



SECOND GENERATION DISTRICT PLAN

Plan Change 1 – Minor Improvements

Summary of Decisions Requested Report

19 February 2025

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Summary of Decisions Requested Report Overview	3
2.1 Scope of Submissions	3
2.2 Proposals with no Submissions in Opposition	4
2.3 Layout of the Summary of Decisions Requested Tables	4
2.4 Principles used in Summarising Submissions	5

Appendix A Summary of Decisions Requested (by Submitters' First Name)

Appendix B Summary of Decisions Requested (by Change ID)

Appendix C Submitter Contact Details for Service of Further Submissions

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

2GP	Partially Operative Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan
ASBV	Area of Significant Biodiversity Value
CBD	Central Business District
CEC	CBD Edge Commercial zones
dB	Decibel
DCC	Dunedin City Council
DnT,w + Ctr	Weighted Standardised Level Difference with Spectrum Adaption Term Ctr
ITA	Integrated Transport Assessment
Plan	Partially Operative Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
RNZNVR	Royal New Zealand Naval Volunteer Reserve

1 INTRODUCTION

1. To assist the further submission process, Clause 7 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires the Dunedin City Council (DCC) to prepare a summary of decisions requested in submissions on Plan Change 1 (Minor Improvements) to the Partially Operative Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan (2GP).
2. The RMA prescribes a 10 working-day period for making further submissions from the day of notification. **The period for further submissions on Plan Change 1 is from Wednesday 19 February (the date of the public notice) to Tuesday, 4 March 2025.**
3. Further submissions can only be made in support of, or opposition to, a point raised in another person's original submission. Therefore, they cannot seek an entirely new change that is not covered in an original submission.
4. The RMA limits who can make further submissions to:
 - a. any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
 - b. any person that has an interest in Plan Change 1 greater than the interest that the general public has (for example someone who may be directly affected by a change proposed in an original submission)
 - c. the local authority (Dunedin City Council).
5. You do not have to have made an original submission to participate.
6. There may be more than one submitter who has submitted on a particular change that you are interested in. You can choose to make a further submission on all or only some of these submissions.
7. You do not need to, and there is no benefit in, making further submissions to repeat any decisions requested or reasons that you have already made in an original submission.
8. This summary of decisions requested concisely summarises the decisions requested in the original submissions on Plan Change 1 to the 2GP, for which the submission period closed on 18 December 2024. The summaries included in this report are not the full or exact content of submissions and do not include reasons for the request or other supporting material included in the submission.
9. Before making a further submission, you are encouraged to read the original submission to fully understand the issues raised by the submitter. Copies of all submissions can be viewed online and at DCC public libraries. See the Plan Change 1 website for details of the further submission process at www.dunedin.govt.nz/2gp-plan-change-1.
10. It is the responsibility of all people making a further submission to serve a copy of the further submission on the person who made the original submission, no later than five working days after lodging the further submission with the DCC. Contact information is provided for this purpose, as detailed further below.

2 SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED REPORT OVERVIEW

11. The summary of decisions requested has been prepared in two formats:
 - a. ordered by submitter name (alphabetical order by first name) – see Appendix A; and
 - b. ordered by 'Change ID' – see Appendix B.
12. Appendix C contains a list of all the original submitter contact details for the service of further submissions. A copy of your further submission must be sent to the submitter's 'address for service' no later than five working days after lodging the further submission with the DCC. Where both an email and postal address are provided, the copy can be sent via either method.
13. It is noted that there are five submissions where submitters have not provided contact details. These submissions have been noted in Appendices A and B with an *, and in Appendix C with the statement "no contact information provided".
14. Please note that some submitters lodged two submissions, each with different contact information. For these submissions, further submitters should ensure that a copy of their further submission is sent to the contact person relevant to the submission points they are further submitting on. A summary of affected submissions is given in the table below. Affected submissions and submission points are also shaded blue in Appendix C.

Submitter number	Submitter
S32	Kevin and Deborah van de Water
S117	Patersons
S174	OUSA
S187	Otago Regional Council
S257	Fire and Emergency New Zealand

2.1 Scope of Submissions

15. As outlined in the Section 32 Report for Plan Change 1¹, the scope of matters being considered in the plan change is limited to the proposals and rejected changes outlined in the Section 32 Report, and any alternative options to achieve the purpose of each proposal.
16. Submissions made on other matters have been identified as 'not in scope' and are listed in separate tables at the end of Appendix A and Appendix B. Best efforts have been made to identify all out-of-scope submission points at this time. However, it is possible that additional matters of scope may still arise through the hearing process, and these will be addressed by the Hearing Panel as necessary.
17. Submissions have been identified as 'not in scope' for one of two broad reasons:

¹ Available online here: [Section-32-Report.pdf](#) (see Section 1.2 on the scope of Plan Change 1)

- a. They seek changes that do not relate to the content of the 2GP (e.g., requests for funding, maintenance, or infrastructure upgrades); or
 - b. They seek changes to the content of the 2GP, but the requests do not fall within the purpose of any proposal included in Plan Change 1.
18. The Hearing Panel can only consider submissions that are within the scope of PC1.
19. The Hearing Panel will determine how it wishes to manage out-of-scope submissions and will likely issue a Minute to submitters on this topic prior to the hearing.

2.2 Proposals with no Submissions in Opposition

20. Several changes in Plan Change 1 did not receive any submissions in opposition, meaning they are now beyond challenge and the Hearing Panel has no decision to make on them.
21. In accordance with Section 86F of the RMA, the affected changes must be deemed operative. This means that the relevant proposed new rules replace the previous rules.
22. Dunedin City Council will update the 2GP and Planning Map to incorporate provisions that are deemed operative. When this process is completed, a report will be published on the Plan Change 1 webpage detailing which changes have been deemed operative, and which provisions were affected.

2.3 Layout of the Summary of Decisions Requested Tables

23. The layout of the summary of decisions requested tables is shown below.

Submission point	Submitter	Change ID	Provision	Position	Decision sought
S103.001	Abby Smith	PHS2	All	Accept with amendments	Amend Change PHS2 (Acoustic insulation for music venues noise management) to require increased acoustic insulation in the entire dwelling rather than only bedrooms.
S300.001	Adam Levine	Res13	All	If not rejected, amend	Reject Change Res13 (Stormwater open watercourse setbacks), but if the change is not rejected amend the setback required from stormwater open watercourse mapped areas at urban residential properties from 5m to 1m.
S106.001	Alan Gray	PHS2	All	Accept with	Amend Change PHS2 (Acoustic insulation for music venues noise management) to

24. The following paragraphs provide explanation of each column in the summary of decisions requested tables.
25. Submission point column:
- a. The submission point is the unique number allocated to each decision requested (e.g. 'S1.001'). It is made up of the submitter ID number (e.g. 'S1') and the submission point number (e.g. '.001').
 - b. If you wish to make a further submission supporting or opposing any decisions requested, please include the submission point number in your further submission; a space is provided for this on the further submission form.
 - c. As far as possible, the submission point numbers allocated to each submitter are sequential. However, sometimes this is not the case as a result of points being added or deleted during the quality assurance process.

26. Submitter column:
- This column contains the name(s) of the individual(s) or organisation that made the submission, or that the submission was made on behalf of.
27. Change ID column:
- Plan Change 1 includes a suite of proposed changes, each of which has a unique Change ID (for example 'Change Res13'). Each change may affect multiple Plan provisions. This column identifies the Change ID to which the submission point relates.
 - A summary of the purpose of each proposed change, the nature of the change and the provisions that are amended through the proposal is available in the Summary of Changes document on the Plan Change 1 website www.dunedin.govt.nz/2gp-plan-change-1.
28. Provision column:
- This column details which Plan provision the submission point relates to. For submissions that affect multiple, or all, provisions being amended by a change, this column will state 'All'.
29. Position column:
- This column summarises the submitter's position on the change that is proposed to the Plan. There are four options:
 - Accept
 - Accept with amendments
 - Reject
 - If not rejected, amend
 - Where submissions did not clearly indicate an option, or it appeared that the incorrect option had been chosen, the table indicates the option that is most appropriate based on the content of the submission.
30. Decision sought column:
- This is a concise summary of the decision requested by the submitter. It is not the full or exact content of the submission.
 - In some instances, where a submission has not made the decision requested clear, staff have inferred what decision the submitter is requesting. Where this has happened the statement 'inferred not stated' follows the text.

2.4 Principles used in Summarising Submissions

- Standardised wording has been used to make it easier for the reader to identify submissions of interest. For example: 'Reject the changes to rule X', or 'Amend rule Y to...', or 'Retain Change SHB3 (Add specified new scheduled heritage buildings)'.
- Any abbreviations used in the summaries are listed at the front of this report.

33. Where a submission requested a specific amendment to the content of a Plan provision, this has generally not been included in the summary of decision requested. Instead, the reader is referred to the original submission to understand the details of the request.
34. The summary of decisions requested does not include a description of the consequential amendments that would result from making the change requested, except where they were discussed explicitly in submissions. The Hearing Panel can consider and make any necessary consequential changes when making its decision on submissions whether or not this is stated in the summary of decision requested.
35. Where a submission has been made against the wrong part of the Plan (for example, a misunderstanding about where the relevant provision sits in the Plan, or the relevant Change ID), the submission point has been coded to the correct provision or Change ID, so that all submissions relating to a particular matter can be considered together.
36. **Note:** While due care and attention has been given to making the Summary of Decisions Requested as accurate and useful as possible, by nature a summary will always involve a degree of judgement in deciding how to best summarise and categorise what is being written, and/or in interpreting information in submissions that may not have been clearly presented. In all cases, people making further submissions should refer to the original submissions before forming a view on the content of the submissions.