



Making it Easier to Build Granny Flats

30 July 2024



Agenda

- Introduction to Government proposal
- Dunedin context
- Proposal for building consents and implications
- Proposal for resource consents and implications
- Next steps
- Questions at set intervals

Introduction to Government Proposal

- Coalition agreement:
 - To make it easier to build 'granny flats' (GFs) up to 60m²
- Responding to two broad issues:
 - Housing unaffordability
 - Increasing demand for small houses
- Proposal is to reduce time and cost of building GFs:
 - No building consents
 - No resource consents

Dunedin Context

- Building consents:
 - Cost less than 2% of likely project cost
 - Average processing time of 12 working days across consents
 - Records indicate 47 GFs developed in the last 2 years
- Resource consents:
 - Equivalent of GFs up to 60m² already permitted by district plan
 - Variation 2 reduced the district plan conditions that apply
 - No cost or delay when district plan conditions are met

Questions ?

Proposal for Building Consents

- Building consent would no longer be required and no checks made by council
- GF development would need to:
 - Comply with the NZ Building Code
 - Use a Licensed Building Practitioner
 - Use authorised plumbers
 - Be a new, standalone, single storey building up to 60m²
 - Subject to other conditions to manage build quality
 - Submit records to councils

Implications for Building Control

- Risks:
 - Faulty building work
 - Property owners bearing the cost of remediation
 - DCC infrastructure being built over
 - Unauthorised infrastructure connections being made
 - Records not being lodged
 - Development contributions not being paid
- Implications for finance, insurance and resale value

Questions ?

Proposal for Resource Consents

- Resource consent would not be required where in accordance with a new National Environmental Standard
- GF development would need to:
 - Be in residential or rural zones - like DCC district plan (DP)
 - Be one per primary residential unit - like DCC DP
 - Be held in common ownership with the PRU - like DCC DP
 - Comply with relatively lenient rules for building coverage, permeable surface, and setbacks from boundaries - unlike DCC DP
 - Comply with DCC's DP rules managing land use, 'matters of national importance', and subdivision

Implications for Resource Management

- Duplication of rules likely to cause confusion
- Could undermine DCC's district plan density rules
- More lenient rules would generate unanticipated effects on neighbours and 3 waters infrastructure etc.
- More lenient rules could set a precedent for other development
- Resource consent may still be needed for the primary unit
- A plan change may be needed to resolve unintended consequences

Questions ?



Next Steps

- Draft submission for approval next Tuesday 6 August (Customer and Regulatory Committee)
- Submission due 12 August

