

Appendix 1: Right of Reply – summary of hearing discussion, response points, and revised recommendation(s):

Site ID	Site Address	Additional DCC expert evidence	Summary of Hearing Discussion	Response to Hearing Discussion, Answer to Panel’s Questions, and Revised Recommendations	2GP Implementation:
Broad submissions (all)		n/a	No submitters spoke at hearing.	Ms Christmas discusses DCC submission OS187.017 in her evidence.	Refer to s42A report
GF01	Parts 155 Scroggs Hill Road, Brighton	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Rezoning is not supported.	Ms Emma Peters: • Submitter now focused primarily on GF01, although still supports RS160. • Application of an RTZ is a possibility for RS160, with a site-specific release rule requiring an ITA and funding of transport upgrades to be in place. • GF01 would be self-serviced for 3 Waters, for wastewater this would be a minimum of secondary treatment. • A footpath connection is feasible and would be dealt with at the time of subdivision. • Considers that other transport issues outlined in the s42A report relate to further development in the area (e.g. RS160). • Proposed planting and setback on site mean yield is likely to be approx. 36-40 dwellings. • Growth in Brighton is necessary, and there is currently insufficient zoned capacity available to the market. Rezoning would provide choice to Dunedin residents and provide capacity for Clutha workforce. • Raised issues in relation to the housing capacity assessment. • Demolition of pre-1940’s buildings rule will reduce the available housing capacity. • Also considers T&S zoning is appropriate, provided transport network can cope Hugh Forsyth: • Mr Forsyth considers the recommended design controls are important to implement. Could be done via structure plan provisions. Mr McCleary: • Rural Residential subdivision isn’t feasible at this location.	Response Points • Matters relating to the housing capacity assessment, the need for capacity in this area and 1940s building rule have been addressed by Mr Stocker. • Ms Christmas has discussed the compact city and resilient townships objective in relation to this site. • DCC Transport has confirmed that any additional development (ie. just GF01) would require roading upgrades. These works are significant and may not be possible without land acquisition and significant engineering works. No expert transport evidence was provided by the submitter to support their position that these are not required. • GF01 was notified as Large Lot zoning and I do not consider there is scope to zone to T&S. T&S zoning would require 3W servicing, which is problematic. • Urban design controls are within scope if the site is rezoned. However, as outlined in the s42A report, this would require additional method to be included in the plan. Ms Christmas comments on this in her evidence. Recommendation DCC Transport has advised there is no change to their previously advised position, that GF01 on its own would require significant roading improvements at the southern extent of Scroggs Hill Road. DCC Transport is unable to currently support the proposed rezoning. Given there is no change to DCC Transports view and no expert evidence has been supplied by the submitter to address this, I retain my original recommendation to not rezone GF01.	Do not retain GF01 as notified: • Do not rezone to Large Lot Residential 1 • Do not apply a ‘no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area’ • Do not apply a ‘new development mapped area’
RS160	155 Scroggs Hill Road (in part)	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Rezoning is not supported.	Some of the information provided in relation to GF01 is relevant (see above). The submitter notes an RTZ may be appropriate for this site, with a release rule focussed on roading upgrades.	Recommendation In the absence of any further evidence from submitters relating to RS160, the significant transportation concerns for this area, and my recommendation not to rezone GF01, I recommend retaining my original recommendation for RS160 to maintain rejection.	Do not rezone RS160 as requested
RS220	53 - 127 Scroggs Hill Road	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Rezoning is not supported.	No submitters spoke at hearing in relation to this site.	Recommendation Retain original recommendation	Do not rezone RS220 as requested
GF02	201, 207 & 211 Gladstone Road South, East Taieri.	DCC Transport: no change to previously advised position.	Mr Robert Reid (Broomfield Trust, owner of 207 Gladstone Road South):	Recommendation No amendments. Support rezoning GF02 and GF02a.	• Rezone GF02 and GF02a to GR1. • Apply an NDMA over GF02 and GF02a.

		Transport upgrades and ITA required at time of subdivision.	- Supportive of the rezoning proposal. The area is suitable for residential development. Ms Emma Peters, on behalf of Ed Stewardson: - Land has limited rural productivity. Site is well suited for GR1 zoning. - Roading connections to adjoining potential rezoning areas would be considered during subdivision. - The key concerns of submitters can be addressed at the time of subdivision.		
GF03	16 Hare Road and 7 Kayforce Road, Ocean View	DCC Transport: no change to previously advised position. ITA required at time of subdivision Stantec: The assessment report addresses concerns in relation to flooding. Land is suitable for rezoning. Stormwater assessments and flood mitigation design will likely be required at the time of consent development	Kurt Bowen: - Broadly agrees with the s42A report, and application of NDMA Neil Johnstone (Flood Sense Limited): - Provided evidence demonstrating risk of flooding is low	Recommendation No amendments. Rezone GF03 to Township and Settlement.	- Rezone GF03 to Township and Settlement. - Apply an NDMA over GF03.
GF04	127a Main Road, Fairfield	DCC Transport: no change to previously advised position. No overarching transport concerns.	Conrad Anderson (evidence provided, but did not speak): - The rezoning of GF04 is supported. - In terms of proximity to state highways, the 2GP contains rules to manage this, including in relation to acoustic insulation, and Rule 6.11.2.7.a.Z which states <i>“Council will consider the effects of subdivision and subsequent development on the safety and efficiency of the state highway network, and may require written approval from Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency”</i>. - Suggests an NDMA is not needed, given half the site has a subdivision consent, and zoning area has only 13 sites. - Notes due to the site’s landform and the fact that the site does not have a boundary directly along the road formation, any dwelling on GF04 land will not be immediately adjacent to the state highway	Response Points: - There has been no further information or conversations between DCC and Waka Kotahi regarding this site. Waka Kotahi has not attended the hearing, or tabled evidence. While Waka Kotahi did submit on GF04, it was not clear on what sites-specific provisions they considered appropriate (if any). - I note that parts of the site are very close (<10m) to SH1. Consistent with site GF08, I recommend a SPMA rule requiring an acoustic insulation assessment be undertaken as part of a subdivision application. Recommendation Rezone GF04 to GR1. I recommend that an NDMA is applied, and note that GF04 was notified with an NDMA overlay. This is to ensure good stormwater management, ensure that subdivision supports best practice outcomes and achieves the strategic objectives of the plan, and ensures consistency of approach for greenfield areas across the city. I recommend a structure plan mapped is included requiring an acoustic assessment to be undertaken at subdivision.	- Rezone GF04 to General Residential 1. - Apply an NDMA over 127a Main Road, Fairfield. - Apply a SPMA over GF04 to require an acoustic assessment at the time of subdivision. - New section 15.8.AM (Fairfield Structure Plan Mapped Area Performance Standards).
GF05	Parts 353 Main South Road, Sunnyvale, Fairfield	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. ITA required at time of subdivision, connecting road optimal. Stantec:	Kurt Bowen on behalf Paul and Michelle Barron: - Submitter previously owned the adjoining Grandvista land. - Is supportive of rezoning. - Provision was made for a road connection between sites at the time of Grandvista subdivision. Ms Emma Peters on behalf of Ron and Sue Balchin:	Response Points: - Noise complaints in relation to adjoining sites: There is one noise complaint relating to 375 Main South Road – in November 2017, regarding noise from chainsaw and band-saw. There are no noise complaints lodged against 377 Main South Road. - The Panel asked whether GF05a should retain its Rural Residential 2 zoning given only a single dwelling is	- Rezone GF05 to General Residential 1 zone. - Application of a ‘new development mapped area’ - Application of a ‘structure plan mapped area’ to manage: - Buffer with adjacent land

		GF05: The Geosolve report appropriately addresses land stability concerns on the site. We concur that the land outside the Miller Street landslide and the “gully feature” appears to be readily developable, subject to further investigations and geotechnical advice at the time of subdivision, and is suitable for rezoning. GF05a and gully feature: The site is not appropriate for rezoning.	• A connecting road from Grandvista would follow an existing water pipe to link with Main South Rd. • Would support a SPMA rule requiring further geotechnical assessment at time of subdivision to identify location of suitable building platforms. • Reverse sensitivity – Grandvista is located closer to Fulton Hogan quarry than GF05. Proposes a 12m setback for residential units from boundary of 375 Main South Road and 377 Main South Rd. • There is a line of trees along the boundary with 375 Main South Road that would provide a further buffer between activities. Mark Walrond (Geosolve): • Extensive test pitting showed favourable geotechnical conditions. • No reason site couldn’t be used for residential activity	proposed. The Stantec evidence advises that the GF05a site is not appropriate for rezoning, and I do not recommend a zone change. Recommendation Based on the geotechnical assessment from GeoSolve and review from Stantec, I am satisfied that the area of GF05 is suitable for residential rezoning to GR1, subject to an NDMA and a structure plan, including: • A 12m buffer from adjoining mining/industrial land • A road connection linking Severn St with Main South Rd • A requirement for a geotechnical assessment at the time of subdivision across all areas of GF05. (note that this requires new assessment Rule 15.12.3.X, and an amendment to Rule 11.6.2.1.i, both as notified) Regarding GF05a, relying on Stantec’s advice in relation to geotechnical issues, I do not recommend rezoning this area. I recommend that the area of GF05a retain its Rural Residential 2 zoning.	○ Provision of a connecting road; ○ Requirement for a geotechnical assessment at the time of subdivision. • Removal of the high class soils mapped area • New section 15.8.AL (Sunnyvale Structure Plan Mapped Area Performance Standards) • New Assessment Rule 15.12.3.X • Amend Assessment Rule 11.6.2.1.i
GF06	Weir Street, Green Island	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. ITA required at time of subdivision.	No submitters spoke at hearing	Retain original recommendation	Refer to s42A: • Rezone GF06 to General Residential 1. • Application of a ‘new development mapped area’. • Remove the ‘high class soils mapped area’.
GF07 and RS169	33 Emerson Street, Concord 41 Emerson Street, Concord	DCC Transport: Rezoning can be supported subject to an ITA being provided at the subdivision stage. 3 Waters: Rezoning can be supported.	Kurt Bowen: • Considers upgrading Emerson Street economic and feasible. • Notes RS169 and adjacent GF07 can be effectively considered as a single site.	Response Points • DCC Transport advise that a footpath on both sides of Emerson Street may not be needed and would be best dealt with at the time of subdivision. • I consider that GF07 and RS169 can effectively be treated as a single site, as they are immediately adjacent to one another and share the same broad characteristics. If one is rezoned, the other should also be. Rezoning both sites would also provide more development capacity for the area which would help dilute the cost of conducting the required upgrades. • There is no concern with rezoning an area adjacent to a cemetery. • I consider a single NDMA covering both sites would provide the best outcomes in terms of stormwater management and urban design. Recommendation Rezone GF07 as notified. Rezone RS169 as requested.	• Rezone GF07 and RS169 to General Residential 1. • Apply a ‘new development mapped area’ covering both sites.
GF08	19 Main South Road, Concord	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. No overarching transport concerns.	Ms Emma Peters: • Recommends implementation of further acoustic assessment at time subdivision in a structure plan for the site. Mr Brendon Shanks: • Discussed the acoustic evidence.	Response Points • I recommend amending the existing Rule 15.8.AB Main South Road, Concord structure plan mapped area rule to include an information requirement or rule requiring further acoustic insulation modelling, with a restriction on building within identified ‘no build’ areas, and acoustic insulation within ‘effects areas’.	• Rezone GF08 to General Residential 2. • Apply a ‘Variation 2 mapped area’ over GF08. • Application of a ‘new development mapped area’. • Application of a ‘structure plan mapped area’

			- Identified a ‘no build’ zone and then an ‘effects zone’. Buildings in the ‘effects zone’ would need to implement noise mitigation, but noted modelling would need to be updated at time of subdivision based on any additional noise mitigation proposed and also consideration of double-storey dwellings - Modelling is based on Waka Kotahi guidance. Mr Cameron Grindlay: - Discussed the possible upgrading / provision of playgrounds and commented that the submitter is open to all possibilities going forward and at the time of subdivision	Recommendation My recommendation in the s42A report was to support rezoning, subject to discussion at the hearing regarding the potential for reverse sensitivity. The submitter has provided a preliminary acoustic assessment, and no further concerns were raised at the hearing itself. I therefore recommend rezoning GF08 to GR2 subject to a further, more detailed acoustic assessment undertaken at the time of subdivision, as recommended by Mr Shanks.	New section 15.8.AB (Main South Road Concord Structure Plan Mapped Area Performance Standards) to manage indigenous vegetation clearance and require an acoustic assessment at the time of subdivision.
GF09	41-49 Three Mile Hill Road, Halfway Bush	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. No overarching transport concerns.	Ms Alice Wouters: - Noted concerns regarding springs, stormwater run-off, flood risk, transport, loss and loss of rural character amongst others. - Her primary concern relates to setting a precedent for further development in the area. Ms Valerie Dempster: - Outlined concerns about flood hazards, lack of drainage, weather impacts to the road, lack of 3 Waters servicing, limited cell reception. - The area is more suited for animal grazing and/or growing food. - Her primary concern relates to setting a precedent for further development in the area.	Response Points - Precedent effect. I do not consider rezoning GF09 to LLR1 would set a precedent for further rezoning (or residential development of) of rural residential zoned land. The rezoning proposed reflects the existing land use and site size (2 ha). No subdivision potential is enabled by the rezoning. Future residential rezoning requests in the Halfway Bush area would be subject to the criteria outlined in Policy 2.6.2.1 of the 2GP and would be considered on their own merits. - The Panel asked for further comment on if rezoning GF09 would achieve the objectives of Variation 2. Ms Christmas addresses the purpose of Variation 2 in her evidence. Recommendation I retain my original recommendation to rezone GF09.	- Rezone GF09 to Large Lot Residential 1. - Application of a ‘no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area’.
GF10	Honeystone Street, Helensburgh	Refer to below from DCC Transport which is also relevant for GF10.	No submitters spoke at hearing specifically in relation to GF10.	Retain original recommendation	Refer to s42A: - Rezone GF10 to Large Lot Residential 1. - Application of a ‘new development mapped area’ - Application of a ‘structure plan mapped area’ to manage indigenous vegetation clearance. - Remove the ‘high class soils mapped area’ - New section 15.8.AA (Honeystone Street Structure Plan Mapped Area Performance Standards).
GF11	Polwarth Road and Wakari Road, Helensburgh			Recommendation to be provided at a later date.	
GF12	233 Signal Hill Road, Upper Junction	DCC Transport: The upgrading works to provide access are significant, and without detailed engineering plans being provided at this stage to demonstrate upgrades are achievable, Transport does not support the rezoning.	Mr Kurt Bowen: - Reasonably significant roading upgrades would be necessary, but considers these practicable and economically feasible. - Proposal is to allow for 8 sites. - Self-servicing for 3 Waters could occur if necessary, but states that a connection to the reticulated network should be possible.	Response Points - DCC Transport has stated that without detailed engineering plans being provided to demonstrate the upgrades are in fact achievable, the proposed rezoning remains unable to be supported from a transportation perspective. - I note Mr Bowen’s comment regarding connection to the 3 Waters network and I reiterate the 3 Waters comments	Do not retain GF12 as notified: - Do not rezone to Large Lot Residential 1 - Do not apply a ‘new development mapped area’ - Do not apply a ‘no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area’

			- Agrees to a structure plan rule “an upgrade of Pleasant Place is a requirement of subdivision” to provide certainty. - Agrees with the other recommendations in the s42A report (NDMA overlay, ‘No DCC wastewater mapped area’ overlay). Mr Harry Harding: - Outlined the work done to date on regenerating bush on the property as part of the HALO project.	from the s42A report , that the site would need to self-service for both potable water supply and wastewater. Recommendation DCC Transport has advised that the proposed rezoning continues to be unable to be supported from a transport perspective, given the significant upgrades that would be required and the lack of detailed engineering plans. In light of this, I retain the recommendation in my s42A report, and am unable to recommend the rezoning of GF12. Should the Panel decide the rezoning GF12 is appropriate, I would recommend including a structure plan over the area to require that provision of suitable access, at the developers expense, is provided.	- Do not apply a ‘Area of Significant Biodiversity Value’ - Do not remove the ‘high class soils mapped area’ - Delete new row in Schedule A1.2 (C166)
GF14	336 & 336A Portobello Road, The Cove			Recommendation to be provided at a later date.	
GF15 and GF17	Area west of Highcliff Road, Portobello	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Upgrades and improvements required, but rezoning can overall be supported.	No submitters spoke at hearing. However, the Panel has asked some clarifying questions on site GF15, GF16, and GF17 which I have answered here as ‘Response Points’.	Response Points: - In terms of connection to the reticulated network, it is proposed to service for GF15 for 3 Waters. - In terms of the ORC’s concerns, the ORC position/comment in their original submission (S271) with respect to GF15, GF16, GF17 states “<i>ORC’s supports in part as the section 32 report has identified there are options which, subject to further investigations, will allow for managing post development flows appropriately. ORC interest is that the increased development could have adverse effects on water quality within the freshwater catchment and the coastal waters but this is not addressed in the s32 assessment.</i>” I would interpret this as primarily relating to stormwater, however it is possible they could also be referring to wastewater. For stormwater, it is proposed to apply NDMA’s over both GF15 and GF16 which will require a stormwater management plan and Policy 9.2.1.Y of the 2GP will need to be met which required there is no increase in the pre-development peak stormwater discharge rate from the development area into any public or private stormwater system. Where this is not practicable, any adverse effects from an increase in the discharge on any public or private stormwater system must be no more than minor. Regarding wastewater, it is proposed that both sites would be connected to the reticulated wastewater system. - At the top of page 170 in my s42A report I discuss that there are existing policies and rules in the 2GP which manage a range of activities that could adversely affect water quality (including Rule 8A.5.7 and Rule 8A.5.10). These rules apply throughout to Dunedin and would therefore apply equally to both GF15 and GF16 (as well as all other greenfield sites). - It is proposed to apply one NDMA to GF15, and a separate NDMA to GF16. An NDMA is not considered necessary for GF17. Recommendation Retain original recommendation.	Refer to s42A: - Rezone GF15 to Large Lot Residential 1 zone. - Application of a ‘new development mapped area’ over GF15. - Rezone GF17 to Recreation zone.

GF16	Area east of Highcliff Road, Portobello	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Upgrades and improvements required, but rezoning can overall be supported.	No submitters spoke at hearing.	Refer to above discussion points on GF15 and GF17, some of which are also relevant to GF16. Recommendation Retain original recommendation.	Refer to s42A: - Rezone GF16 to Township and Settlement zone. - Application of a ‘new development mapped area’ over GF16. - Removal of the high class soils mapped area over GF16.
RTZ1	30 Mercer Street, Kenmure	DCC Transport: The timings of any improvements to the Barr St/Kenmure St/Kaikorai Valley Rd intersections are still a potential project for the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP2). This is still unfunded and is just one amongst several similar projects that could get submitted for funding. This will be confirmed during 2023-2024. Rezoning could not reasonably be required to be contingent on the provision of the roundabout. Internal site layout issues, these could be satisfactorily addressed at the subdivision stage. Rezoning of the site could be supported and that any necessary transportation infrastructure upgrades could be addressed as part of an ITA at the subdivision stage.	Mr Chris Medlicott: - Proposal now includes a second entrance onto Kaikorai Valley Road. He has a verbal agreement to purchase that land if a second access point is required. - Also noted future connection opportunities to Mornington Road. - House at 127 Barr St would be removed to widen access. - Seeks GR2 zoning, if necessary would accept GR1. - Supports the communal wastewater system requirement. - Not convinced the roundabout on Kaikorai Valley road is necessary.	Response Points DCC Transport now satisfied that transport issues can be dealt with at subdivision. Recommendation Given the above, I recommend RTZ1 is rezoned to GR2. The issue of the Kaikorai Valley Road / Barr Street intersection can also be assessed further at the time of subdivision. I do however recommend a structure plan rule is applied to the site to require provision of a secondary access point to Kaikorai Valley Road, given this is considered a key requirement.	- Rezone RTZ1 to GR2 2 zone. - Remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone. - Application of a ‘new development mapped area’. - Amend Assessment Rule 15.11.5 to require that subdivision provides for a communal wastewater detention system. - Amend Assessment Rule 9.6.2 to require that subdivision provides for a communal wastewater detention system. - Add a structure plan mapped area to require a secondary access point to Kaikorai Valley Road.
RTZ2	87 Selwyn Street, North East Valley	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Significant upgrades would be required, ITA required at subdivision.	Mr Anthony Fitchett: - Primary concern is the removal of trees on his property at adjacent 14A Forrester Avenue. - Should development proceed, requests a condition is placed on the subdivision of RTZ2 to only allow removal of trees on 14A Forrester Ave for reasons of safety (as opposed to reasons of shading).	No submitters spoke in support of rezoning RTZ2, and no evidence was provided addressing the issues identified in the s42A report. Recommendation: Retain original recommendation and do not rezone.	Do not retain RTZ2 as notified: - Do not rezone to General Residential 2 - Do not remove the Residential transition Overlay Zone - Do not apply a ‘new development mapped area’ - Do not apply a ‘structure plan mapped area’ - Do not include new Assessment Rule 15.11.5.Z - Do not include new Assessment Rule 9.6.2.Y - Do not include section 15.8.AC (Selwyn Street Structure Plan mapped area performance standards)
RTZ3	13 Wattie Fox Lane	Refer to discussion on RTZ1 above.	Refer to discussion on RTZ1 above.	Rezone RTZ3 to GR1	- Rezone RTZ3 to General Residential 1. - Remove the Residential Transition Overlay Zone.

RS052	Part 235 Signal Hill Road	n/a	No submitters spoke at the hearing	Retain original recommendation	Do not rezone RS052 as requested
RS14	Freeman Cl. & Lambert St., Abbotsford			Recommendation to be provided at a later date.	
RS109	119 Riccarton Road West	DCC Transport: Development would have no noticeable impact on the surrounding transport network. 3 Waters: DCC 3 Waters would not service this site with 3 Waters infrastructure, however a high-level assessment suggests that there are no significant issues for self-servicing of water supply, wastewater or stormwater.	Mr Kurt Bowen on behalf of Mark and Jacqui Taylor: - Now seeking LLR2 zoning with self-servicing for 3W. - Notes other undersized rural sections in area. - Flood risk can be mitigated at the time of development. - Loss of rural amenity minimal at this location. Mr Mark Taylor: - Further general information regarding the property and his history of ownership provided.	Recommendation The section 42A report assesses rezoning to GR1 zoning; however LLR2 is now sought. While I acknowledge the reduced scale of the development, I still consider that rezoning to residential remains inconsistent with the criteria specified Policy 2.6.2.1. The site is still fully disconnected from existing residentially zoned land, and is located relatively distant to centres, and other community facilities. Additionally, I do not consider rezoning these small, isolated, and disconnected sites to large lot residential zoning an efficient use of the land, given they could potentially support GR1 zoning in the future. I note Ms Christmas discusses the use of LLR zoning further in her evidence. Overall, I do not consider residential zoning for RS109 to be appropriate at this time. I therefore maintain my original recommendation that RS109 is not rezoned to residential (including LLR2).	Do not rezone RS109 as requested
RS110	23 Sretlaw Place	DCC Transport: The scheme plan (Appendix 4) still shows a legal road past 25 Sretlaw Place. Therefore, this issue of access remains unresolved. The one-way proposal would not meet the Code of Subdivision standards for adoption. However, there is no apparent need for this arrangement as Lot 14 could be accessed from the existing ROW and with a small reduction in Lot sizes Lots 15 & 16 could be fed by a ROW between Lots 12 & 13. Without the ability to access the site and provide for a legal road, rezoning should not proceed. Landscape: No change from original comments – rezoning would result in some adverse effects on the natural character of this area, particularly for users of the nearby reserve track, and neighbouring residents. Stantec: Rezoning is acceptable from a hazards perspective.	Ms Emma Peters: - Noted current access options via one of two Right of Ways (RoW), one attached to 25 Sretlaw Place and the other to 18 Sretlaw Place. - Notes potential for Council to invoke the Public Works Act to acquire the RoW. - Notes the need for structure plan controls on built form. Mr Cole Bennetts: - Outlined history and vision for the site. Mr Hugh Forsyth: - Presented the proposed landscape mitigations, including design controls Mr Mark Walrond: - No geotechnical issues that would prevent rezoning Mr Scott Cookson: - Notes wastewater servicing would require a pump. - Questioned the cumulative impact of development on the wastewater network. - States stormwater management is feasible. <u>Other submitters who spoke at the hearing:</u> Mr Justin Venables:	Response Points - Frasers Stream Esplanade Reserve is located to the north of 23 Sretlaw Place. Under Rule 10.3.1.X of the 2GP, subdivision activities along the bank of Frasers Creek must provide an esplanade reserve with a minimum width of 20m. A reserve with this width is already in place, and the northern part of 23 Sretlaw Place does not encroach onto this. - DCC Transport remains of the view that there is no ability to provide for a legal road to the site. - The Council is highly unlikely to use the Public Works Act (PAW) to compulsory acquire land to access the site. I note that the compulsory acquisition process is slow, complicated, and expensive, and should only be used as a last report. I have discussed this with a senior colleague, who is unaware of this process being used by Council in the last 20 years. Use of the PWA is only likely to be considered if the land was necessary for a vital local work (e.g. part of a larger area needed for expansion of a wastewater treatment plant, or land needed for a key transport route). - Stormwater: DCC do not consider the stormwater proposal would meet relevant 2GP policies and rules. - Wastewater: 3 Water advise that the ‘tipping point’ in the catchment has already been reached and further development is not appropriate. - RTZ: An RTZ is used to provide for future residential zoning where land has been identified as appropriate for growth and where infrastructure servicing is not planned in the medium term. 3 Waters has advised that the upgrades required for the downstream wastewater network have a	Do not rezone RS110 as requested

		3 Waters: Stormwater: Attenuation volumes are provided, however the calculations are not shown. The stormwater attenuation volumes are lower than would normally be expected. The submission does not detail how stormwater would be managed at the northeast side of the site (the lowest point). No detail is provided on how stormwater quality would be managed. It appears unlikely that stormwater management policy 9.2.1.Z, and 2GP rules would be met by the proposal for stormwater management. Wastewater: The tipping point for wastewater overflows in the Kaikorai wastewater catchment has already been reached through current zoning. Any further development beyond that already provided for through current zoning pushes the wastewater overflows past the tipping point. Initial comments stand and rezoning is not supported.	- Opposes rezoning, would object to any more than 5 lots being developed on site, plus seeks multiple development controls. Mr David Shearer: - Concerned about loss of amenity and access. Could potentially support LLR2 zoning. Mr Myles Thayer: - Concerned about proposed plans and access issues.	long term timeframe to resolve. While an RTZ might be appropriate to manage wastewater issues, this will not address concerns around stormwater management or access to the site. It would be theoretically possible to draft a release rule that includes both infrastructure servicing and provision of suitable access. However, given the uncertainty of access with respect to both feasibility and timing, I do not consider a RTZ appropriate at this time. Recommendation My recommendation is unchanged from that outlined in the s42A report. The site cannot be serviced for wastewater and there appears no opportunity to provide a legal road into the site. There are also concerns about the feasibility of appropriate stormwater management.	
RS151	147 St Leonards Drive	Landscape: Mr McKinlay has provided an initial assessment of the site and has commented that LLR development would detract from the consistently rural characteristics of the surrounding hillslopes, which form part of the SNL. Mr McKinlay considers that rezoning would have an at least moderate effect on the rural character of these hillslopes.	Ms Emma Peters: - Site is within an SNL. - Proposal is for LLR2 on part of the site, along with ecological enhancement. - Structure plan controls are proposed to manage built form, along with biodiversity protection. - Sites would self-service for 3W. - SNL values are not compromised and ecological enhancement would add to the area. Mr Hugh Forsyth: - Contributed towards proposed structure plan controls. - Supports rezoning, area doesn't particularly stand out in landscape. - Notes SNL overlay set by a contour, not site specific.	Recommendation I acknowledge that the ecological enhancements proposed by the submitter are reasonably significant. However, the site is fully contained within the Flagstaff-Mt Cargill SNL. Mr McKinlay advises that residential development would detract from the consistently rural characteristics of the surrounding hillslopes, which form part of the SNL. As outlined in the s42A report, I consider that residential zoning is inconsistent with an SNL overlay. The s42A report also identifies other conflicts with Policy 2.6.2.1. I therefore retain my original recommendation to reject rezoning RS151.	Do not rezone RS151 as requested
RS153 and RS204	Chain Hills Area, Mosgiel			Recommendation to be provided at a later date.	
RS157	90 Blackhead Road and surrounds	DCC Transport: No overriding transport objections to rezoning.	Mr Kurt Bowen: Area suited for higher density development than current RR2. Proposes LLR2 zoning.	Response Points Public transport extension to Tunnel Beach: This is a function of the Otago Regional Council. I have contacted	Do not rezone RS157 as requested

		3 Waters: At LLR2 - DCC 3 Waters would not service LLR2 sites with 3 Waters infrastructure. The high-level assessment suggests that there are no significant issues for self-servicing of water supply, wastewater, or stormwater. At GR1 – significant 3 Waters infrastructure would be required to connect the area to the existing networks. This is not planned or funded.	- Well serviced for transport - Sites would self-service for 3W. - Limited rural productivity. - Would provide more housing choice. Mr Craig Duncan (90 Blackhead Road) and Mr Barry Armour (70 Green Island Bush Road): - Both outlined their history of owning the properties.	their transportation team regarding this query, and they have advised that there are no plans to extend to the Tunnel Beach car park at the moment. - Regarding the Cemetery on Emerson Street, the Panel is correct that that the cemetery currently acts as a break separating the residential zoning to the north/east with the rural residential zoning to the south/west, however this should not hinder any future expansion of residential zoning from the east. - There is a very clear and distinct block of Rural Residential 1 zoning at this locality, and I consider it inconsistent with Policy 2.6.2.1 to rezone single blocks of land that lie within this broad rural residential block. I refer to the evidence of Ms Christmas who discusses the ‘compact city’ objective further. 3 Waters has advised that significant water infrastructure would be required to connect the area to the existing water network. Treated water storage reservoirs may also be required, along with significant upstream network upgrades that are long-term to complete. For wastewater, significant wastewater infrastructure would be required to connect the area to the existing wastewater network. Flows would likely go towards the Green Island Wastewater Treatment Plant, which may require capacity upgrades depending on the area and the number of lots that would be serviced. Some pumping may be required. Further assessment would be necessary to consider the feasibility of GR1 zoning in the future. Recommendation I retain the recommendations in my s42A report, that rezoning pockets of land that are isolated and disconnected from existing residentially zoned land is in direct conflict with Policy 2.6.2.1.d.xi. I also do not consider that rezoning to large lot residential density is the most efficient long-term use of the land, as per my s42A report. I therefore continue to recommend that RS157 is not rezoned.	
RS161	210 Signal Hill Road	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. ITA required at time of subdivision. Landscape: Mr McKinlay agrees that a reduction in sites to 3 will have lower effects on landscape and visual amenity values. If proposed design controls implemented, adverse effects on the SNL would be reduced to moderate/low levels. He would also recommend a condition requiring the retention of existing	Mr Kurt Bowen: - Updated proposal is 3 new building platforms. Proposes LLR2 plus a structure plan restricting number of lots to 3 total. - Outlines proposed landscape mitigation measures. - Outlines biodiversity protection being proposed. - Sites would self-service for 3W. - Footpath connection possible, but best determined at time of subdivision.	Recommendation The submitter is proposing to rezone to LLR2 with a structure plan limiting the total number of lots to three. The rezoning area is ~6.3 ha, so limiting the number of total sites to three is significantly below the maximum residential capacity of the site at LLR2 density and is similar to Rural Residential 1 density (minimum site size of 2 ha). As per my discussion for RS176 below, I do not consider this type of zoning appropriate for this variation, and consider it would be more appropriately considered under a future Rural Residential plan change. Furthermore, RS161 is fully contained within the Flagstaff-Mt Cargill Significant Natural Landscape (SNL) Overlay Zone. While I acknowledge the limited development proposed and the biodiversity enhancements that would accompany this, it is my view	Do not rezone RS161 as requested

		boundary planting surrounding Site 2 in perpetuity.		that enabling further residential zoning in areas of SNL is inconsistent with Policy 2.6.2.1.d.iv, and making an exception for RS161 would set a precedent. My recommendation is therefore to retain my original recommendation, and not rezone RS161.	
RS165	750 Highcliff Road	n/a	Ms Sally Stewart: • Now seeks LLR2 zoning. • Not highly productive farmland. • Sites would self-service for 3W. • Notes a number of existing residential dwellings in the area.	Recommendation In my s42A report, I conclude that rezoning to RS165 to residential has multiple key conflicts with Policy 2.6.2.1. Critically, this includes that the entire site is covered by an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) overlay. The conflicts I identify in my s42A discussion largely also apply to the proposed LLR2 zoning as is now currently being sought by the submitter. I also note that Ms Christmas discusses the use of LLR zoning in her evidence. I consider that any form of residential zoning at this location is inappropriate, and I retain my original recommendation to maintain rejection of RS165.	Do not rezone RS165 as requested
RS167	50 - 60 Brinsdon Road	n/a	No submitters spoke at hearing.	Retain original recommendation	Do not rezone RS10967 as requested
RS168	300 - 304 Leith Valley Road	n/a	No submitters spoke at hearing.	Retain original recommendation	Do not rezone RS168 as requested
RS170	103, 105, 107 Hall Road, Sawyers Bay			Recommendation to be provided at a later date	
RS171	3 Brick Hill Road & 18 Noyna Road, Sawyers Bay			Recommendation to be provided at a later date	
RS175 and RS154	85 Formby Street, and 91 and 103 Formby Street, Outram	DCC Transport: No overriding issues in relation to local or network transport issues. However, having regard to the lack of sustainability of the site, DCC Transport are not supportive of either of these proposed sites. Landscape: Considers that rural amenity values as perceived from locations surrounding the site will be adversely impacted by the loss of open space and rural character on the site. The extent of these effects will be moderate and limited to the immediately surrounding area. 3 Waters: 3 Waters do not support rezoning of the site due to water supply issues and stormwater concerns.	Ms Emma Peters: • Discusses flaws in housing capacity assessment, implication of demolition of pre-1940's rule. • Notes a number of real estate agents submitted in support of the proposed rezoning. • Recommends a structure plan, including rules requiring a landscape plan be prepared at time of subdivision. • Notes that the NDMA overlay would require a stormwater management plan at the time of subdivision and therefore an assessment of the ox bow lake's capacity would be undertaken at that time. • Considers rezoning is consistent with Policy 2.6.2.1 • Notes the Stantec low – medium hazards assessment. Mr Mike Moore: • Overall assessment of rezoning is adverse, but low effects on landscape values. Mr Derek McLachlan: • Provided legal submission. • Discussed concept of resilient townships. • Notes that Objectives 15.2.1 – 15.2.4 in the 2GP would be achieved through rezoning this site.	Response Points • Capacity in Outram: Mr Nathan Stocker has provided additional information regarding demand and capacity specifically in relation to Outram. Mr Stocker acknowledges that, based on the evidence provided by submitters, there may be demand for additional homes in specific townships and settlements that is not currently being met by available development capacity coming to market. However, there is no requirement under the NPS-UD for the sufficiency of development capacity to be assessed at a township or settlement scale, with NPS-UD guidance suggesting that a catchment approach is more appropriate. • Pre-1940's building demolition rule: I note that this rule does not apply within Outram, which is subject to a 'no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area'. Therefore, the rule will have no effect on housing capacity in this area. Please also refer to the evidence of Mr Stocker. • Further information relating to the carbon emissions analysis is addressed by Mr Nathan Stocker in his evidence. • DCC Transport has reviewed Mr Carr's transportation evidence. They agree with Mr Carr's comment that the work done to date would cover the majority of the issues that would need to be addressed as part of an ITA at the	Do not rezone RS175 and RS154 as requested

			- Notes NPS-HPL and comments that this is still draft, and submits not too much weighting should be placed on it. Mr Andy Carr: - Notes ITA still required at time of subdivision, but most work completed in this respect. Mr Craig Bates: - Noted strong demand for real-estate in the area. Mr Tim O’Sullivan: - Discussed overall vision for the site. Mr Peter Doherty: - Discussed positive attributes of Outram, and vision for the site. Mr Philip Osborne: - Criticised aspects of the DCC housing business assessment capacity. Mr Craig Horne: - Discussed recent housing developments in Outram. - Two structure plan options. One with standard 1,000m² lot sizes that would each self-service for wastewater. The second with higher density and a communal wastewater system. This system could either disperse treated wastewater off-site, or pump it to Allanton and into the main system from there. - Discusses stormwater management calculations to indicate this is possible. <u>Other submitters that attending the hearing in opposition:</u> Mr Trevor Braid: - Concerns regarding stormwater and flooding. - Stormwater and wastewater systems need upgrading before any future development takes place in Outram. Ms Margaret Henry: - Multiple concerns relating to development on highly productive land, and a flood hazard area. - Concerned that climate change will increase flood hazard risk. - Concerned about lack of wastewater reticulation and lack of detail about how stormwater attenuation would work. Mr Christopher Girling: - Concerned about loss of high class soils, sufficient residential capacity in Outram, multiple concerns relating to climate change, lack of infrastructure in	time of subdivision. DCC Transport are also in agreement that the traffic flow increase would not have any noticeable effect on the wider transport network. However, DCC Transport remain of the view, as originally set out, that having regard to the lack of sustainability of the site, that DCC Transport are not supportive of either of these proposed sites for rezoning. - The Panel asked a number of questions relating to 3 Waters for this site. For complete answers, I refer the Panel to the 3 Waters memo. Broadly however, the key information provided is: - The water source for Outram is a bore. - There is currently no defined point or population at which a reticulated wastewater network for Outram would be implemented and costs for doing so aren’t known at present. - Regarding the potential to pump wastewater to Allanton, such a pipe should be able to convey all of Outram community’s wastewater, not just the rezoning site. It is not currently known if there is sufficient capacity, and more investigation is required. - Stormwater: 3 Waters do not believe that the stormwater management proposed in the evidence will meet the stormwater management policy 9.2.1.Z and rules that are now operative through Variation 2 of the 2GP. The evidence does not change 3 Waters’ view that stormwater servicing for the proposed site is unfeasible due to the large area of land required and the associated cost for stormwater infrastructure. - Subdivision-based communal wastewater systems are generally not supported by 3 Waters. - The National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) is due for imminent release. If the NPS-HPL is released prior to the decision on the greenfield rezoning being released, then the Panel will need to give effect to this in its decision making. It may be the case that further information will be required. - I note that consent from ORC may be required for on-site wastewater disposal. The ORC are currently reviewing their water plan to ensure it gives effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM), including the concept of Te Mana o te Wai. - Public transport: This is managed by the Otago Regional Council. I have contacted their transportation team in relation to servicing Outram. They have advised that there haven’t been any recent discussions to extend services to there. However, there has been work with the DCC on the park’n’ride opportunity for Mosgiel and are soon to be introducing express services from Mosgiel to Dunedin City, which would also service the park’n’ride. It is hoped that this scheme would draw commuters from surrounding areas such Outram, Allanton etc.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			Outram, and significant concerns relating to the flood risk in Outram. Ms Susan Broad: Outlined concerns relating to water supply, impact to services in Outram, that there is already sufficient capacity in Outram. Notes proposal would represent a significant increase to the population of Outram. Notes that Outram is an expensive place to live (fuel, travel, septic tanks etc). Extensive concerns about building in a flood zone, stormwater, septic tanks, heavy traffic use on Formby St, footpath provision, and loss of high class soils and local food production potential.	In response to Mr McLachlan's comment about rezoning achieving objectives 15.2.1 – 15.2.4, I note that these objectives are not relevant to a decision on rezoning, but instead set up the policies and rules for residential zones. The criteria to be assessed when evaluation land for residential rezoning are outlined in Policy 2.6.2.1. Recommendation I maintain my recommendation to not rezone RS175 and RS154. I highlight in particular concerns in relation to: stormwater management, the Flood 2 Hazard overlay and previous flooding issues with Outram, the lack of evidence of need for additional residential capacity to maintain a resilient township, and the distance from the larger centres of Mosgiel and Dunedin resulting in increased carbon emissions as outlined further in the s42A report. I note that Ms Christmas has discussed the compact city and resilient townships objective in relation to this site.	
RS176	234/290 Malvern Street, Leith Valley	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. No overarching transport concerns. Landscape: Mr McKinlay generally agrees with the findings of the submitter's landscape and visual assessment (effects adverse/very low in the short term and positive in the long term). Notes that the proposed design controls would play an important role in ensuring visual integration. Stantec: Rezoning is acceptable from a hazards perspective.	Mr Kurt Bowen: - Notes proposal is only seeking two additional dwellings in total. Submitter is seeking LLR2 zoning plus a structure plan limiting the total number of sites to 3. - New sites would self-service for 3W. - Recommends various landscape mitigations and biodiversity protection requirements be included in a structure plan. - Considers that site is probably well suited to RR1 zoning, but it is uncertain about when a rural residential variation/plan change will occur - Notes that rezoning would act to enable further protection for significant amounts of native bush. Peter and Marja van Loon: - Outlined their history of site ownership.	Response Points - The purpose of Variation 2 is outlined in Ms Christmas' evidence. Rezoning to a Large Lot Residential (1 and 2) zoning is within scope of Variation 2. - Structure plan rules: These are part of the 2GP and apply until they are removed or changed as a result of a formal plan change. In general, rules that contravene a structure plan mapped area performance standard are non-complying activities. To gain consent for a non-complying activity, the applicant must establish that the adverse effects of the activity on the environment will be no more than minor or that the activity will not be contrary to the objectives of the relevant plan. The consent authority has full discretion as to whether or not to grant consent, and what conditions to impose. The DCC has used structure plan rules for a range of other sites across the city and this is an accepted method of ensuring appropriate rules and management apply to specific sites. Recommendation Rezoning to LLR2 with three lots as proposed, would result in lots of 7.35 ha, 4.51 ha, and 3.97 ha in size. This is more consistent with Rural Residential 1 zoning (minimum site size of 2 ha) than LLR2. Mr Bowen states that "the bottom line is that this proposed rezoning seeks a residential zone format, and that it will produce additional housing capacity. On this basis, while we accept that the appearance of the rezoning might be more akin the type of properties that are found in the Rural Residential Zones, the proposed rezoning is entirely compatible with the purpose of Variation 2." I reiterate my view that this type of zoning is not appropriate for this variation and is more appropriately considered under a Rural Residential plan change.	Do not rezone RS176 as requested

				I consider that such an outcome is unfair to other landowners who may also have wanted a rural residential density development / zoning but did not submit as this was not within the scope of Variation 2. Therefore, my recommendation remains unchanged.	
RS193	177 Tomahawk Road			Recommendation to be provided at a later date	
RS195	Part 774 Allanton - Waihola Rd, Allanton	Landscape: Whilst the visual change in character would be pronounced, the perception of this change would be largely restricted to the immediate surrounding area, including the approaches to the site on SH1. It is noted that the proposal is reliant on mitigation planting. In general, Mr McKinlay considers the proposed rezoning would adversely affect existing rural character values to at least a moderate extent. DCC Transport: The site is in an unsustainable location. No detailed proposals provided regarding rail access. Likely that a roundabout access to SH1 would be required rather than slip lanes. Discussion with Waka Kotahi is required. DCC Transport are not in a position to support this proposal. 3 Waters: 3 Waters comments that it is a risky site from 3 Waters perspective, for all 3 waters. Wastewater servicing may be expensive and technically challenging. If disposal occurs on-site, soils on the site are poorly drained and a large area may be required. If wastewater uses the existing reticulated system, it is possible that the rising main to the Mosgiel WWTP would not have capacity for the additional volumes. Stormwater management may be expensive, and 3 Waters note that there is no stormwater network in the area, and the site is adjacent to the Taieri River and parts of the	Ms Emma Peters: - Notes no development proposed in the Hazard 1A overlay and favourable geotechnical assessment for rest of development. - Outlines issues with the DCC's housing capacity analysis. - Notes commute to Mosgiel is flat, good option for electric vehicles. - Notes evidence provided about the land's limited productive uses. - Proposing to self-service for potable water, consistent with the rest of Allanton. For wastewater, LLR zones can self-service, T&S zones would need to have reticulated wastewater system (which would either discharge to a wetland within RS195, or be pumped via the existing wastewater system in Allanton). - Discusses access options (primary access off Centre Road) Mr Hugh Forsyth: - Outlined site layout and visibility from SH1. Mr Paul Rogers (owner): - Discussed potential rail connectivity. - Notes the existing facilities available in Allanton. Mr Paul Thomson: - Discussed real estate demand in the general area. Mr Mark Walrond: - Geotechnically, no significant problems. Addresses flood hazard in evidence and, while noting further work will be needed, considers the property suitable for residential development.	Response Points - The hazard overlays on the 2GP map were introduced in the notified plan in 2015. The mapping is based on reports prepared by the Otago Regional Council – Flood hazard on the Taieri Plain and Strath Taieri (ORC June 2014 and Revision 1 August 2015). Evidence was presented at the 2GP hearings that resulted in some relatively minor changes in extent and introduced the Hazard 1A Zone. Mr Payan has provided further background. - Further information relating to the carbon emissions analysis is addressed by Mr Nathan Stocker in his evidence. - A discussion on Variation 2 consistency with the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (pRPS) is outlined in section 2.1.2 of the s42A report. Objective UFD-02 Development of Urban Areas, and Policy UFD-P4 Urban Expansion are relevant. I consider that the 2GP objectives and policies relating to compact city are well aligned with the pRPS. 3 Waters: Allanton is self-serviced for water supply. For wastewater, Allanton is serviced by a pressure sewer scheme, depends on a pumping unit installed at each property to pump household sewage into the wastewater network. The wastewater is pumped into the pressure sewer network to the Mosgiel Wastewater Treatment Plant. There is some capacity in this scheme for additional flows. - There is no 3 Waters stormwater network in Allanton. Stormwater flows through open channel drains alongside roads and through culverts under roads, generally in a northwest direction, under the railway line to the Taieri River. - In terms of the submitter's comment that Allanton could become a 'centre' should rezoning proceed, I note that centre zoning is to provide hubs for social and economic activity for communities. Allanton itself would not become a 'centre', but could potentially have an area of 'Rural Centre Zone' to provide for various commercial activities to occur. I note that centre zoning is not within scope of the submission to rezone this site. - The concept of resilient townships is discussed in Ms Christmas' evidence. - SH1: I confirm that SH1 adjacent to RS195, and to the north and south is a 'limited-access' road. Recommendation	Do not rezone RS195 as requested

		site are in a Hazard 1 overlay zone. Further investigation is necessary. Stantec: In general, the Geosolve report adequately addresses the hazards at the site, and the site is generally suitable for rezoning from a hazards perspective.		I maintain my recommendation to not rezone the site, for several reasons. The site is distant from public transport, centres and facilities and there is a lack of evidence in relation to what is required to achieve a resilient township. There are potential issues in relation to wastewater servicing, concerns about the ability to manage stormwater, and the site is partly located on a Flood 1A Hazard overlay. While houses are not proposed for these areas, this may affect accessibility during times of flooding. The need for additional development capacity Allanton should most appropriately be considered through the Future Development Strategy process, which is currently underway. If so, the most appropriate location and overall design (particularly in relation to access to SH1), should be assessed. Consultation with Waka Kotahi at an early stage is critical. Overall, I do not recommend rezoning RS195 to residential.	
RS200	489 East Taieri-Allanton Road, Allanton	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. Concerns about the unsustainable location from a transportation perspective. Landscape: On balance, effects on existing rural character values will be moderate, but will be largely restricted to the immediate surrounding area, predominantly viewed by approaching motorists on SH1.	Ms Emma Peters: - Discusses proposed access via a slipway on SH1. Secondary access via Ralston St. - Proposal is for a combination of LLR and T&S zoning, with ecological enhancement areas. - Recommends a structure plan to require a noise assessment at time of subdivision, and a planting plan. - Discusses 3W servicing; self-servicing for water and use of one of the planting areas for stormwater attenuation. - An ITA would be required at time of subdivision. - Discussion on Policy 2.6.2.1 and how the s42A applied this with a Dunedin-centric view.	Response Points See comments on Site RS195 above in relation to the need for growth in Allanton, and the most appropriate mechanism of achieving this (if required). Recommendation I maintain my recommendation to not rezone the site. See comments in relation to RS195 which also apply here.	Do not rezone RS200 as requested
RS205	Part 761 Aramoana Road	DCC Transport: No change to previously advised position. No overarching transport concerns. Stantec: Rezoning can be supported for a hazards perspective, acknowledging a rockfall assessment would be required at time of subdivision.	Ms Claire Carey: - Opposes rezoning due to the site's proximity to the Aramoana coastal flats ecological area. Mr Allan Cubitt: - Outlined history of the property. - Unjustified that site is treated differently to adjacent land. - No development proposed for Lot 4. - Accepts other recommendations in the s42A report. Ms Denise Grey: - Outlined family history of the property. Ms Tracy Fleet: - Opposes development on Lot 4, which runs along the back of other properties. However, is supportive of rezoning Lot 1, Lot 2, and Lot 3 as is being proposed.	Response Points - The Panel questioned how a decision on the zoning of RS205 differs from a consent hearing, only 3 extra lots would be permitted. The development proposed is extremely small in scale; however, would be a non-complying activity under the current rural zoning. The rezoning proposal seeks a broader decision about the appropriateness of residential activity in this area. The details of development and site-specific mitigation (if required) would be considered at the time of subdivision consent. - History of zoning: Residential zoning proposals in the notified 2GP were based on either existing residential zones or groups of residential-sized sites with established residential activity on them. Large sites, or sites without established residential activity on them (including this site), were typically not rezoned to a residential zoning at that time. Recommendation From a planning perspective, I maintain that rezoning is not well aligned with Policy 2.6.2.1, due to the coastal hazard risk, sea level	No recommendation is provided on rezoning RS205. If the Panel decides to rezone, I recommend: - Rezone RS205 to Township and Settlement. - Apply a 'no DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area'. If considered within scope, amend the Careys Bay to Te Ngāru Significant Natural Landscape Overlay to exclude the area covered by RS205, or amend rules 10.3.5.X and 10.3.5.Y to exclude this area, as shown in my s42A report.

				rise, distance from services and public transport, and issues with the compact and accessible city objective. On the other hand, the rezoning area is small, and it is surrounded by existing residential zoning on a similar scale. The expert evidence is generally supportive. From a natural justice perspective, I am sympathetic to the submitter's proposal. I also note that many (although not all) of the further submitters are supportive of the rezoning of Lots 1, Lots 2, and Lots 3. There is no proposed rezoning of Lot 4. I make no recommendation. If the Panel chooses to rezone the site, the amendments outlined in the next column would be required: Given the site's extremely small size and limited development potential, I consider that an NDMA is not required.	
RS206, RS206a, RS77	35 Watts Road, 37 Watts Road, 43 Watts Road, Part 309 North Road			Recommendation to be provided at a later date.	
RS212	170 Riccarton Road West	DCC Transport: An additional 140 dwellings (GR1 zoning) is a significant amount of new development. Both the localised and potentially wider transport impacts would need to be considered as part of an ITA (which could be provided at the subdivision stage). Otherwise, no overriding transport issues to rezoning this specific area of land, but there may be more significant issues rezoning this site set a precedent for further areas. 3 Waters: At LLR1 - DCC 3 Waters would not service this site with 3 Waters infrastructure. A high-level assessment suggests that there are no significant issues for self-servicing of water supply, wastewater, or stormwater. At LDR or GR1 – There are wastewater and water network constraints, as follows: Potable water: The Mosgiel water supply is currently constrained during dry hot summer periods and this would be exacerbated by	Ms Emma Peters: - Notes a number of small and fragmented sites between RS212 and existing GR1 zone. - Proposal is for either LLR1, LDR, or GR1 zoning. Yield would be: - LLR1: 31 dwellings - LDR: 71 dwellings - GR1: 100 – 140 dwellings - Suggests use of a structure plan if rezoning to a lower density to enable identification of building platforms, so as not to preclude future intensification - Applying an RTZ is an option with a release criterion of a connection of residentially zoned land between RS212 and Mosgiel. Mr Scott Cookson: - All the proposed structure plans show indicative areas for stormwater management. - Does not anticipate any downstream effects from development. Mr Roger Southby: - Rezoning would provide additional capacity, and the site is not currently viable as an economic unit. Mr Russell Lundy: - Spoke regarding residential demand in Mosgiel. Notes that site is flat, and this would likely be an attractive site for development Mr Tim Heath:	Response Points RTZ: The RTZ method is used to hold areas for residential use while infrastructure issues are addressed. Using it to identify a site until neighbouring land is rezoned is not consistent with this approach, and would not be necessary, as this parcel could be rezoned at the same time, if it was assessed as being appropriate. Consideration of the wider area at one time (possibly through the FDS process) to determine the need for additional residential land (if any) and the best location for it, is a more appropriate approach to future growth of Mosgiel. Recommendation I maintain my original recommendation to not rezone RS212. The site is disconnected from existing residentially zoned land and rezoning isolated and disconnected pockets of land conflicts with Policy 2.6.2.1.d.xi. If servicing is expected (e.g. at GR1 or LDR density), this will result in the need to extend servicing infrastructure and conflict with Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ix. I also note the initial 3 Waters comments for this site, which identify significant 3 Waters servicing issues at LDR or GR1 density, particularly in relation to wastewater and water supply. Finally, I do not consider rezoning these small, isolated, and disconnected sites to large lot residential zoning an efficient use of the land, given they could potentially support GR1 zoning in the future. Overall, I do not recommend rezoning RS212 at this time.	Do not rezone RS212 as requested

		further development. Significant upstream network upgrades required and will be medium term timeframe to resolve. Wastewater: Significant downstream upgrades are required as the network and treatment plants have issues in wet weather events. Medium to long term to resolve.	There will be a loss of high class soils, but loss is likely to be picked up by other highly productive land sites across Dunedin.		
--	--	--	--	--	--