

**BEFORE THE COMMISSION  
APPOINTED BY THE DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL**

<b>Under</b>	The Resource Management Act 1991 (the <b>Act</b> or <b>RMA</b> )
<b>IN THE MATTER</b>	of proposed Variation 2 (Additional Housing Capacity) to the Second Generation Dunedin District Plan ( <b>2GP</b> )
<b>BY</b>	<b>FLETCHER GLASS</b>  Submitter ( <b>OS123.001,</b> <b>OS123.002, OS123.003,</b> <b>OS123.004</b> )

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF CONRAD STEWART ANDERSON**  
**Dated 5 August 2022**

---



**GALLAWAY COOK ALLAN LAWYERS**  
Phil Page / Rebecca Crawford  
phil.page@gallowaycookallan.co.nz  
rebecca.crawford@gallowaycookallan.co.nz

P O Box 143  
Dunedin 9054  
Ph: (03) 477 7312  
Fax: (03) 477 5564

## **BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF CONRAD ANDERSON**

### **Introduction**

1. My full name is Conrad Stewart Anderson. I am a Director of Anderson & Co Resource Management and since 2012 I have been employed as a resource management planner with Anderson & Co (Otago) Ltd.
2. I hold a Master of Business Administration, and a Master of Planning from the University of Otago and I am a full Member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
3. I have visited the site multiple times.
4. On behalf of the Submitter I have been involved in various aspects of the proposal and in preparing this evidence I have reviewed:
  - (a) National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)
  - (b) The Section 32 Report
  - (c) The Section 42A Report, including the Appendix C (Site assessments)
  - (d) The evidence of Tony Milne
  - (e) The evidence of Kurt Bowen
  - (f) The Second Generation Dunedin District Plan (2GP) and
  - (g) Variation 2 to the 2GP.

### **Code Of Conduct for Expert Witnesses**

5. Although not necessary in respect of council hearings, I can confirm I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note dated 1 December 2014 and agree to comply with it. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence, and I agree to comply with it while giving oral evidence before the hearing panel. Except where I state that I am

relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

### **Background to Submission**

6. Formerly a quarry, this activity formed the site which is now characterised by distinct parts;
  - (a) Area A / RS206a – Residentially zoned land facing Watts Road. A resource consent has been granted for a 14-lot subdivision (SUB-2019-138/LUC-2019-578)<sup>1</sup>.
    - (i) Currently zoned General Residential 1 (GR1).
    - (ii) Proposed zoning General Residential 2 (GR2).
  - (b) Area B / RS206a – the ‘face’ of the former quarry. Now terraced with walking tracks, with a variety of replanting.
    - (i) Currently zoned Rural Hill Slopes.
    - (ii) Proposed zoning Recreation.
    - (iii) Note: Suggested amendment to the eastern edge as per footnote 1, plus (if required) an allowance will need to be made for an emergency access route and/or waste water pumping from Area A (refer evidence of Mr Bowen).
  - (c) Area C / RS206a – a ridge to the east of the base of the former quarry. Includes areas of reduced slope/flat contours.
    - (i) Currently zoned Rural Hill Slopes.
    - (ii) Proposed zoning GR2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note, the western edge of the subdivision has resulted in a jagged edge, which now does not align with the areas associated with the submission. Aligning the western edge of Area A to the consented area would be a practical outcome.

- (d) Area D / RS206 – an upper plateau, located behind the former quarry area. This area is relatively flat and planted as a small (overgrown) orchard.
    - (i) Currently zoned Rural Residential 2 (RR2), with a landscape overlay on most of the area.
    - (ii) Proposed zoning Large Lot Residential 1, with the continuation of the landscape overlay, which would inform future development. In addition a structure plan is proposed to assist with the management of future development and to protect/enhance the green southern edge (refer evidence of Tony Milne).
  - (e) Area E / RS77 – a bush gully on the south-west side of the site.
    - (i) Currently zoned Rural Hill Slopes.
    - (ii) Proposed zoning GR2., including structure plan to provide for the development area, access, any allowances required for on-site detention infrastructure associated with waste water and/or stormwater, if required (refer evidence of Mr Bowen), and protection/enhancement of the surrounding bush.
  - (f) The base of the former quarry, which is zoned GR2 (not part of the submission).
7. The areas lists a – e above are included in the submission.
  8. Along the southern boundary is a creek, and the site is associated with 2 listed trees and electrical network infrastructure.
  9. To the west, south and east an established residential area envelopes the site which is near a school and public transport.
  10. Rezoning the site is the most appropriate planning outcome because:
    - (a) The majority of the submission area is zoned Rural Hill Slopes, but the area is limited in size, and has no real connection to the

wider rural zone. The area is adjacent to residential areas and in close proximity to a school and public transport via North Road.

- (b) The area zoned Rural Hill Slopes effectively has very limited, if any real, development capacity due to 2GP rules associated with density and minimum site sizes.
- (c) The upper plateau area (Area D / RS206) is zoned Rural Residential 2 which results in an inefficient use of a relatively flat land resource, which has limited biodiversity values<sup>2</sup>.
- (d) The requested zonings would enhance the efficient use of the land resource, a key outcome under the NPS-UD.

#### **National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)**

- 11. The NPS-UD is directed at increasing development capacity and does not address protecting landscapes/rural character (apart of the amenity matters discussed below), biodiversity, or natural hazards.
- 12. I consider the following NPS-UD matters relevant:
- 13. Objective 2 of the NPS-UD seeks that “Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets.” The proposed zoning will assist in that regard.
- 14. Objective 3 of the NPS-UD seeks that “...*district plans enable more people to live in ... areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:*
  - (a) *the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities*
  - (b) *the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport*
  - (c) *there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.”*

---

<sup>2</sup> Note, I am not an expert in biodiversity matters, but I understand the upper plateau is associated with an overgrown orchard.

15. The site aligns with Objective 3 since the site:
  - (a) Is almost opposite North East Valley Normal School and within 1.5km of Dunedin North Intermediate and the Gardens Shopping area.
  - (b) Is in close proximity to employment opportunities associated with the above, along with Ross Home and a number of small industrial areas.
  - (c) Has frontage to North Road, which is the main public transport route in the area.
  - (d) Is in North East Valley (NEV) which has residential demand from both tertiary students and non-student residents.
16. Objective 4 of the NPS-UD notes that *“New Zealand’s urban environments, including their amenity values, develop and change over time in response to the diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations.”*
17. The above effectively acknowledges that the implementation of the NPS-UD is likely to result in tension/changes to the environment, however that tension/change should result in beneficial outcomes in terms of meeting the community’s needs, including additional housing.
18. Objective 6 of the NPS-UD seeks *“Local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are:*
  - (a) *integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions; and*
  - (b) *strategic over the medium term and long term; and*
  - (c) *responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity”*

19. In terms of infrastructure, the subject site could be managed as per other large sites in NEV such as the north end of Selwyn Street or the south end of Montague Street. Also, refer evidence of Mr Bowen.
20. In terms of being strategic over the medium and long terms, the proposed use of the site is essentially 'infill', which would not result in any strategic issues arising.
21. In terms of Objective 6.c, the subject site would be considered to have the ability to supply significant development capacity (circa 240<sup>3</sup> to 273<sup>4</sup> dwellings), as such, a more responsive local authority decision is indicated by the NPS-UD.
22. Objective 8 of the NPS-UD seeks that "*New Zealand's urban environments ... support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions...*".
23. As per Figure 1 of the Section 42A Report (page 21) the subject site is one of the few sites in the lowest two sectors for '*commute-related carbon emissions*'.
24. The NPS-UD objectives above are supported by the following relevant policies:
25. Policy 1 supports matters such as housing choice, accessibility and the reduction of greenhouse gases.
26. Policy 6 notes that decision-makers are to have particular regard to a number of matters, including that changes that result from the implementation of the NPS-UD "*may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people but improve amenity values appreciated by other people, communities, and future generations, including by providing increased and varied housing densities and types*" and such changes "*are not of themselves, an adverse effect*".
27. In summary:

---

<sup>3</sup> Site Assessment Appendix C

<sup>4</sup> Refer evidence of Mr Bowen

- (a) Objective 3 of the NPS-UD provides for three attributes, noting that only one is required. The site aligns with at least one attribute, therefore the site should be open for consideration.
  - (b) The NPS-UD anticipates some tension with its implementation, therefore it provides direction, such as:
    - (i) Amenity is subject to change (Objective 4).
    - (ii) Changes in amenity values may not be an adverse effect (Policy 6).
    - (iii) Policy 6 seems to increase support for the rezoning of sites that provide a higher level (i.e. significant) development capacity (Policy 6.c)
    - (iv) Increased support for the rezoning of sites that assist to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Objective 8).
28. Overall, rezoning the site achieves the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD.

## **2GP**

29. The 2GP has a number of strategic objectives, each of which is supported by a number of policies. Those relevant matters are:
- (a) Objective 2.2.2 Environmental performance and energy resilience. In addition to other matters, this Objective seeks to reduce reliance on private motor cars for transportation. The site's location to a main bus route and local services contribute to this objective. Supporting Policies include Policy 2.2.2.4.c and d.
  - (b) Objective 2.2.3 Indigenous Biodiversity. In terms of significant indigenous biodiversity, such areas are recognised by Council through an ASBV or UBMA overlay. No such overlay is associated with the site. In terms of non-significant indigenous biodiversity, while the various objectives and policies seek to maintain or enhance such areas, the policy direction of that



protection is focused on areas associated with the coast, wetlands and water bodies. That is evidenced by the rules that provide for clearance associated with fence lines, plus, clearance associated with 3m wide tracks (subject to appeal), plus 1,000m<sup>2</sup> of clearance every 3 years in the Rural Hill Slopes zone. In terms of the current submission, the use of structure plan(s) could be used to retain/enhance some bush areas (refer evidence of Mr Milne).

- (c) Objective 2.2.4 Compact and Accessible City. As noted above, the site presents an 'infill' opportunity (i.e. assists Dunedin to remain a compact city), is located on a main public transport route and in close proximity to a number of amenities (which assists in terms of an accessible city). However, it is noted that Policy 2.2.4.1.b seeks to ensure urban land is efficiently zoned, except if: hazards; slope; the need for on-site stormwater storage; the need to protect important biodiversity, water bodies, landscape or natural character values; or other factors make a standard density of residential development inappropriate. In which case, Policy 2.2.4.1.b does provide for an 'exception to the exception' via the use of a structure plan mapped area.
- (d) Objective 2.3 and supporting Policies: In addition to other things this seeks to protect important productive rural land. For the subject site, while the majority of the land currently zoned rural is not productive land so productive land would not be lost as a result of rezoning.
- (e) Objective 2.4 and supporting Policies, amongst other things, seeks to protected and enhanced matters such as important green and other open spaces, trees that make a significant contribution to the visual landscape and history of neighbourhoods, and important visual landscapes and vistas.

- (f) The submission is supported by expert landscape input, which considers the various parts of the sites and concludes that the proposal is suitable (refer evidence of Mr Milne).
  - (g) Objective 2.6 Dunedin has Quality Housing Choices and Adequate Urban Land Supply and supporting Policies, are the key matters within the Section 32 Report. These are considered in more detail below.
30. Objective 2.6.1 Housing Choices (and supporting Policies) seeks a ranging of housing, with development mix including infill, while supporting a compact and accessible city. The proposal aligns with this Objective.
31. Objective 2.6.2 Adequate Urban Land Supply is a key matter, and for that reason, it is repeated below in full:

*Objective 2.6.2 Adequate Urban Land Supply*

*Dunedin provides sufficient, feasible, development capacity (as intensification opportunities and zoned urban land) in the most appropriate locations to at least meet demand over the medium term (up to 10 years), while sustainably managing urban expansion in a way that maintains a compact city with resilient townships as outlined in Objective 2.2.4 and policies 2.2.4.1 to 2.2.4.3.*

32. This objective sets a minimum not a maximum for meeting demand while managing urban expansion, subject to:
- (a) Objective 2.2.4 – as above, as the proposal is for infill, hence finds good alignment.
  - (b) Policy 2.2.4.1 – as above, seeks to ensure land is used efficiently, and where certain situations exist, then a Structure Plan is considered appropriate.
  - (c) Policy 2.2.4.2 – does not apply to urban housing.
  - (d) Policy 2.2.4.3 – links to the criteria in Policy 2.6.2.1. See below.

33. Policy 2.6.2.1 is a long policy, so for ease it is shown below in a table format along with comments:

#### Policy 2.6.2.1

Identify areas for new residential zoning based on the following criteria:

Policy Number	Policy Wording	Notes
2.6.2.1.a	rezoning is necessary to ensure provision of at least sufficient housing capacity to meet expected demand over the short and medium term; and	The rezoning proposed is to support the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD which do not support an upper limit on development capacity.
2.6.2.1.b	rezoning is unlikely to lead to pressure for unfunded public infrastructure upgrades, unless either an agreement between the infrastructure provider and the developer on the method, timing, and funding of any necessary public infrastructure provision is in place, or a Residential Transition overlay zone is applied and a future agreement is considered feasible; and	Could be managed as per other large sites in NEV, such as the north end of Selwyn Street or the south end of Montague Street. Refer evidence of Mr Bowen.
2.6.2.1.c	the area is suitable for residential development by having all or a majority of the following characteristics: i. a topography that is not too steep; ii. being close to the main urban area or townships that have a shortage of capacity; iii. currently serviced, or likely to be easily serviced, by frequent public transport services; iv. close to centres; and v. close to other existing community facilities such as schools, public green space and recreational facilities, health services, and libraries or other community centres;	Note, there are 5 characteristics, and only a majority (i.e. at least 3) are required.  The proposal aligns with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proximity / shortage of capacity.</li><li>• Access to public transport.</li><li>• Close to other existing community facilities.</li></ul>
2.6.2.1.d	This is a long policy and is considered below:	

Policy 2.6.2.1.d Identify areas for new residential zoning based on the following criteria: considering the zoning, rules, and potential level of development provided for, the zoning is the most appropriate in terms of the objectives of the Plan, in particular:

2.6.2.1.a.i	the character and visual amenity of Dunedin's rural environment is maintained or enhanced (Objective 2.4.6);	<p>In terms of the Rural zoning, that area is essentially squeezed between the GR2 zoning of the quarry floor and the residential zoning to the west and east, and the RR2 zoning to the north. As a result the 'rural' area has limited connection to the wider rural zone. Due to the effective urban setting, the subject area is unlikely to be considered as being part of Dunedin's rural environment.</p> <p>Further, as noted earlier, the NPS-UD expects some changes result from the implementation of the NPS-UD.</p>
2.6.2.1.a.ii	land, facilities and infrastructure that are important for economic productivity and social well-being...	Of limited relevance.
2.6.2.1.a.iii	Dunedin's significant indigenous biodiversity is protected or enhanced...	<p>Limited relevance due to lack of any such overlay.</p> <p>Noting the Policy ends by stating that to achieve the desired outcome under this Policy, then there is general avoidance of application for new residential zoning in ASBV and UBMA. This reinforces the reliance on the ASBV and UBMA overlays – neither of which are associated with this site.</p>
2.6.2.1.a.iv	Dunedin's outstanding and significant natural landscapes and natural features are protected (Objective 2.4.4). Achieving this includes generally avoiding the application of new residential zoning in ONF, ONL and SNL overlay zones;	<p>Only part of the site is associated with a landscape overlay – that area is the upper plateau (referred to as Area D / RS206).</p> <p>Similar to the above, the policy seeks to generally avoid residential zoning in the landscape overlays. That policy does provide some flexibility, as it seeks to 'generally avoid', rather than 'avoid'.</p>

		Therefore, there is scope to consider the requested residential zoning in the SNL overlay area. Refer evidence of Mr Milne.
2.6.2.1.a.v	the natural character of the coastal environment...	Not relevant.
2.6.2.1.a.vi	subdivision and development activities maintain and enhance access to coastlines, water bodies	Limited relevance but noting can be managed via setbacks and/or structure plan.
2.6.2.1.a.vii	<p>Objective 2.4.1 Form and Structure of the Environment</p> <p>The elements of the environment that contribute to residents' and visitors' aesthetic appreciation for and enjoyment of the city are protected and enhanced. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. important green and other open spaces, including green breaks between coastal settlements;</li> <li>b. trees that make a significant contribution to the visual landscape and history of neighbourhoods;</li> <li>c. built heritage, including nationally recognised built heritage;</li> <li>d. important visual landscapes and vistas;</li> <li>e. the amenity and aesthetic coherence of different environments; and</li> <li>f. the compact and accessible form of Dunedin.</li> </ul>	<p>This Objective has resulted in the landscape overlay on the upper Plateau and for two trees to be listed within the 2GP.</p> <p>The proposal does not seek to change or remove the protected trees.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape overlay referring back to Objective 2.6.2.1.a.iv (see above) the 2GP does provide some flexibility in terms of residential zoning in a landscape overlay.</p> <p>In essence of the SNL does provide the protection, but that protection is not absolute.</p> <p>In addition, please refer to the expert landscape evidence.</p>
2.6.2.1.a.viii	The potential risk from natural hazards...	Limited relevance.
2.6.2.1.a.ix	Objective 2.7.1	Refer evidence of Mr Bowen.

	Public infrastructure networks operate efficiently and effectively and have the least possible long term cost burden on the public.	
2.6.2.1.a.x	Objective 2.7.2	Limited relevance
2.6.2.1.a.xi	Dunedin stays a compact and accessible city with resilient townships based on sustainably managed urban expansion. Urban expansion only occurs if required and in the most appropriate form and locations (Objective 2.2.4).	As discussed above, the proposal is essentially 'infill', thus strongly supporting a compact city.

34. Overall, the 2GP strategic policy direction has a number of key areas, including the desire to stay a compact and accessible city (objective 2.2.4, 2.6.1 and 2.6.2), with Policy 2.6.2.1.c providing characteristics sought for residential development which the subject land meets.
35. I acknowledge that some tension arises with policies associated with amenity, biodiversity and landscape. However to the extent that these relate to amenity the NPS-UD provides instructive guidance set out above.
36. In addition, there seems to be limited, if any real, policy direction supporting the rural zoning associated with the site. For example, Objective 16.2.1 states that “*Rural zones are reserved for productive rural activities and the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, along with certain activities that support the well-being of communities where these activities are most appropriately located in a rural rather than an urban environment*”. However the area of the site associated with the Rural zone:
- (a) Is unlikely to have a productive rural use.
  - (b) Is not associated with the landscape overlay.
  - (c) Has no connection to the wider rural community.
37. Objective 16.2.3 includes “*that rural character values and amenity of the rural zones are maintained or enhanced, elements of which include...a low density of residential activity, which is associated with rural activities...*”. As noted above the site is unlikely to support rural activity, but Objective 16.2.3 seeks that residential activity needs to be associated with a rural activity.
38. Further, the rural policy direction sets a very high bar in terms of undersized subdivisions and increased density, both of which are associated with ‘avoid’ policies (Policy 16.2.1.X and 16.2.1.7).
39. As discussed within this evidence (together with the supporting evidence of Mr Bowen and Mr Milne) the site does provide capacity for

new urban development. However, the utilisation of that capacity requires increased densities and subdivision, which clashes strikingly with the policy direction of the Rural zoning.

40. Therefore, an alternative zoning is considered appropriate.
41. The site is well aligned with both the NPS-UD direction and the 2GP's strategic direction for residential zoning.

## **Variation 2**

42. The Section 32 Report writer explains Variation 2 *"...is being proposed primarily to give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)."*<sup>5</sup>. With Variation 2 addressing *"the requirement to provide sufficient development capacity for the short and medium term (up to 10 years)"*<sup>6</sup>.
43. Under Section 55(2B) of the RMA, a local authority must make amendments to a proposed plan to give effect to provisions within a national policy statement. The most relevant Objectives and Policies of the NPS-UD are outlined above.
44. In terms of the subject site, within the Section 42A Report, the site was assessed solely against Policy 2.6.2.1 (refer page 331 of the Section 42A Report). A site assessment is included in Appendix C (refer Appendix C.32). However, the site assessment does not:
  - (a) engage with the elements of Policy 2.6.2.1 that support rezoning
  - (b) provide a wider review of the strategic direction.
  - (c) address the NPS-UD.
45. Matters on which the site rated highly for, or which did not raise any issue, include:
  - (a) Accessibility – Public
  - (b) Accessibility – Schools

---

<sup>5</sup> Para Section 32 Report.

<sup>6</sup> Para Section 32 Report.



- (c) Transport effects (wider network)
  - (d) Compact city – proximity to existing residential areas
  - (e) Compact city - ability to develop land efficiently
  - (f) Effects on Manawhenua values
  - (g) network utility operators, Southern District Health Board, Ministry for Education and FENZ
46. The key matters raised in the site assessment against rezoning are:
- (a) Slope
  - (b) Accessibility to Centres
  - (c) Rural Character/visual amenity
  - (d) Significant indigenous biodiversity
  - (e) Natural Hazards
  - (f) Transport effects (local)
47. I respond to these in turn below:
- (a) In terms of slope, a mean slope range is utilised. This does not consider that the site comprises a number of separate areas, some of which are relatively flat, such as Area 4 (RS206) and parts of Area C (Rs206a). Further the proposal now seeks Area B to be zoned Recreational. The removal of this area of the slope calculations will be beneficial.
  - (b) Accessibility to Centres is considered poor, due to the Gardens shopping area being 1.25km away. However, in reality, this is largely countered by the flat nature of North Road (which has cycle lanes, resulting in good/excellent cycling and walking connections) and the 'very good' rating for accessibility to public transport.

- (c) In terms of the rural character/visual amenity matters, the assessment seems to place significant weight on the SNL (which is on only part of the site). In addition, such matters can have reduced weight placed on them, as per paragraph 33 of the Section 42A Report:

*All zoning to residential will result in loss of rural character and amenity, replacing it with a residential character. I do not consider that Objective 2.4.6 requires a protection of all rural character and amenity values, as this would prevent most new residential zoning. Therefore, while an assessment has been made of the relative value of the rural environment in each location and the likely effects on it, in general relatively little weight has been placed on meeting this objective in terms of supporting rezoning of new sites.*

- (d) In terms of significant indigenous biodiversity, this has limited relevance, as the 2GP anticipates areas of significant indigenous biodiversity to be protected via an overlay. The site has no biodiversity related overlay. In terms of non-significant indigenous biodiversity, the 2GP provides guidance on areas of importance (around waterways, wetlands etc), while providing for the removal of some biodiversity as a permitted activity.
- (e) The Natural Hazards were considered to be 'not manageable'. However, such matters are regularly managed via the 2GP, as evident by SUB-2019-138/LUC-2019-578 which relates to a 14-lot subdivision of the residential area adjacent to Watts Road.
- (f) The transport effects (local) were considered to be 'not manageable'. In terms of access to/from Watts Road, the residential area adjacent to Watts Road was recently granted a resource consent (SUB-2019-138) for a 14-lot residential subdivision. Subject to conditions of consent, the expert traffic advice that Council received in relation to that application, concluded that traffic matters (access, traffic generation etc) were acceptable. In terms of local traffic matters, rezoning the upper

plateau or providing for increased densities for the residential land adjacent to Watts Road, such matters are regularly managed via the 2GP. Also refer to the evidence of Mr Bowen.

48. This only leaves outstanding rural character/visual amenity matters and indigenous biodiversity.
49. I have also assessed the key concerns raised in the Section 42A report appendix against the policy direction of the NPS-UD:

Section 42A report matter	NPS-UD	Comment
Slope	The NPS-UD provides no guidance on this matter	Suggest limited, if any, to be weight placed on it.
Accessibility to Centres	Increased support for the rezoning of sites that assist to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Objective 8).	Due to access to public transport, along with the cycle network etc, accessibility is relatively high.
Rural Character/visual amenity	Amenity is subject to change (Objective 4). Changes in amenity values may not be an adverse effect (Policy 6).	Further, the Section 42A Report suggests limited weight is placed on such matters.
Significant indigenous biodiversity	The NPS-UD provides no guidance on this matter	Suggest limited, if any, to be weight placed on it as such matters are generally managed via an overlay.

Natural Hazards	The NPS-UD provides no guidance on this matter	Suggest limited, if any, to be weight placed on it. Also can be managed at the resource consent stage.
Transport effects (local)	The NPS-UD provides no guidance on this matter	Suggest limited, if any, to be weight placed on it. Also can be managed at the resource consent stage.

50. In summary:

- (a) Variation 2 is generally seeking to implement the NPS-UD. The site has been assessed by Council for that purpose.
- (b) The site has good alignment with the policy direction of the NPS-UD which is a higher order document.
- (c) The key matters raised by Council for the subject site can be managed through the 2GP or in the case of rural amenity are outweighed by the direction in the NPS-UD.

### **Conclusion**

- 51. The current zoning unnecessarily constrains development potential, and with no real consenting pathway inhibits the most efficient use of the site, a land resource without productive value.
- 52. The site represents a significant increase in development capacity in an accessible well connected, infill location.
- 53. The overarching purpose of the 2GP Variation 2 is to “give effect to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).”.

54. Objective 3 of the NPS-UD is clear that:  
*“... district plans enable more people to live in ... areas of an urban environment in which one or more of the following apply:*
- (a) *the area is in or near a centre zone or other area with many employment opportunities*
  - (b) *the area is well-serviced by existing or planned public transport*
  - (c) *there is high demand for housing or for business land in the area, relative to other areas within the urban environment.”*
55. The subject site has one or more of the above characteristics.
56. Further:
- (a) The subject site is large enough to provide “*significant development capacity*”, which requires a more “*responsive*” decision by the council (Objective 6.c).
  - (b) A key NPS-UD Objective is that “New Zealand’s urban environments support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions” (Objective 8.a).
57. The proposal would give effect to these higher order Objectives / Policies.
58. Rezoning Areas A and C to GR2 present no material policy tension.
59. Rezoning Area D to Large Lot Residential 1 requires consideration of the landscape overlay. The evidence of Mr Milne supports a structure plan to protect/enhance the plantings on the southern portion of this area. If Area D was to be rezoning, any subsequent subdivision (by itself) would not create any effects of concern. The resulting use of the site would be subject to a resource consent processes in terms of future development. Landscape effects can be considered and managed at that stage.
60. Using a structure plan for Area D (RS206) and Area E (RS077) is supported. Indicative performance standards for a structure plan(s) are within the appendix.

61. Rezoning Area E to GR2 may require consideration of biodiversity matters, however with an appropriate structure plan, development can be centred, and located away from waterways and wetlands. As outlined in the appendix a suggest performance standard for the structure plan associated with Area E is to ensure the land between the southern boundary/stream and the access/housing area is maintained and becomes a recreation reserve area.
62. Overall, the proposal aligns with the NPS-UD, the main driver of Variation 2. Where there are tensions with the 2GP these must be considered in light of giving effect to the higher order document.

Date: 5 August 2022

Conrad Anderson

## **Appendix 1: Suggested structure plan area performance standards**

### Area D (RS206)

The protection and enhancement of native vegetation along the majority of the south part of the area.

New buildings and additions and alterations to buildings:

- Shall have a maximum height of 5m above finished floor level.
- The exterior cladding must comply with Rule 10.3.6.
- The exterior claddings that are painted, shall be finished in colour ranges of Greys, Greens and Browns.

One shared access way will provide access to every future lot within Area D and will be located outside the area associated with the protection and enhancement of native vegetation.

All future activity is to be self-sufficient in terms of water supply and waste water disposal.

### Area E (RS077)

Native vegetation outside the development area<sup>7</sup> is protected and enhanced.

The land to the south of the access/development area is to become a recreation reserve. A public walking track/footpath is to connect the recreation reserve area to the sites access point to North Road.

The access from North Road to the development area is to include a formed vehicle access (xxm wide), a footpath (1.5m wide), and a cycle lane (1.5m wide).

---

<sup>7</sup> The development area of Area E is the area associated with earthworks for access, buildings and any future waste water and/or stormwater detention requirement(s).