Dunedin City District Plan PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN CHANGE 14 Residential 6 Zone (Holyhead Street, Outram)

Summary of Decisions Requested



The first stage of the process for Proposed Plan Change 14 provided an opportunity for anyone to make a submission, subject to clauses 6(2) to 6(4) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act'). The period for making submissions closed on Friday 14 September, 2012. A summary of decisions requested by persons making submissions is contained in this document.

This is the second stage of the process for Proposed Plan Change 14. Under clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Act, this stage provides an opportunity for the following parties to make a further submission either supporting or opposing a submission or submissions already made:

- any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;
- any person who has an interest in the proposed plan change that is greater than that of the general public; and
- the Dunedin City Council itself.

This second stage does not provide another opportunity to make new submissions on the Plan Change itself, as a further submission can only relate to a submission that has already been made.

Please refer to the original submissions for full details. Copies of the original submissions are available for public inspection at:

- Planning Enquiries, Customer Services Centre, Ground Floor, Civic Centre, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin
- Public Libraries at Dunedin and Mosgiel

Further submissions should be made in writing and sent to the Dunedin City Council using one of the following options:

Post to: City Development Manager, Dunedin City Council, PO Box 5045, Moray Place,

Dunedin 9058

Deliver to: Planning Enquiries, Customer Services Centre, Ground Floor, Civic Centre, 50 The

Octagon, Dunedin

Fax to: 474 3451 (if you fax your submission, please post or deliver a copy to one of the

above addresses)

E-mail to: planning@dcc.govt.nz

Submit online at: www.dunedin.govt.nz/district-plan-changes

The further submission must be in Form 6 of the Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003 or similar, and must state whether or not you wish to be heard on your submission. Copies of this form are available from Planning Enquiries and at the public libraries listed above, can be downloaded from www.dunedin.govt.nz or can be mailed by request if you phone 477 4000, or email planning@dcc.govt.nz.

The further submission period closes on Wednesday, 24th October 2012.

The process for public participation in the consideration of the proposed plan change under the Act is as follows:

- if a submitter asks to be heard in support of their submission, a hearing must be held;
- the Council will give its decision on the proposed plan change (including its reasons for accepting or rejecting submissions); and
- anyone who has made a submission has the right to appeal the decision on the proposed plan change to the Environment Court.

Please note that if you make a further submission, you must provide a copy of it to the original submitter(s) that you have opposed or supported within five working days of making the submission. The contact details of original submitters are provided in the table overleaf. For further information please telephone Paul Freeland on 477 4000, or email paul.freeland@dcc.govt.nz.

List of Submitters

Submission Number	Name	Address 1	Address 2	Address 3	City
PC-14-1	Craig Werner	30 Howard Street, Macandrew Bay			Dunedin 9014
PC-14-2	New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Queens Building 109 Princes Street	PO Box 5467		Dunedin 9058
PC-14-3	Jennifer Allen	16 Mountfort Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-4	Lyndon Gold	2 Mountfort Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-5	Allan and Esther Hill	65 Holyhead Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-6	Wendy Ockwell	2a Bidson Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-7	Carol Bryan	58 Holyhead Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-8	Brian Miller	77 Riccarton Road, West RD 2			Mosgiel 9092
PC-14-9	Tim and Donna-Marie Gibson	56 Holyhead Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-10	Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	No 1 RD 1			Outram 9073
PC-14-11	New Zealand Transport Agency	PO Box 5245			Dunedin 9058
PC-14-12	Otago Regional Council	Private Bag 1954			Dunedin 9058
PC-14-13	Gregory and Rebecca McSkimming	2 Bidston Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-14	Rebecca and Peter Brookland	5 Mountfort Street			Outram 9019
PC-14-15	Kenneth Cookson	54 Holyhead Street			Outram 9019

Guide to the Summary of Submissions

Submissions on Plan Change 14 have been summarised and arranged to facilitate further submissions. The submissions have been arranged by topics associated with the plan change to which they relate, so that submissions relating to each topic can be easily found. Individual submissions have been provided with reference numbers such as PC-14-2 (or Plan Change 14/Submitter 2). Where a submission relates to a number of different topics a further reference has been added, for example PC-14-2/a, PC-14-2/b etc.

How the summary is organisedThe summary has been organised as follows:

Topic to which the submission relates	<u>Summary</u>
	<u>begins on Page:</u>
Whole of plan change	5
Consultation	5
Urban Planning Principles	6
Character of the town – including:	4
Heritage	6
Demand	7
Infrastructure	7
Traffic Issues	9
Suitability of the Land – including:	
High Class Soils	11
 Natural Hazards 	
Spatial Plan	12
Reverse Sensitivity	12
Design Controls	13

Submitter Name	No	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Craig Werner	PC14- 1/a	Whole of plan change	Opposes the proposed plan change.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Lyndon Gold	PC14- 4/a	Whole of plan change	Supports the proposed plan change.	That the Council approve the plan change.	No
Allan and Esther Hill	PC14- 5/a	Whole of plan change	Opposes the proposed plan change.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Wendy Ockwell	PC14- 6/a	Whole of Plan change	Opposes the proposed plan change.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Brian Miller	PC14- 8/a	Whole of plan change	Opposes the proposed plan change.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
NZTA	PC14- 11/a	Whole of plan change	Neutral on the proposed plan change.	That the Council approve the plan change subject to the changes requested	Yes
ORC	PC14- 12/a	Whole of plan change	Opposes the proposed plan change.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Gregory and Rebecca McSkimming	PC14- 13/a	Whole of plan change	Oppose the proposed plan change	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/a	Whole of plan change	Oppose the proposed plan change	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Kenneth Cookson	PC14- 15/a	Whole of Plan Change	Supports the proposed plan change	That the Council approve the plan change.	No
Tim and Donna- Marie Gibson	PC14- 9/b	Consultation	Felt they should have been considered as an affected party and only found out about the subdivision by chance		No
Carol Bryan	PC14- 7/b	Consultation	Lives next door and feels they should have been consulted as an affected party.		Yes
Craig Werner	PC14- 1/c	Urban Design Principles	Contends that the expansion of Outram is contrary to urban planning principles of de-intensification and containment of Council costs within urban limits.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 5 of 13

NZHPT	PC14- 2/c	Urban Design Principles	The concept plan should be adopted as a structure plan in order to provide certainty.	Approve the plan change subject to inclusion of a structure plan which includes appropriate activity status triggers for resource consent applications.	May wish to appear
NZTA	PC14- 11/c	Urban Design Principles	The concept plan should be adopted as a structure plan in order to provide certainty.	Approve the plan change subject to inclusion of a structure plan and possible Residential 6 zoning with activity status and rules included.	Yes
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/c	Urban Design Principles	Design and maintenance issues around the proposed detention pond need to be properly developed including adequate public safety measures.	Decline the plan change, but if granted use an integrated design with riverbank use, cycling and walkways to ensure public safety.	Yes
Jennifer Allen	PC14- 3/d	Character of the town	Comments on the need to extend the lower speed limits further out from the town to the Berry farm on the basis of the increasing popularity of the town.	Approve the plan change subject to amended speed limits on the outskirts of Outram	No
Tim and Donna- Marie Gibson	PC14- 9/d	Character of the town	In the event that the plan change is adopted is seeking the maximum setbacks possible to prevent impacts on the existing town.	Decline the plan change, but if approved include generous boundary building setbacks in the event that the plan change is adopted.	No
Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC14- 10/d	Character of the town	Have concerns over the development of a historic market gardening area. They preferred to see a flourishing market garden and shop. Additionally they feel the isolation of the Balmoral homestead will further dilute its historic significance.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No indication
Rebecca and Gregory McSkimming	PC14- 13/d	Character of the town	Oppose the proposed plan change as it will change the town, especially at its entrance.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/d	Character of town	Disagree with the applicants claim that the plan change area is an isolated pocket of land. Rather they feel that the land enhances the rural character of the town and that it contributes to the connection with the Glen and the Taieri River.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
NZHPT	PC14- 2/d	Character of the town - heritage	Balmoral dwelling is registered with the NZHPT as well as being listed in Schedule 25.1 The NZHPT is seeking: • Protection of the curtilage of the dwelling – including outbuildings • One of the outbuildings (Cowman's Cottage) has a long association with the site.	Approve the plan change so as to protect the dwelling and associated outbuildings in an adequate setting being in one allotment.	May wish to appear

Dunedin City District Plan Page 6 of 13

			T		
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/d	Character of the town - heritage	Feel that the size of the site on which Balmoral is to be located in is not of sufficient size to do it justice.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Lyndon Gold	PC14- 4/e	Demand	Supports the plan change as it will allow Outram to continue to grow.	That the Council approve the plan change.	No
Craig Werner	PC14- 1/e	Demand	Feels that the proposal allows the developer to stimulate demand rather than demand being led by proper Council planning processed.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/e	Demand	Maintain that there is currently an adequate supply of vacant sites in Outram, Allanton, and Mosgiel to meet current demand.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Jennifer Allen	PC14- 3/f	Infrastructure	Is concerned about the impact of sewage disposal on the river.	None sought	No
Wendy Ockwell	PC14- 6/f	Infrastructure	Is concerned about the capacity of stormwater services to cope as flooding starts now after 3 hours of rain. Includes dated photographs with submission to illustrate point.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
			The area of the proposed detention pond does not free drain.		
			Further contends that there is a potential health and safety risk associated with sand flies, and the potential danger to children of a new pond.		
Allan and Esther Hill	PC14- 5/f	Infrastructure	Is concerned about the ability of the town's infrastructure to cope with the additional development as there are two other current subdivisions in Outram.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 7 of 13

Tim and Donna- Marie Gibson	PC14- 9/f	Infrastructure	Have concerns over the ability of the existing water supply to cope with increasing demand. Included as part of the submission is a memo from Environmental Consulting Engineer prepared for PC-16 which modelled the town's water supply and outlines various scenarios, including upgrading the falling main from the reservoir and associated 240m of pipes in Holyhead Street between Hoylake and Bidston Streets. They conclude that (for PC 16) the additional 36 lots will have little effect on pressures during high demand once the section of pipes in Holyhead Street is replaced (if their assumptions on the roughness of that section of pipe are correct). The installation of a second falling main (or replacement of the existing main with a larger capacity pipe) would significantly reduce pressure fluctuations. They further conclude: That no matter what else is done, the raw water pumps and treatment plant will probably need to be upgraded to increase the daily capacity in order to meet any increased demand, though this will depend on the DCC minimum requirements for fire fighting and emergency storage.	Either decline the proposal, or commit to upgrading the infrastructure of the town	No
Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC14- 10/f	Infrastructure	Feel that the detention pond could become a nuisance (mosquitos/sand-flies) and that the drain under the state highway appears inadequate. Also have concern over the capacity of septic tanks in the subdivision to cope and that this may further add to the load the ground is expected to carry, especially during floods.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No indication

Dunedin City District Plan Page 8 of 13

Otago Regional Council	PC14- 12/f	Infrastructure	Have concerns over excavations resulting in the loss of fine sediment layers which have a confining effect on coarser more easily transportable sediments. Such structures could lead to flow paths for piping during floods and result in tanks popping out of the ground. Any undergrounding of services in general has an associated piping risk; and could also have an impact on building foundations. Raises concern over the ability of the existing infrastructure to cope with stormwater event, although generally supportive of the applicant's analysis. Feels the proposal will result in a decrease in the quality of stormwater management. If plan change proceeds ORC consents may be required under the Regional Plan: Water and	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
			approval may be required for any alterations to an excavation sensitive area, and for structures in proximity to flood defences.		
Rebecca and Gregory McSkimming	PC14- 13/f	Infrastructure	Raise concerns in relation to the current ability of the town's stormwater system to cope during heavy rain and flood events, and the additional strain the subdivision will place on that system. They are on a neighbouring property and have concerns over contamination and point to the new systems in Allanton as being required to address issues and accommodate this proposal.	Decline because of the current lack of infrastructure	No
Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/f	Infrastructure	Concerned that the water supply figures underestimate the impact of the proposal. Is concerned about the future impact of the proposal on water supply.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Jennifer Allen	PC14- 3/g	Traffic Issues	Feels there is a pressing need to reduce the speed limits in the vicinity of the proposal. Raises specific concerns about the location, and letters written to the authorities.	Reduce the speed limit to 70k to the opposite side of the Berry Farm.	No
Carol Bryan	PC14- 7/g	Traffic Issues	Raises concerns over compliance with conditions of consent (including vehicle crossings) which have not been followed through in previous subdivision in the adjacent area.		Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 9 of 13

Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC14- 10/g	Traffic Issues	The entrance to the subdivision on SH87 is in a 100kph zone, vehicle pulling out from the subdivision will be travelling slowly and will therefore create a traffic nuisance.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No Indication
NZTA	PC14- 11/g	Traffic Issues	NZTA advise that they are submitting in their statutory role with the objective being: to carry out its functions in a way that contributes to an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. Raises the issue of ribbon development, but is not concerned as the river is the pattern boundary to	Approve subject to the inclusion of site line provisions to address any issue with visibility at the State Highway access.	Yes
			concerned as the river is the natural boundary to urban spread. Raise the issue of the entire subdivision being accessed off Holyhead Street, but acknowledge that the state highway is the logical place to create the entrance.		
			Raise concern over the sight distances back towards Outram as being inadequate. NZTA indicate that a change in speed limits is unlikely, but that safety improvements can be achieved by design and vegetation trimming.		
Rebecca and Gregory McSkimming	PC14- 13/g	Traffic Issues	Are concerned about the additional traffic volumes accessing the main road and Holyhead Street.	Decline the plan change, but if approved ensure that traffic issues are addressed.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 10 of 13

Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/g	Traffic Issues	Are concerned that sight distances for the main road entrance have been over estimated and that	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
			clear sight distance are considerably less. Challenge speed assumptions made in the application in relation to traffic behaviour and that traffic does not drop to 85k in this location. The entrance is in a 100k area that is known for frosts in the winter months. The 282m sight distances in each direction are not obtainable.		
			Mountfort Street is currently inadequate in its current state to handle construction traffic and additional volumes arising from the proposal. Questions the maintenance that is required and contends that the road needs widening and resurfacing.		
			Refutes the assertion in the application that the carriageway is 20m wide and contends that it is 5.5m wide, has no kerb and channelling, no footpaths and inadequate drainage.		
			Increased traffic volumes will result in amenity impacts for the south side of Mountfort Street and confusion on the state highway.		
			Contends for the reasons outlined that the proposed cycleway/walkway will not work.		
Allan and Esther Hill	PC14- 5/h	Suitability of Land	Opposes the use of this land as it is not suitable for residential development mainly due to water run-off and feels that the proposed retention pond will become stagnant and smelly. They are concerned as they are directly adjacent to the proposed pond.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Carol Bryan	PC14- 7/h	Suitability of Land	Lives in an adjacent subdivision done by the same applicant. Is worried as feels that works were not adequately completed – including inadequate provision for pumping. Is concerned about the ability of the land to support the proposed development and the consequences on the surrounding area.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC14- 10/h	Suitability of Land – High Class Soils	Feel that the loss of high class soils should not be allowed.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Not stated

Dunedin City District Plan Page 11 of 13

Brian Miller	PC14- 8/h	Suitability of Land – High Class soils	Is concerned about the on-going status of the high class soils in the subdivision area. Are these going to be deleted from the planning maps? Feels the application is incomplete.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Wendy Ockwell	PC14- 6/h	Suitability of Land – Natural Hazards	Concerned about the flood risks posed to neighbouring sites and that people in Holyhead Street are already required to pump water during storm events. Is worried about where the water will be pumped to as the Fire Brigade was not allowed to pump into the river during a recent event. Feels the proposed ponding area is inadequate. Is concerned over agency responsibility for addressing these issues.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC14- 10/h	Suitability of Land – Natural Hazards	The flood risk in the proposal area is high. It is adjacent to the Outram Flood Bank Relief Spill Way. In a large flood the area will be inundated. They question the analysis of David Hamilton as being too complicated and provide their own data collected over a long period. They are concerned that peak flows are increasing in scale and that if the land remained rural that it could more quickly recover from a flood than if it was residential. They raise the issue of alternative sites for the	That the Council decline the plan change.	Not stated
			subdivision and state their concern that the proposal will establish a further precedent on the edges of the town.		
Otago Regional Council	PC14- 12/h	Suitability of Land – Natural Hazards	The ORC are concerned about the location of the North Taieri fault being in proximity to the subject location. Geo-technical issues may occur both within the Flood Protection Management Bylaw 2012 (excavation of sensitive sites) areas and within the subject site, and have not been sufficiently addressed.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
			Discuss David Hamilton's report and conclude that the area is likely to be subject to inundation.		
Craig Werner	PC14- 1/i	Spatial Plan	Feels the Council should be promoting development that is consistent with the Spatial Plan.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
NZTA	PC14/1 1/j	Reverse Sensitivity	The NZTA are concerned about the potential for reverse sensitivity to become an issue arising from the proposed subdivision in relation to the state highway.	Approve the plan change subject to including plan provisions relating to reverse sensitivity.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 12 of 13

Rebecca and Peter Brookland	PC14- 14/k	Design Controls	There are no specifics in the application relating to performance standards and design controls. They are likewise concerned that sustainability approaches are suggested in the application but there is no requirement sought to have these put in place by owners.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
--------------------------------	---------------	-----------------	---	---	-----

Dunedin City District Plan Page 13 of 13