)" (see submission for proposed drafting).	No	No	Papakāika provisions apply in zones other than residential zones and amending them may overlap with unresolved appeals (e.g. on Rule 16.5.2 rural density) and cause delays to the 2GP appeal process.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to extend provisions related to papakāika housing).
147	234.068 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora also seeks that the supported living facilities is provided for as a permitted activity as these facilities are critical to supporting vulnerable members of our communities and should be provided for via a more enabling consenting pathway..." (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 15.3.3.2 15.11.2.5	Yes, but only for the assessment of stormwater effects from supported living facilities (Change F2-3) and wastewater in an NDMA (Change F3-2). The activity status of these activities is not proposed to change.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to amend provisions related to supported living facilities other than as it relates to 3 waters package)
148	205.001 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Amend provisions for supported living facilities and rest homes to include provisions more specific to retirement villages. Generally align these provisions with other recent district plans, clarify the consenting process, and enable construction, operation and maintenance of retirement villages.	Yes, but only for the assessment of stormwater effects from supported living facilities (Change F2-3) and wastewater in an NDMA (Change F3-2). The activity status of these activities is not proposed to change.	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to amend provisions related to supported living facilities and retirement homes other than as it relates to 3 waters package).

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
149	205.011 Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Amend Section 15.1 to recognise: the important role of retirement villages in providing for the ageing population; that the nature and effects of retirement villages are different to other higher density residential activities; and that retirement villages can require higher density of development than other residential activities Any consequential relief that will further enable and encourage retirement villages within the Residential Zones.	Yes, but only for the assessment of stormwater effects from supported living facilities (Change F2-3) and wastewater in an NDMA (Change F3-2). Other changes are not proposed for retirement villages.	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to amend provisions related to supported living facilities and retirement homes other than as it relates to 3 waters package)
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO TRANSPORTATION PROVISIONS							
150	160.003 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.2.2.x to reference connectivity to existing or planned cycle ways or walk ways to centres and reference good design of ev and ebike charging and bike storage.	Yes, Policy 2.2.2.X is being added under Change D5 (solar access in large greenfield subdivisions) & Change E4 (minor changes to remove duplication).	No, as this policy is about the environmental performance of housing.	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope but provide for relief to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to this specific provision and the purpose of the proposals through which it is created.
151	160.005 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.4.1.7 to require provision of bicycle storage and infrastructure as part of the design of urban expansion.	Yes, Policy 2.4.1.7 is being amended under Change E5 (clarifying the strategic directions regarding when structure plans should be used).	No, as this policy is about maintaining a compact city by managing urban expansion.	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope but provide for relief to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to this specific provision and the purpose of the proposals through which it is amended.
152	160.008 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.6.2.AA to add connectivity to existing or planned walking and cycling infrastructure.	Yes, Policy 2.6.2.AA is being added under Change D1 (to refer to the NDMA provisions), Change E5 (to refer to structure plan mapped areas) and Change E6 (adding strategic direction policy that guides the application of overlays and mapped areas at the time of a plan change).	No, as this policy is about when to apply a overlays or mapped areas at the time of a plan change.	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope but provide for relief to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to this specific provision and the purpose of the proposals through which it is created.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
153	160.009 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 2.7.1.2 to address transport and mode shift, not just water and waste.	Yes, Policy 2.7.1.2 is being amended under Change D8, Change E8, Change F1-7, Change F1-8, Change F2-2, and Change F3-2. All these changes relate to 3 waters except for Change D8, which is broadly about the efficient use of land and public infrastructure.	No, as while this policy is about public infrastructure (which is defined to include public roading networks), it is about the long term cost to the public.	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope but provide for relief to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to this specific provision and the purpose of the proposals through which it is amended.
154	160.010 Dunedin Tunnels Trails Trust (Kate Wilson)	Amend Policy 6.2.3.Y to highlight walking and cycling and public transport connectivity internally to subdivisions and to the surrounding area with priority for carbon neutral.	Yes, Policy 6.2.3.Y is being added under Change D2 (transportation connections in subdivisions).	No, as this policy is specifically about when to require new roads to be vested as part of a subdivision.	Other points made by the submitter are considered in scope but provide for relief to the appropriate provisions.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to this specific provision and the purpose of the proposals through which it is created.
155	125.001 Bus Users Support Group Otepoti/Te Roopu Tautoko Kaieke Pahi ki Otepoti	Add new rules for proximity of new dwellings to bus stops, so that any new dwelling in the General Residential 2 zone must be within 400m walking distance of a bus stop with a regular service or 800m walking distance of a bus stop with a rapid service, and any new dwelling in the General Residential 1 zone or Township & Settlement zone must be within 800m of a bus stop or 1200m of a bus stop with a rapid service; with contravention resulting in application of the housing density rules for a lower density zone.	Yes, Rule 15.5.2 (density) for General Residential 1 zone is proposed to change under Change A2 (permitting duplexes) and other changes.	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.
156	125.002 Bus Users Support Group Otepoti/Te Roopu Tautoko Kaieke Pahi ki Otepoti	Add new rules so that a developer can procure an extension of a bus service to ensure a new dwelling can achieve closer proximity to a bus stop by direct negotiation with the public transport authority (the Otago Regional Council).	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
157	125.004 Bus Users Support Group Otepoti/Te Roopu Tautoko Kaieke Pahi ki Otepoti	Add new rules so that any bus stop involved in the walking distances to bus stop calculations is listed in a schedule appended to the District Plan so removal of the bus stop (and therefore removal of the public transport walking distance accessibility it confers on an area) requires a resource consent.	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.
158	125.006 Bus Users Support Group Otepoti/Te Roopu Tautoko Kaieke Pahi ki Otepoti	Add new rules so that any walking route to a bus stop relied on to meet the submitter's proposed new rules for proximity of new dwellings to bus stops is a proper roadside footpath or other path that is paved, safe and accessible to people with disabilities.	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
159	234.004 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to provisions in Chapter 6: Transportation to include the word "adjacent" in front of and in reference to transport networks. Not all developments will result in adverse effects on the safety and efficiency of the wider transport network. Any potential transport effects from a new development or activity should be focused on the effects on the safety and efficiency of the adjacent and immediately affected transport network, not the full wider transport network...Amendments are required throughout 2GP to align with the relief sought" (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 6.2.3 6.2.3.(1)(3)(4)(7)(8)(9)(12)(13) 6.10.3.(4)(5)(7)(8) 6.11.2.(1)(2)(4)(5)(6)(7) 15.10.3.2 15.10.4.11 15.10.4.12 15.11.2.1 15.11.2.3 16.8.2.1 16.10.2.(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) 16.10.4.1 16.11.2.1 17.10.4.1 19.10.5.1 20.10.4.1	Yes, for example Rule 6.11.2.7 as part of Change D2 (transportation connections in subdivisions).	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (how effects on transportation networks are assessed)

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
160	234.005 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to reflect that "Kāinga Ora opposes the retention of the minimum car parking requirement in the 2GP, as the Council is required to remove all minimum car parking requirements in its Plan in accordance with Policy 11 of the NPS-UD" (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 6.10.3.6 6.10.3.7 6.11.2.1 6.11.2.2 15.3.3.(2)-(6)(8)(22)(25) 15.5.8 15.7.4.2 15.10.3.8 16.5.8 17.5.8 18.5.6 19.5.6 20.5.5 Any further amendments to Major Facilities Zones provisions	No	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Note that the implementation of Policy 11 of the NPS-UD in relation to car parking is being done without Schedule 1 where this is possible or through Variation 3 where it requires Schedule 1.
161	107.002 Penny Turner	Remove references to minimum car parking space (Rule 15.5.8 Minimum Car Parking)	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Note that the implementation of Policy 11 of the NPS-UD in relation to car parking is being done without Schedule 1 where this is possible or through Variation 3 where it requires Schedule 1.
162	233.006 Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth	Retain the deletion of minimum on-site car parking requirements for the residential zones.	No	No		Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Note that the implementation of Policy 11 of the NPS-UD in relation to car parking is being done without Schedule 1 where this is possible or through Variation 3 where it requires Schedule 1.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO 3 WATERS PROVISIONS							

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
163	234.056 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend Policy 2.7.1.2.c so that the extent of debt required to be taken on by the DCC is not a consideration for new urban development. "Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed wording of this policy as notified as financial costs should not be the sole consideration driving investment in infrastructure..."	Yes, for example Policy 2.7.1.2 is being amended under Change D8, Change E8, Change F1-7, Change F1-8, Change F2-2, and Change F3-2. All these changes relate to 3 waters except for Change D8, which is broadly about the efficient use of land and public infrastructure.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
164	234.058 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Remove Rule 9.3.7.2 so that service connections for telecommunications, power, water, and wastewater, other than for sites for a specified purpose, are not required. This submission point does not relate to the deletion of stormwater service connection requirements, as this is addressed in a separate submission point. Includes amendments to the following provisions: 9.3.7.2 9.3.7.Y 9.3.7.Z	Yes, Rule 9.3.7.2 is being amended under multiple change numbers.	No, Change F2-1 reconsiders whether it is appropriate to require connections to stormwater infrastructure only.	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. deletion of the stormwater service connection rule) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
165	234.028 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to remove the "no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area" method from the Plan and identify these features in a separate set of non-statutory maps as "Kāinga Ora considers that a more appropriate way in which to address this issue is to treat the spatial data of the capacity constraints in the three waters infrastructure network as a non-statutory layer..." (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point only relates to the no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area in the Plan prior to notification of Variation 2 (i.e. not new areas of no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area that are proposed under Changes NWRA1-7, GF01, GF09 and GF12, or to Change F3-1 – these are covered under a separate submission point). Amend the following provisions: 15.1.1.6 15.5.2.1 15.6.10.1.f 15.7.4.1.g Planning map	Yes, new areas of this mapped area are proposed to be added under Changes NWRA1-7, and links to Change F3-1. Greenfield rezoning through Changes GF01, GF09 and GF12 include application of this mapped area. However, no changes to existing mapped area and provisions.	No	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. changes that are proposed in Variation 2 to the no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
166	234.111 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend provisions to remove the "infrastructure constraint mapped area" method from the Plan and identify these features in a separate set of non-statutory maps as "Kāinga Ora considers that a more appropriate way in which to address this issue is to treat the spatial data of the capacity constraints in the three waters infrastructure network as a non-statutory layer..." (see submission for proposed drafting). This submission point only relates to the infrastructure constraint mapped area in the Plan prior to notification of Variation 2 (i.e. not new areas of wastewater constraint mapped area that are proposed under Changes WCMA1-4, IN05, IN06, IN09 or IN10, or Change F3-3 which renames this mapped area – these are covered under a separate submission point). Amend the following provisions: 15.5.2.1.b 15.5.2.4.b 15.7.4.1.b 15.10.3.3 Planning map	Yes, Changes WCMA1-4 correct the extent of this mapped area, and Change F3-3 renames this mapped area. Intensification rezoning through Changes IN05, IN06, IN09, IN10 also apply this mapped area to parts or all of these rezoning areas.	No	The relief sought that is within scope (i.e. changes to the infrastructure constraint mapped area or wastewater constraint mapped area proposed in Variation 2) is covered by a separate submission point.	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING CHANGES TO NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONE PROVISIONS							
167	266.001 James Sunderland & Megan Justice	Consider whether Balmacewen Golf Course should be listed as a heritage item.	No changes to heritage items are proposed. Balmacewen Golf Course is affected by Change NDMA09, the application of a new development mapped area over the part of the site. Change IN09 also rezones two parcels at the corner of the site on Cannington Road from General Residential 1 zone to General Residential 2 zone (the submitter does not comment on this part of the site or this change).	No	The introduction of NDMA09 is addressed in a separate submission point that is within scope. See also the rezoning and mapping table for a related submission point on removing the RTZ and retaining Rural zoning or rezoning to Recreation zone.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
168	262.002 Peter and Michelle Thomson	Amend the activity status of subdivision that contravenes the minimum site size in the Rural Hill Slopes zone in Rule 16.7.4.1.d so that it is always assessed as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity.	No	No	Rule 16.7.4 (minimum site size in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-276 Blueskin Projects Limited and Others).	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
169	226.002 John Williamson	Amend the activity status of subdivision that contravenes the minimum site size in the Rural Residential 1 zone in Rule 17.7.5 so that it is always assessed as a discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity.	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
170	210.002 Lisa Jolly	Amend the activity status of subdivision that contravenes the minimum site size in the Rural Residential 1 zone in Rule 17.7.5 so that it is always assessed as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying or discretionary activity.	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
171	213.002 James and Katherine Cotter	Amend the activity status of subdivision that contravenes the minimum site size in the Rural Residential 1 zone in Rule 17.7.5 so that it is always assessed as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a non-complying or discretionary activity.	No	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
172	248.001 David Leslie Meyer & Christine Raywin Cordell	Amend the Rural Residential 2 zone provisions relating to 337 Green Island Bush Road and surrounding Rural Residential 2 zoned properties to enable additional housing development capacity but not to a residential density.	No	No		Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
173	256.001 Tony Steven McFadgen (Ocean Park Trust)	Amend the Rural Residential 2 zone provisions relating to 440 Blackhead Road and surrounding Rural Residential 2 zoned properties to enable additional housing development capacity but not to a General Residential 1 zone density.	No	No		Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
174	144.001 Douglas Warhurst	Amend the Rural zone provisions so that a residential unit can be built on an undersized lot.	No	No	Rule 16.5.2 (density in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-276 Blueskin Projects Limited and Others; ENV-2018-CHC244 Bruce Wayne Taylor and the Estate of Lawrence Taylor).	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
175	231.003 Barry Douglas & Fiona Lynn Armour	Extend the changes to the family flat provisions in the residential zones to all zones including Rural Residential 2 zone.	No	No, changes to family flats in non-residential zones are expressly excluded from Change A1.	Rule 16.5.14.2 (family flats design in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-254 Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.)	Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
176	248.002 David Leslie Meyer & Christine Raywin Cordell	Extend the changes to the family flats provisions in residential zones to all zones, including Rural Residential 2 zone.	No	No, changes to family flats in non-residential zones are expressly excluded from Change A1.	Rule 16.5.14.2 (family flats design in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-254 Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.)	Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
177	256.002 Tony Steven McFadgen (Ocean Park Trust)	Extend the changes to the family flats provisions in residential zones to all zones, including Rural Residential 2 zone.	No	No, changes to family flats in non-residential zones are expressly excluded from Change A1.	Rule 16.5.14.2 (family flats design in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-254 Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.)	Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
178	257.002 Barbara and Donald McCabe	Extend the changes to the family flats provisions in residential zones to all zones, including Rural Residential 2 zone.	No	No, changes to family flats in non-residential zones are expressly excluded from Change A1.	Rule 16.5.14.2 (family flats design in the rural zones) is subject to appeal (ENV-2018-CHC-254 Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc.)	Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
179	233.001 Garry & Bronwyn Applegarth	Amend the Industrial zone provisions to better enable residential activity.	No	No		Yes	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING CHANGES TO THE PLAN FORMAT & STYLE							
180	234.059 Kāinga Ora (Homes and Communities)	Amend the assessment rules for contravention of all zone performance standards so that they are all included within the zone chapter and do not link to other chapters as "Kāinga Ora opposes the assessment criteria as all information relevant to an infringement on a zone performance standard should be included within the zone chapter" (see submission for proposed drafting). Amend the following provisions: 9.5.3.3 9.5.3.X 9.5.3.11 9.6.2.2 9.6.2.Y 9.7.4.3 9.7.4.4 9.8.2.2 9.8.2.5	Yes, multiple assessment rules are being amended.	No	-	Yes (paras. 17-20 & 33)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2.
SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING CHANGES THAT ARE NOT RELEVANT TO THE PLAN							
181	56.002 Saddle Hill Community Board	Amend Land Information Memoranda so that any proposed changes to development potential in the immediate and surrounding area are identified.	No, not a plan provision.	No	This request will be referred to the appropriate DCC staff.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Submission is not on the Plan.

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
182	110.001 Brian Miller	Amend the Section 32 assessment to include a survey of the number of unoccupied habitable dwellings and take this into account for the need for more dwellings as there may be a case to legislate to make unoccupied dwellings available for occupation, before building more dwellings.	No, not a plan provision.	No		No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Submission is not on the Plan.
183	141.002 Barbara J Kennedy	Clean the mud tank at 88 Cannington Road once a year.	No, not a plan provision.	No	This request will be referred to the appropriate DCC staff.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Submission is not on the Plan.
184	207.002 Graham William Potter	Properly restore the boundary fence between 175 Musselburgh Rise and Shore Street, which was previously modified by DCC as part of 3 waters upgrades.	No, not a plan provision.	No	This request will be referred to the appropriate DCC staff.	No	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not relevant to any purpose of proposal in V2. Submission is not on the Plan.

SUBMISSION POINTS FROM THE REPORT ADDENDUM OF 4 MAY 2021

SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO THE POLICY APPROACH TO RESIDENTIAL CAPACITY & ACTIVITY

185	189.004 Ryman Healthcare Limited	Amend provisions throughout the Residential chapter of the 2GP, including (but not limited to) the following, to remove the focus on 'maintaining' the character and amenity of the area and better reflect that 'amenity' is a dynamic concept that will change over time [this submission point excludes Change B5 to Policy 15.2.4.2 etc. and Change A1 to Policy 15.2.4.3 etc., which have separate points]: Introduction of 15.1 Policy 15.2.1.6 Objective 15.2.3 Policy 15.2.3.4 Objective 15.2.4 and its associated policies Rule 15.11.2.5(b)	Yes, Policy 15.2.4.2 is proposed to be deleted under Change B5 and Policy 15.2.4.3 is proposed to be amended under Change A1.	No, as Change B5 and Change A1 are excluded from this point.	The submitter has other submission points which provides scope for consideration of Change B5 and Change A1.	Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.
186	189.007 Ryman Healthcare Limited	Add a new objective and policy in Section 15.2 on well-functioning urban environments and to recognise that changes in amenity values are not of themselves an adverse effect (to give effect to the NPS-UD - see submission for proposed drafting at para.s 48.4 and 48.7.	No	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as it is not within the scope of any of the purpose of proposals in Variation 2 and is seeking changes to policy and management regimes that are not being reviewed in Variation 2.

SUBMISSION POINTS SEEKING WIDER CHANGES TO RESIDENTIAL RULES

Row	Submitter	Decision Requested	Are any of the affected provisions being amended through V2, albeit for different purposes? (Yes/No)	Is the submission seeking an alternative solution to an objective highlighted in any purpose of proposal statement? (Yes/No)	Other things to consider (e.g. potential for appeals overlap)	Is scope addressed in submission?	Overall assessment
Other Residential Provisions							
187	189.001 Ryman Healthcare Limited	Amend provisions for supported living facilities and rest homes to include provisions more specific to retirement villages. Generally align these provisions with other recent district plans, clarify the consenting process, and enable construction, operation and maintenance of retirement villages.	Yes, but only for the assessment of stormwater effects from supported living facilities (Change F2-3) and wastewater in an NDMA (Change F3-2). The activity status of these activities is not proposed to change.	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to amend provisions related to supported living facilities and retirement homes other than as it relates to 3 waters package).
188	189.011 Ryman Healthcare Limited	Amend Section 15.1 to recognise: the important role of retirement villages in providing for the ageing population; that the nature and effects of retirement villages are different to other higher density residential activities; and that retirement villages can require higher density of development than other residential activities Any consequential relief that will further enable and encourage retirement villages within the Residential Zones.	Yes, but only for the assessment of stormwater effects from supported living facilities (Change F2-3) and wastewater in an NDMA (Change F3-2). Other changes are not proposed for retirement villages.	No		Yes (paras. 29-35)	Submission is out of scope as the change sought is not within any purpose of proposal statements and is seeking a change to a management regime within the Plan that is not being reviewed in Variation 2 (whether to amend provisions related to supported living facilities and retirement homes other than as it relates to 3 waters package)

APPENDIX B – VARIATION 2 INITIATION REPORT

INITIATION OF CHANGES TO THE SECOND GENERATION DISTRICT PLAN (2GP)

Department: City Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1 Decisions on the Second Generation District Plan (2GP) were released in November 2018 after a period of development extending back to 2012.
- 2 This report seeks approval to initiate two plan changes to the Second Generation District Plan (2GP).
- 3 The first plan change to be approved for initiation is to address minor issues in the 2GP that have been identified since it was initially developed. This plan change (Plan Change 1) will not have any substantial impact on the plan's objectives, policies or methods but will predominantly correct minor issues with the rules and mapping.
- 4 The second plan change responds to the latest urban development capacity assessment results as required under the National Policy Statement – Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC). According to the results of the *Housing Capacity Assessment for Dunedin City* report (also on this Committee agenda) Dunedin currently has enough capacity to meet five years' worth of demand for new housing. As such, we are required to initiate a response to this shortfall within 12 months. This report seeks approval to undertake preliminary work on a plan change to the 2GP to enable additional capacity over the medium-term.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

- a) **Approves** the initiation of a plan change to address minor issues in the Second Generation District Plan (2GP) (Plan Change 1).
- b) **Approves** the initiation of a plan change to the Second Generation District Plan (2GP) to enable additional residential capacity (Plan Change 2).

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

PLAN CHANGE 1 (2GP MINOR ISSUES AND ERRORS)

- 5 Several errors and minor issues have been identified since the close of submissions on the 2GP. These errors and issues include: typos, unclear wording, provisions that are contradictory, mapping errors and unintentional gaps in rules. Where possible, these were addressed through decisions on submissions or changes allowed under clause 16 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act. Clause 16 provides an exemption to the

normal Schedule 1 steps for a plan change for a local authority to make changes where "an alteration is of minor effect, or may correct any minor errors". However, there are still a handful of issues that could not be addressed through either of these processes.

- 6 The minor plan issues and errors that could not be resolved through cl.16 or submissions, or have been identified more recently, have been collated for incorporation into a plan change. The intention is to notify this plan change (Plan Change 1) by the middle of 2019.

PLAN CHANGE 2 (ADDITIONAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY AREAS)

- 7 As detailed in the concurrent report, the National Policy Statement – Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC) aims to ensure that councils adequately consider the impacts of their planning frameworks on the development market. This includes enabling the market to operate efficiently by providing sufficient opportunities for development.
- 8 New population projections released in September 2017 meant that Dunedin triggered additional requirements as a medium-growth urban area, including assessing the demand and capacity for new housing.
- 9 The *Housing Capacity Assessment for Dunedin City* indicates a shortfall in residential capacity of approximately 1,000 dwellings over the medium term (2021-28) and 4,700 over the long term (2028-48). Consequently, the NPS-UDC requires that the DCC initiate a response to provide sufficient residential capacity within 12 months. Residential land for the medium-term must either be serviced or have funding identified for servicing in the 10 Year Plan. Residential land for the long-term must have infrastructure requirements identified in the Infrastructure Strategy.
- 10 The development of options for enabling further residential capacity must be guided by the strategic framework in the Dunedin Spatial Plan and the 2GP. As the 2GP policy criteria are subject to appeal, it is intended to ask the Environment Court to fast track any consent orders and hearings on outstanding appeal points on these matters (with some appeal points potentially being able to be mediated).
- 11 Decisions on those criteria will also be required prior to consideration of appeals on zoning, where the use of those criteria is fundamental to the appeal.
- 12 The NPS also requires DCC to identify how long-term demand for housing will be enabled. Long term demand does not need to be zoned in the District Plan and is usually identified in a separate plan prepared under the Local Government Act. A proposed project to address this requirement, including how this will link to the Spatial Plan adopted by Council in 2012 will be outlined in a future report.
- 13 The identification of issues and options will consider the most recent information on housing needs and can take on board any relevant findings of the Mayor's Taskforce on Housing. It may also include new housing preferences research.
- 14 The NPS-UDC requires that the DCC consider all practicable options to enable necessary housing capacity. This could include applying residential zoning to new areas (greenfield development) and/or amending rules or other provisions to increase the density of housing enabled in existing urban zoned land, or using statutory tools and methods available under other legislation.
- 15 The identification and evaluation of options will involve collaboration between City Development, Transport, and 3 Waters to identify options that are cost-effective to service. This will also ensure integration between land use and infrastructure planning documents, including the 2GP and Infrastructure Strategy.

16 Once initial options are developed, consultation with landowners will be undertaken to ascertain the likelihood that areas would be developed if enabled. Broader public consultation will also support the evaluation of other aspects of the feasibility of development, and the assessment against the 2GP policy criteria.

17 The plan change will then involve formal submissions on the preferred areas.

OPTIONS

Option One –Approve initiation of plan changes

Advantages

Plan Change 1:

- Will make the 2GP clearer and easier to use and therefore more efficient and cost-effective.
- Will remove unintended consent requirements.

Plan Change 2:

- Will assist the DCC with infrastructure planning.
- Compliance with legislative requirements.

Disadvantages

- None identified.

Option Two – Status Quo

Advantages

- None identified.

Disadvantages

Plan Change 1:

- Not addressing these issues will lead to difficulties with plan administration and the plan rules and methods not appropriately or effectively giving effect to the policies of the Plan.

Plan Change 2:

- Dunedin will not have adequate housing capacity or infrastructure in place when required.
- DCC will not meet its obligations under the NPS.

NEXT STEPS

18 If Plan Change 1 is approved, council officers will prepare a plan change (including undertaking the required Section 32 analysis) to address the identified 2GP errors and will seek approval from this committee to formally notify the plan change to start the submissions and hearing (if required) process.

- 19 If Plan Change 2 is approved, council officers will develop a range of options to enable additional residential capacity. These options will be brought to this committee later in 2019 for approval. If approved, the next step will involve informal public consultation prior to preparing the plan change (including finalising the required Section 32 analysis) for approval by Committee for notification and the start of formal submissions.

Signatories

Author:	Anna Johnson - City Development Manager
Authoriser:	Nicola Pinfold - Group Manager Community and Planning Sandy Graham - General Manager City Services

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Fit with purpose of Local Government

This decision relates to providing a regulatory function and it is considered good-quality and cost-effective.

Fit with strategic framework

	Contributes	Detracts	Not applicable
Social Wellbeing Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environment Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts and Culture Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3 Waters Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spatial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrated Transport Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Recreation Strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other strategic projects/policies/plans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The identified projects would positively contribute to the Strategic Framework.

Māori Impact Statement

The Resource Management Act is subject to the Treaty of Waitangi and also requires consideration of 'the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga' as a matter of national importance; accordingly early consultation with tangata whenua will occur if potential effects on these matters are anticipated.

Sustainability

The Resource Management Act has sustainable management as its purpose, therefore this will be a primary consideration in the plan changes.

LTP/Annual Plan / Financial Strategy /Infrastructure Strategy

These projects are not specifically identified in the LTP as they are part of the core function of the City Development team. Plan Change 2 will need to be integrated with a review of the Infrastructure Strategy.

Financial considerations

The projects are unbudgeted, however, they will be primarily undertaken by existing staff.

Significance

This report is assessed as low significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

Engagement – external

No external engagement has been undertaken.

Engagement - internal

Engagement with the 3 Waters Group has occurred in relation to Plan Change 2.

Risks: Legal / Health and Safety etc.

No identified risks.

Conflict of Interest

No identified conflicts of interest.

Community Boards

Community Boards have submitted on plan changes previously.

