PROPOSED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE 16 Residential 5 Zone - Formby Street, Outram

Summary of Decisions Requested



The first stage of the process for Proposed Plan Change 16, a private plan change sought by Two Note Limited, 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 13 July 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 16. 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 Service Centre, Ground Floor, Civic Centre, 50 The Octagon, Dunedin
- Public Libraries at Dunedin (McNab Room) 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 (clearly mark as submission)

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

Octagon, Dunedin (clearly mark as submission)

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

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 public libraries, can be downloaded from www.dunedin.govt.nz or will be mailed to you if you phone 477 4000, or email dsycamor@dcc.govt.nz.

The further submission period closes on Friday 31st August 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 Darryl Sycamore on 477 4000, or email dsycamor@dcc.govt.nz.

List of Submitters

Submission Number	Name	Address1	Address2	Address3	City
PC-16-1	Craig Werner	30 Howard Street	Macandrew Bay		Dunedin 9014
PC-16-2			Бау		
	Angela & Sacha Anderson	43 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-3	Director-General of	C/-Otago Conservancy,		Attention:	
	Conservation (Robin	Department of	DO Day 5344	Catherine	Dunadia 00F0
PC-16-4	Thomas) Maree Harrington	Conservation 660 Georgetown-Pukeuri	PO Box 5244	Warren	Dunedin 9058
PC-10-4	Maree Harrington	Road	RD 6K		Oamaru 9494
PC-16-5	Henry Flett	51 Formby Street	KD OK		Outram 9019
PC-16-5 PC-16-6	Paul Johnston & Frances	31 Formby Street			Outrain 9019
PC-10-0	Sleeman	51A Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-7	Peter & Lauren Watkins	63 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-8	Barbara Milne	28 Orme Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-9	David Cottle	3 Skerries Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-10	Anne Warrington-Blair	33 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-11	Brian Miller	77 Riccarton Road West	RD 2		Mosgiel 9092
PC-16-12	Lynda Choie	99 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-13	Bernadette Hay	PO Box 34			Outram 9062
PC-16-14	Sue Whitty	41 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-15	Pamela Grant	45 Skerries Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-16	Peter & Rosina Crossan	47 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-17	Susan Miller	39 Lynas Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-18	Neil Simpson	45 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-19	Neil Johnston	47A Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-20	Seaton Ager	2 Beaumaris Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-21	Garrett Hogan	39 Formby Street			Outram 9019
PC-16-22	Patricia Bosshard-Browne				Middlemarch
		277 Murrays Road	RD3		9598
PC-16-23	Raymond & Evelyn				
	Beardsmore	167 McDonald Road	RD1	Woodside Manor	Outram 9073
PC-16-24	Otago Regional Council (Fraser McRae)	Private Bag 1954		Attn: Sarah Valk	Dunedin 9054
PC-16-25	Teresa Stevenson		North East	Titali Garan Pank	
. 5 10 25		12 Harold Street	Valley		Dunedin 9010
PC-16-26	Brian Doherty	9 Huntly Road	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Outram 9019
PC-16-27	Trevor Braid	82 Formby Street			Outram 9019

Submitters 13 through 21 provided a form submission for consideration. Two of those submitters also provided a personal submission.

Guide to the Summary of Submissions

Submissions on Plan Change 16 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-16-2 (or Plan Change 16/Submitter 2). Where a submission relates to a number of different topics a further reference has been added, for example PC-16-2/a, PC-16-2/b etc. The summary of submissions references the form submission in the format PC-16-13 through 21/*.

How the summary is organised
The 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
Precedent	6
Sustainable use of the land/physical resources	6
Historic heritage	7
Character of Outram	8
Community resilience	8
Housing demand	8
Demography of Outram	9
Amenity	9
Dwelling height	10
Sunlight, shading & frost effects	11
Smoke emissions	12
Sustainable use of fossil fuels	12
Infrastructure costs and effects	12
Reticulated water supply demand	13
Storm-water capacity	14
Waste-water treatment plant	15
Odour from waste-water treatment system	17
Potential loss of productive/high class soils	17
Road design and traffic hazards	18
Wetland ponding	20
Historic landfill	21
Defences against water	21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Craig Werner	PC-16- 1/a	Whole of plan change	The submitter opposes the plan change as the proposal is contrary to densification planning principles where expansion should be targeted to communities where existing services are already.	That the Council decline the Plan change.	Yes
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/a	Whole of plan change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Department of Conservation (Robin Thomas)	PC-16- 3/a	Whole plan change	The submitter has a neutral view with respect to the plan change as the development is not likely to impinge on the Department's interests.	Not specified.	No
Maree Harrington	PC-16- 4/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety	That the Council decline the plan change.	Yes
Barbara Milne	PC-16- 8/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety.	Not specified.	No
David Cottle	PC-16- 9/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter supports the plan change in its entirely	That the Council approve the plan change.	No
Brian Miller	PC-16- 11/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change.	That the application be declined.	Yes
Lynda Choie	PC-16- 12/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter supports the plan change proposal.	Not specified.	No
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21	Whole of Plan Change	The submitters oppose the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 5 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Торіс	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/a	Whole of Plan Change	The submitter opposes the plan change entirely, but notes the proposal could be improved.	That the Council decline the plan change, or alternatively promote a revised proposal with less sites, more efficient shared sewage scheme, and the majority of land being retained for farming purposes.	Yes
Anne Warrington- Blair	PC-16- 10/a	Granting the development will set a precedent	The submitter is concerned that should this application be granted, it will create a precedent which would assist other developers in applying for further development on rural land.	The submitter wishes to be informed of the decision.	No
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/b	Granting the development will set a precedent	The proposal will create a precedent for further development.	The submitter requests the Council stop setting new precedents that permit other development.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC- 23/a	Granting the development will set a precedent	The proposal will create a precedent for further development.	Leave it to the Hearings Committee to make a wise decision.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/b	Granting the development will set a precedent	The submitter has the view that should the application be approved, that would set a precedent and result in further plan change applications being approved for low density residential activity on productive farming soils, in areas adjoining the Residential 5 zone.	Decline the application, or alternatively consider an alternative model where the development features less residential units, sited in a cluster (or farm-park) model, retaining high value soils for productive use.	Yes
Craig Werner	PC-16- 1/b	Sustainable use of the land/physical resources	The expansion of Outram is contrary to current urban planning principles of densification.	Decline the application.	Yes
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/b	Sustainable use of the land/physical resources	Is concerned with residential properties being established on productive rural land.	Decline the application.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 6 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/b	Sustainable use of the land/physical resources	The group of submitters hold the view the use of productive rural land for residential purposes is contrary to Section 5(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 as it will remove the ability for the land to be used for rural purposes.	Decline the plan change application.	No
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/c	Sustainable use of land/physical resources-	Is concerned at the loss of productive areas for food production.	The submitter notes a desire to retain productive land for horticultural/ agricultural purposes.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/b	Sustainable use of land/physical resources	Concerned with the loss of productive land for horticultural purposes.	Avoid further subdivision of land reducing the available production land.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/c	Sustainable use of land/physical resources	The submitter is concerned the proposed use of land for low density housing will result in a loss of valuable production land for future generations.	The submitter seeks the proposed layout be modified to feature less residential units, and have them more centralised, where the majority of land can be retained for future farming purposes.	No
Barbara Milne	PC-16- 8/a	Sustainable use of land/physical resources	The submitter holds the view the proposal will positively contribute to social and economic wellbeing of the community by providing for future growth in Outram.	Approved the development providing additional residential units in the Outram area.	No
Craig Werner	PC-16- 1/c	Sustainable use of land/physical resources	The submitter holds the view that expansion of areas outside of established settlements will not minimise car travel.	Decline the application.	Yes
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/b	Sustainable use of land/physical resources	The submitter suggests the development of productive rural land into residential displaces food producing areas further from centres, which in turn leads to increased vehicle movements and fuel use which is not a sustainable use of the finite resource.	Decline the application.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/c	Protection of historic heritage from development	Have raised issue with the site featuring a historic landfill. In the submitters' view the landfill would be a historic site and as such should be afforded appropriate protection.	Ensure the archaeological site is appropriately considered.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 7 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/b	Impact on character of Outram	The submitter stresses the unique ambience of Outram is a significant reason families go to live in the area. In their view, the expansion of Outram and the resultant increased population will compromise the rural atmosphere and amenity. They note the siting of their dwelling in relation to the proposed development and raise concern at the potential to lose the aural ambience and privacy the submitters currently enjoy.	Decline the proposal, however should the development be approved, the submitters seek the improvement of the boundary fence to help offset the loss of privacy.	Yes
Maree Harrington	PC-16- 4/b	Impact on character of Outram	Is concerned the proposed development will affect the rural outlook, character and privacy. The submitter is also concerned about noise affecting the quality of the wider environment.	Decline the proposal, however should the development be approved, the submitter seeks the installation of a boundary fence to protect privacy and keep noise levels down.	Yes
Barbara Milne	PC-16- 8/b	Proposal will improve community resilience	The submitter holds the view the proposal will increase the resilience of the Outram community as an increase population will promote business and cultural/recreational groups.	Approve the proposal.	No
David Cottle	PC-16- 9/b	Proposal will improve community resilience	An increased population base in Outram will contribute to viability of the community, its businesses and clubs.	Grant the proposed development.	No
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/b	Housing demand	The demand for further housing is questioned by the submitter. They note several other subdivisions that have been approved where significant numbers of additional residential lots have been created and not yet developed.	The submitters seek the Council decline the proposal.	Yes
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/c	Housing demand	Notes that there is a number of subdivisions in the wider area that are not yet fully developed.	The submitter seeks the application be declined.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/d	Housing demand	Note that there are several subdivisions in the Outram and Mosgiel area that should be supported before further rural land is converted for residential use.	Decline the application.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/d	Housing demand	The submitter highlights there are a number of existing residential sites in the immediate and wider area approved for development. Any further conversion of land from rural to residential is not necessary.	Decline or modify the proposal to feature less residential units, retaining large tracts of the site form productive use.	Yes

Page 8 of 21

Dunedin City District Plan

Submitter Name	No.	Торіс	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/c	Proposal will alter the demography of Outram	They submit that Outram's distinct character is a result of the District Plan zoning, and should the Plan Change be granted, it will contribute to a loss in that character.	Decline the proposal.	Yes
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/d	Proposal will alter the demography of Outram	That Outram is currently a destination location attracting visitors due to its character and rural outlook. She submits that the character and ambience will alter as a result of approving this proposal.	Decline the proposal.	No
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/c	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate wider area	The submitters live on land adjoining the subject site. They are concerned about the loss of amenity arising from the proposal, both visual and aural. The entranceway to the proposed development will result in significant noise issues on the submitter with respect to vehicles using the access and also the increase in road noise arising from increased vehicle movements. Rural outlook from the submitters' property will be lost by the development resulting in a significant loss of privacy and amenity.	Decline the application, or alternatively should Council approve the proposal, the submitters seek the developers pay for the installation of a new fence at the rear of their property.	No
Maree Harrington	PC-16- 4/b	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate wider area	Is concerned that the proposal will result in a significant loss of privacy and increased noise arising from residential use and vehicular movements.	Decline the application, or alternatively should Council approve the proposal, she seeks the developer install a fence at their cost sufficient to screen her property from the development.	Yes
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/c	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate and wider area	The submitter states that when he built the family home on the site, there was no likelihood of their view or privacy being built-out by residential development on the adjoining rural land. He is concerned at the effects on the amenity resulting from the development.	Decline the application.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/b	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate wider area	Are concerned about their rural view being obstructed by the development. Have raised the issue that the development may result in relocatable homes being transported onto the new lots. They are also concerned about noise from both the development and carriageway degrading their amenity.	Decline the application.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 9 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/d	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate and wider area	The submitters are concerned at the loss of privacy likely to arise as a result of the development. They currently have uninterrupted rural views with natural surroundings which will be affected by the proposal. The Watkins' hold the view that traffic noise will be increased which will affect their aural amenity.	Decline the proposal.	Yes
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/c	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate wider area	The group of submitters state the rezoning will permanently affect the amenity, both in the immediate area, and also extending into the wider Taieri. They state the change from a rural outlook to a residential development does not enhance or maintain the rural amenity values of the area and therefore the requirements of Section 7(c) of the Act, cannot be met. The group of submitters also are concerned about how noise will result in a loss of aural amenity, arising from both residential use on the land, and also vehicle movements accessing the development and also traversing the carriageway. Sue Whitty also notes the access to the development will adjoin her site and will result in increased noise, increased light spill, and alter the general privacy and amenity enjoyed from her dwelling. She is concerned at the prospect of double-story housing compromising the views.	The group of submitters seek the applicants commission a noise report which comments on the potential noise issues from both the residential activity and vehicle movements.	No
Brian Doherty	PC-16- 26/a	Proposal could potentially alter amenity both within the immediate wider area	Is concerned at the loss of rural views where new housing will obscure the existing vistas.	Decline the proposal.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/c	Potential heights of dwellings in development	The submitters have expressed a concern at the height of the houses that will be established should the development be approved.	They seek the application be declined.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 10 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Lauren & Peter Watkins	PC-16- 7/e	Potential heights of dwellings in development	The submitters note that the proposed size of the lots will encourage multi-stories dwellings, which in turn will result in further loss of amenity/privacy.	Decline the proposal as it will compromise the amenity and privacy of existing landowners.	Yes
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/d	Potential heights of dwellings in development	The group of submitters comment that the rezoning to Residential 5 could potentially provide for dwellings up to 9m high, located 2.0m from the side yard boundary. This could result in significant bulk constructed along the eastern boundary of the subject site which would significantly affect the outlook to adjoining landowners.	Decline the proposal, or alternatively should the Council approve the development, they group of submitters seek a minimum 10m setback from existing boundaries with a maximum height from dwellings across the development of 4.5m. They encourage the applicants to consider volunteering a private covenant.	No
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/d	Development bulk will reduce sunlight hours on adjoining properties, increase shading and duration of frosts	The submitter has expressed concern that development on the adjoining land will obscure sunshine hours on his land as a result of the bulk and topography. He also suggests, during frost events, the duration of the frost will be increased.	Decline the proposal.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/d	Development bulk will reduce sunlight hours on adjoining properties, increase shading and duration of frosts	The submitters note a concern about shading on their property.	Decline the proposal.	No
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/e	Development bulk will reduce sunlight hours on adjoining properties, increase shading and duration of frosts	The group of submitters comment that the rezoning to Residential 5 could potentially provide for dwellings up to 9m high, located 2.0m from the side yard boundary. This could result in significant shading issues to existing landowners.	Decline the proposal, or alternatively should the Council approve the development, the group of submitters seek a minimum 10m setback from existing boundaries with a maximum height from dwellings across the development of 4.5m.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 11 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Торіс	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/e	Further dwellings will increase the likelihood of increased smoke emissions from burners	The submitters suggest that the development will result in increased air pollution issues arising from domestic burners.	Decline the proposal.	No
Craig Werner	PC-16- 1/d	Sustainable use of fossil fuels	Notes the proposal is contrary to sustainable use of fossil fuels as it would promote vehicle movements.	Decline the proposal.	Yes
Patricia Bosshart- Browne	PC-16- 22/e	Sustainable use of fossil fuels	The submitter holds the view that as Outram has little in the way of services, the development will lead to more vehicle use, consumption of fossil fuels and subsequent pollution.	Decline the proposal.	No
Craig Werner	PC-16- 1/e	Effects on infrastructural capacity and costs	The submitter is concerned that the proposal will not enable Council to limit infrastructure costs.	Decline the proposal.	Yes
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/d	Effects on infrastructural capacity and costs	The submitters expressed concern that additional infrastructural costs for the development will be borne by the general ratepayer.	Decline the proposal.	No
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/f	Effects on infrastructural capacity and costs	The group of submitters are concerned the development will lead to the requirement to upgrade existing infrastructure and/or install new infrastructure. Susan Miller is also concerned with the ratepayers paying for the supply of potable water infrastructure to the development.	The submitters seek that all costs associated with the upgrade or installation of infrastructure is borne by the developer.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/e	Effects on infrastructural capacity and costs	The submitter states the infrastructure in Outram is currently insufficient for residential expansion. She also notes that the Outram community has sought an upgrade in infrastructure to remove the reliance on septic tanks. The submitter infers the community is dissatisfied with the existing management of water-water where this development will exacerbate those pressures.	That the proposal be declined or modified to have less residential units that have less pressure on infrastructure.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 12 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/f	Potential for increased demand of potable water from reticulated supply	The submitters have expressed concern that the development will result in increased demand on the reticulated supply of water.	Decline the proposal.	No
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/f	Potential for increased demand of potable water from reticulated supply	They suggest the Council's Water and Wastewater Department has advised that the existing water supply to Outram does not have capacity to serve additional demand of for fire-fighting purposes.	The costs of obtaining additional potable water should be borne by the developer.	No
Anne Warrington- Blair	PC-16- 10/b	Potential for increased demand of potable water from reticulated supply	The submitter has raised concern at the increased demand on potable water that supplies Outram. She questions whether there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development. She also notes another development in the area is also being considered which will have additional draw-down on capacity.	She wishes to be advised whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate demand.	No
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/g	Potential for increased demand of potable water from reticulated supply	The group of submitters note a discrepancy in the application where paragraph 81(i) of the document states the development should have few issues in terms of water pressure, and that the Council has confirmed there is sufficient capacity. The submitters then note in Appendix 4, there is some issue regarding water pressure and fire-fighting capacity, where once granted the applicants will then consult with Council over upgrades and development contributions.	The group of submitters seek that all costs of any upgrade are absorbed by the developer. They seek clarification as to whether there is an issue with water pressure serving the development, if adequate pressure for fire-fighting can be achieved and whether an infrastructural upgrade is necessary. The submitters seek that no effects on the Outram water supply affect the other property users in the area. They also seek no costs are passed onto other landowners.	No
Brian Doherty	PC-16- 26/b	Potential for increased demand of potable water from reticulated supply	The submitter has the view that the existing potable supply serving Outram was not designed with additional capacity to service the development.	Decline the proposal.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 13 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/e	Capacity for storm-water system to accommodate additional loading	The submitter questions whether the existing stormwater system can handle additional loading as a result of the development.	Decline the proposal.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/g	Capacity for storm-water system to accommodate additional loading	Have concerns about the ability for managing stormwater drainage from the development.	Decline the proposal.	No
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/h	Capacity for storm-water system to accommodate additional loading	The group of submitters comment that the development may alter the stormwater flow characteristics over the area.	They request that all stormwater is managed and controlled on the site to ensure no additional runoff affects adjoining properties.	No
David Cottle	PC-16- 9/c	Capacity for storm-water system to accommodate additional loading	The submitter holds the view that the proposal has adequately considered the effects of the development on the existing stormwater system.	The submitter supports the provisions with respect to the adequacy of the storm-water.	No
Otago Regional Council (Fraser MacRae)	PC-16- 24/a	Capacity for storm-water system to accommodate additional loading	The submitter discusses the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and Regional Plan:Water (RP:W) and the policies therein. They note the proposal has the ability to degrade the water quality within the 'wetland' area as a result of increased surface runoff. ORC holds the view that the proposal does not adequately address the effects of stormwater runoff.	The submitter seeks the consenting authority be assured the level of contaminants from storm-water runoff is acceptable. They also seek that the applicant undertakes further investigations to address stormwater quality and quantity concerns.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 14 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/e	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	Mr Flett has raised a concern at the hazards associated with any potential failure of the disposal field serving the Wastewater Treatment Plant for the development.	Decline the proposal.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/h	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitters have noted the additional discharge of human wastewater to land where it may enter water, has the potential to affect ground-water quality.	Decline the application.	No
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/g	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitters highlight that Outram does not have a reticulated sewerage system. They have concern at the additional loading of human waste-water to land that may compromise the health of the groundwater both over a short and long term.	Decline the proposed application.	Yes
David Cottle	PC-16- 8/d	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	Mr Cottle holds the view that the application includes adequate provisions for the disposal of sewerage to land.	He supports the proposal in its entirety and accepts the information provided in the application regarding sewerage disposal.	No
Anne Warrington- Blair	PC-16- 10/c	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitter support the approach promoted by the applicant with respect to the wastewater treatment plant and disposal field. She holds the view it is sufficient for the requirements and will not be problematic.	Supports the proposed wastewater treatment plant proposal to compliment the development.	No
Brian Miller	PC-16- 11/b	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitter has the view that no further developments should occur in Outram until a reticulated sewerage system is in commissioned.	Decline the application, and other developments until a reticulated sewerage treatment plant is commissioned to alleviate the need to use septic tanks.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 15 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/i	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The group of submitters hold the view the proposed wastewater treatment plant and disposal field is sufficiently adequate and preferable compared to individual septic tank systems. Susan Miller also is also concerned that the additional residential properties cumulatively contributing to adverse effects on the groundwater system over time.	The group of submitters request that the proposal be declined. Alternatively, should Council approve the proposal, the submitters seek that the treatment plant and soakage field should vest in Council to ensure consistency of operation and management.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/e	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitters have raised concern at the increase in treated human wastewater arising from the development that would go to ground and may affect the quality of groundwater.	Leave it to the Hearings Committee to make a wise decision.	No
Otago Regional Council (Fraser MacRae)	PC-16- 24/b	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	Fraser MacRae on behalf of the Otago Regional Council provided comment that the applicants have obtained resource consent to discharge human wastewater to land that may enter water for the development.		Yes
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/f	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	The submitter comments that the Outram area is serviced with reticulated water supply, but does not have an existing reticulated wastewater treatment system. As a result, increased volumes are discharged into the grey and septic systems in comparison to areas relying solely on rainwater for potable supply. The submitter suggests this arrangement makes the area less suitable for residential expansion until a reticulated sewerage system is commissioned.	Decline the proposal, or reduce the number of residential units. Those units should be centralised to allow for improved disposal of waste-water to land.	Yes
Trevor Braid	PC-16- 27/a	Commenting on the adequacy of the proposed waste-water treatment system	Mr Braid opposes further development in the Outram area until a reticulated sewerage system is commissioned.	Decline the subdivision.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 16 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Торіс	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/f	Odour issues from wastewater treatment plant disposal field	The submitters raise the issue of odour emanating from the disposal field of the waste-water treatment plant. They note their dwelling is in close proximity to the proposed disposal field.	They would like to be further informed as to the odour issues, and how that will be managed.	No
Henry Flett	PC-16- 5/f	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The submitter held the view that highly productive soils do not get developed.	Retain high class soils for productive use.	No
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/h	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The submitters note the proposed development is situated within the High Class Soils, which encompasses a portion of the Taieri. They note the subject site has been used for grazing and growing winter feed, and previously the site had been used as a market garden. The submitters are concerned that the land is highly fertile and has a microclimate ideally suited to early production. They comment that once developed, the productive capacity of the land is irrevocably lost for future generations.		Yes
Brian Miller	PC-16- 11/c	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	Stresses the rezoning of the subject site from rural to residential will result in the loss of High Class Soils permanently. He notes the soils are 'Pomahaka' soils that are defined as being deep silty loam soils and are most valuable for horticulture.	Decline the proposal.	Yes
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/j	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The group of submitters have the view the proposal does not sustain the natural and physical rural land for rural purposes. They note that while the application states that case law has indicated the protection of versatile and productive soils is outside the scope of the RMA, the proposal does not consider the life supporting capacity of those soils which will be adverse affected and rendered unusable by the residential development. They hold the view the proposal is contrary to Section 5(b) of the RMA.	That the application be declined.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 17 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Patricia Bosshard- Browne	PC-16- 22/f	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The submitter notes the effects of development in other regions where food growing and processing are now long distances, rather than local high quality areas. The effects of this results in increased costs to the consumer.	Decline the proposal.	No
Raymond and Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/f	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The submitters state recent subdivisions in the Outram area have removed the ability to use High Class Soils for horticultural or agricultural use. They suggest the excellent microclimate and excellent soils make the area unique for production purposes. They are concerned at the incremental loss of these High Class Soils by development.	Leave it to the Hearings Committee to make a wise decision.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/g	Proposal will result in a loss of productive soils	The submitter is concerned the proposed development will result in a loss of valuable production soils for present and future generations. She suggests the proposal could be amended to form a cluster of residential units, where tracts of productive soils are retained for agricultural use. The submitter notes the large number of proposed residential sites limits the ability to retain such land, and suggests the development is revised to consider the value of the productive soils.	That the application be declined, or the applicants modify the proposal to that of a 'farm-park' or cluster model with less residential units and more emphasis on retaining the productive land.	Yes
Angela & Sacha Anderson	PC-16- 2/g	Adequacy of road design and the increased potential for accidents	The submitters are concerned at an increase in traffic along Formby Street. They note that Outram is a family-orientated settlement where children walk to school, and play along Formby Street. They also note that other roads servicing Outram are narrow and convey heavy traffic volumes. The width and quality of those surfaces is questionable in their opinion. Further development will exacerbate the issues on these carriageways.	They do not want Outram to become congested like other settlements.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 18 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Peter & Lauren Watkins	PC-16- 7/i	Adequacy of road design and the increased potential for accidents	The submitters are concerned that the proposed development will lead to an increase in vehicular movements on both Formby Street and the surrounding streets. They state the carriageway is narrow, with parking on one side only, and an increase in 350 vehicle movements a day is significant. They note that speeds on the road are often more than the signposted 50kmph. The submitters note the carriageway at the southern end crosses over a mud-tank and drain serving the kerb and channel on the western extent of Formby Street. They submit that the tank and drain will require relocation. The submitters note the carriageway is used for children walking to school. An increase in vehicle	Decline the proposal.	No
Anne Warrington- Blair	PC-16- 10/d	Adequacy of road design and the increased	The submitter is concerned the development could increase traffic movements which could adversely affect school buses.	That she be informed of Council's decision.	No
		potential for accidents			
- Bernadette Hay - Sue Whitty - Pamela Grant - Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller - Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/k	Adequacy of road design and the increased potential for accidents	The group of submitters acknowledge the traffic Impact Assessment which details how the development will integrate with the existing roading network. They do however refute the statement that an anticipated 350 vehicle movement increase per day is "very minor". They suggest that the effects will be significant and adverse on the roading network.	That the application be declined.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 19 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/g	Adequacy of road design and the increased potential for accidents	The submitters suggest that the carriageways are congested. As new housing is established, they suggest, the carriageway is becoming more hard-surfaced and kerb & channelling being installed.	The proposal will lead to further change to the roading network which is contributing to change in the settlement that diminishes the charm of the area.	No
Paul Johnston & Frances Sleeman	PC-16- 6/g	Wetland/ ponding area issues	The submitters note the ox-bow wetted area on the subject site contains water year-round. They expressed concern at the implication of such a wetted area in close proximity to the wastewater disposal field should there be a malfunction.	That the Council decline the plan change.	No
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 23/h	Wetland/ ponding area issues	The submitters comment that the permanently wetted areas provide habitat for, and has previously been responsible for, mosquito and sandfly nuisance. They state these areas are low-lying areas that were part of the old Taieri riverbed, which fill to capacity during flood events. The Beardsmores raise concern at the risks associated with global warming and the potential for floodbanks to breach resulting in increased risk should the development result in additional residents within the hazard area.	They wish to know how pests such as mosquito will be controlled.	No
Teresa Stevenson	PC-16- 25/h	Wetland/ ponding issues	The submitter note the presence of the oxbow where water drains and is retained. She submits the wetted feature may render some areas unsuitable for residential activity, where hard surfaces may intensify surface run-off with potential contamination effects.	That the application be declined, or the applicants modify the proposal to that of a 'farm-park' or cluster model with less residential units and more emphasis on retaining the productive land.	Yes
-Bernadette Hay -Sue Whitty -Pamela Grant -Peter & Rosina Crossan - Susan Miller -Neil Simpson - Neil Johnston - Seaton Ager - Garret Hogan	PC-16- 13 to 21/I	Subject site features an historic landfill	The group of submitters note a historic landfill was located on the subject site, and little is known about the materials, the depth and extent of the fill or the effect of the waste on the groundwater. They do not believe it is appropriate to rezone the site into Residential 5 when the landfill presents a hazard risk. They also note the application does not include an assessment under the National Environmental Standard (NES) for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health.	The submitters requests the Council does not approve the development until any necessary consents have been obtained for the disturbance of a contaminated site, or the NES. They seek a full investigation to be carried out on the site.	No

Dunedin City District Plan Page 20 of 21

Submitter Name	No.	Topic	Submission Summary	Decision sought from Dunedin City Council	Wishes to be heard
Otago Regional Council (Fraser MacRae)	PC-16- 24/c	Subject site features a historic landfill	The Otago Regional Council notes the presence of the historic landfill, and the recent land use activity as a commercial nursery. They suggest those activities would have resulted in land contamination and any disturbance of that land will require resource consent under Rule 5.6.1 of the Regional Plan: Waste.	That the Council be assured that the level of contamination is appropriate for rezoning for residential activity, and that the applicant obtain the necessary consents.	Yes
Raymond & Evelyn Beardsmore	PC-16- 25/i	Subject site features a historic landfill	The submitters note the presence of the historic landfill and suggest that it should be regarded as an archaeological site.	Want appropriate consideration to the historical status of the old landfill.	No
Otago Regional Council (Fraser MacRae)	PC-16- 24/d	Development includes the creation of a defence against water	The submitter noted the proposal contains a plan titled <i>Calculation for Flood Storage</i> which indicates the installation of a bund, being a defence against water at RL106.8. Rule 14.3.2.1 of the Regional Plan:Water for Otago requires that bund will require resource consent. The 'wetland' partially contained within the subject site has been mapped as an overland flow path under the Proposed Flood Protection Management Bylaw 2012 and the connection of any pipe, channel or conduit may therefore require approval.	Obtain the necessary consents and approvals from the Otago Regional Council.	Yes

Dunedin City District Plan Page 21 of 21