

## Roxanne Davies

---

**From:** Emily McEwan  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 26 May 2021 09:54 a.m.  
**To:** District Plan Submissions  
**Subject:** FW: Out of Scope

**Categories:** Roxanne dealing with

Hi Roxy,

Could you please add this email to the submission file for S128 Mark Geddes, thanks.

---

**From:** Mark Geddes  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 28 April 2021 10:23 p.m.  
**To:** 2GP Hearings  
**Subject:** Out of Scope

Hi,

While I think the Variation 2 document is proactive on many points and City Planning have done well there, I feel also that the scope document is flawed and should have considered some other areas and infrastructure considerations. I am surprised that this document was not discussed with industry professionals prior to being put in place.

With all of that said, I would like to amend my submission so it then falls within scope so the rest of my input can be considered.

Can I please substitute the following paragraph for my paragraph under section A3 of my initial submission:

*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.*

Please contact me in advance of 5pm, Monday 3rd of May if my request to substitute this paragraph is not acceptable or if any other element in my submission is deemed out of scope.

Kind regards

Mark Geddes

## Roxanne Davies

---

**From:** mprgeddes@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 3 March 2021 11:43 p.m.  
**To:** District Plan Submissions  
**Subject:** Variation 2 submission

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Roxy

### Submission Form Submitted

**Reference number** 808407

**Submitter name**  
Mark Geddes

**Organisation**

**Contact person/agent**

**Postal address**  
77 Halfway Bush Road Dunedin Dunedin 9054

**Email**  
mprgeddes@hotmail.com

**Contact phone number**  
0220331890

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

**If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please select an answer**

**Variation 2 change ID**  
A1, A2, A3, B1, B3, B4, B6, C1, D4, D6, D7

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

**My submission seeks the following decision from the Council**  
Accept the change with amendments outlined below

#### Details

A1 - accept the change in full A2 - accept the change but subdivision consent of duplex sites should not happen until a code of compliance is issued for the building. A3 - accept what is in Variation 2 fully but could go further to include more land with development potential for Gen Res 2. B1 - accept in full B3 - accept the change B4 - accept the change B6 - accept the change in full C1 - accept in full D4 - accept in the change D6 - accept the change Transport provisions - reject the change and amend D7 - accept but use appropriate professional advice

**Reasons for my views**

A1 - this is a positive change to a 2GP rule that was limiting residential living options due to the family nature of the rule. A2 - this would reduce the risk of sites being subdivided for duplex developments but then on-sold separately where a detached buildings could potentially be built on either new lot. Please add the need for a code of compliance as both a policy and a rule. 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. Medium sized potential developments in areas to remain general residential 1 often have better infrastructure than those included in the variation 2 mapping. Given the capacity of some of the city's infrastructure is in question, I think it is best to explore medium sized development options 4-10 lots where good servicing exists and building platforms could be more readily developed. I believe the scope of 'Variation 2' is at fault here. A2 - accept but I suggest that a code of compliance should be gained for the new duplex building prior to subdivision resource consent being granted. B1 - should be accepted in full as the potential to consider topographical features and vegetation and the practical space within an allotment is broader with this rule in place. B6 - this is a sensible change that is consistent with much of the public's expectation that a house can be built on a freehold title where the effects are known and expected. C1 - in short, we need social housing so I see this as a proactive move from the DCC. I would, however, say that this should be open to all and not just registered housing providers D6 - greater need for consideration of indigenous biodiversity is required in greenfields developments. This should assist in that. D7 - if this assists in getting more appropriate planting and public amenities in greenfields subdivision, then that is very positive. I do however feel that landscape architects should have more input than urban planners in this regard due to their skill base and practical experience. Transport provisions - the need to have a legal road for housing developments over 12 lots is does not consider site layout, in-fill subdivision or topography and seems quite random. I think a better solution is to put different width requirements in place for private access ways of greater than 12 lots. I do not see a reason to limit the number of users if the road is of adequate width and a purchaser has bought a site knowing the maintenance requirements and potential traffic flows for their private road.

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

No file uploaded

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

No

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

Yes