



**SECOND
GENERATION
DISTRICT PLAN**

**Variation 1: Minor Amendments to
the Proposed Second Generation
Dunedin City District Plan (2GP)**

Decision of DCC Hearings Committee

18 July 2020

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Scope of Decision	4
1.2	Submissions seeking amendment of provisions	4
1.3	Section 32AA Evaluation	5
1.4	Statutory Considerations	5
2	Hearing	6
3	Decisions on submissions	6
3.1	Definition of driveways (Change 1.3)	6
3.1.1	Submission	6
3.1.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	6
3.1.3	Decisions and reasons	7
3.2	Rule 4.5.7 Number, Location and Design of Temporary Signs (Change 1.17)	7
3.2.1	Submission	7
3.2.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	7
3.2.3	Decisions and reasons	7
3.3	Building Length (Change 1.32)	7
3.3.1	Submission	7
3.3.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	8
3.3.3	Decisions and reasons	8
3.4	Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping (Change 1.37) and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments (Change 1.38)	8
3.4.1	Submission	8
3.4.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	8
3.4.3	The Oil Companies tabled hearing statement	9
3.4.4	Reporting Officers opening hearing statement	9
3.4.5	Decisions and reasons	9
3.5	Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking (Change 1.41)	10
3.5.1	Background	10
3.5.2	Submission	10
3.5.3	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	10
3.5.4	Decisions and reasons	10
3.6	Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in Relation to Boundary (Change 1.47)	11
3.6.1	Submission	11
3.6.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	11
3.6.3	Decisions and reasons	11
3.7	Reference to Policy 2.3.2.2 and Policy 2.4.3.4 in assessment rules for retail and office activities (Change 1.59)	11

3.7.1	Background	11
3.7.2	Submission	11
3.7.3	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	12
3.7.4	Decisions and reasons	12
3.8	Rules that apply to pedestrian street frontage mapped areas (Change 1.60)	12
3.8.1	Submission	12
3.8.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	12
3.8.3	Decisions and reasons	13
3.9	Land between Hartstonge Avenue, Reid Avenue and Factory Road (Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)	13
3.9.1	Submission	13
3.9.2	Recommendations in Section 42A Report	13
3.9.3	Decisions and reasons	13
Appendix 1 – Amendments to the Decision version of the 2GP (2018) as a result of decisions on submissions to Variation 1		14
1	Amendments to Family Flats – Design performance standards (Dunedin City Council submission 750356-OS-Change 1.3)	14
2	Amendments to Rule 15.6.1. Building Length (Dunedin City Council submission 750356-OS-Change 1.32)	15
3	Amendments to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments (The Oil Companies submissions 750659-OS - Change 1.37 and Change 138)	15
4	Amendments to Note 18.6.8A Other relevant District Plan provisions (The Oil Companies submission 750659-OS – Change 1.41)	16
5	Amendments to Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in Relation to Boundary (Dunedin City Council submission 750356-OS-Change 1.47)	16
6	Amendments to the assessment rules in the Campus Zone (Rule 34.11.2 and Rule 34.12.2) (Dunedin City Council submission 750356-OS-Change 1.59)	17
7	Amendments to Rule 18.6.16.1.b and c Setback from road boundaries (Dunedin City Council submission 750356-OS-Change 1.60)	19
8	Amendments to land between Hartstonge Avenue, Reid Avenue and Factory Road (Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)	20

1 INTRODUCTION

1. This document details the decisions of the Dunedin City Hearings Committee (Councillors David Benson-Pope (Chairperson), Christine Garey and Commissioner Ros Day-Cleavin) with regard to the submissions and evidence considered at the Variation 1: Minor Amendments to the Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan (2GP) Hearing held on 5th June 2020.
2. The amendments to the 2GP proposed by Variation 1 are generally minor in nature with 50 of 73 amendments considered clarifications rather than substantive changes, and the remainder being minor substantive changes.
3. Variation 1 was notified for submissions on Wednesday, 20 November 2019, with the submission period closing on Wednesday, 18 December 2019. The summary of decisions requested by submitters was open for further submissions from Wednesday, 29 January to Thursday, 13 February 2020. No further submissions were received.

1.1 Scope of Decision

4. The Variation 1 Section 42A Report addressed the 7 submissions and 32 submissions points from Dunedin City Council, Heritage New Zealand, KiwiRail, the Oil Companies, Transpower New Zealand Limited, University of Otago and Ryman Healthcare Limited.
5. Fonterra Limited, Dunedin City Council, the Oil Companies and Transpower New Zealand Limited lodged submission points (750635-OS-Change 1.26, 750356-OS-Change 1.44, 750659-OS-1.26, 750602-OS-Change 1.11) were subsequently withdrawn.
6. Heritage New Zealand, KiwiRail, and Ryman Healthcare Limited only submitted in support of Variation 1 provisions. Only Dunedin City Council, the Oil Companies and the University of Otago made submissions which sought amendment of provisions changed by Variation 1.
7. This decision report only addresses the submission points which sought amendment to provisions (refer sub-section 1.2 below), because no decisions are required on submissions in support of changes proposed in Variation 1.

1.2 Submissions seeking amendment of provisions

8. The submission points which sought amendment to provisions are:

Variation 1 change number	Variation 1 change name	Submitter name and number
Change 1.3	Definition of driveways	Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.3)
Change 1.17	Rule 4.5.7 Number, Location and Design of Temporary Signs	University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.17)
Change 1.32	Rule 15.6.1 Building Length	Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.32)

Variation 1 change number	Variation 1 change name	Submitter name and number
Change 1.37 and Change 1.38	Rules 18.3.6 and 19.3.4 Development Activity Status Tables, 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping (change 1.37) and 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments (change 1.38)	The Oil Companies (750659-OS-1.37 and 750659-OS-1.38)
Change 1.41	Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking	The Oil Companies (750659-OS-Change 1.41)
Change 1.47	Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in Relation to Boundary	Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.47)
Change 1.59	Reference to Policy 2.3.2.2 and Policy 2.4.3.4 in assessment rules for retail and office activities	University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.59)
Change 1.60	Rules that apply to pedestrian street frontage mapped areas	Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.60)
Change 1.64 and Change 1.65	Land between Hartstonge Avenue, Reid Avenue and Factory Road	Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)

9. Our decisions, and reasons for these decisions on these submissions, are outlined in sub-section 3.0 of this report, below.

1.3 Section 32AA Evaluation

10. Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) establishes the framework for assessing proposed objectives, policies and rules. Section 32AA of the RMA requires a further evaluation to be released with decisions, outlining the costs and benefits of any amendments made after the Proposed Plan was notified.
11. The evaluation must examine the extent to which each objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA and whether, having had regard to their efficiency and effectiveness, the policies and rules proposed are the most appropriate for achieving the objectives. The benefits and costs of the policies and rules, and the risk of acting or not acting must also be considered.
12. *Variation 1 Proposed Amendments and Section 32 Evaluation Report* was notified with Variation 1. No amendments were made to the wording of 2GP objectives as part of this variation. The Section 32AA of the RMA evaluation required for changes to provisions as a result of submissions are incorporated into the reasons for each decision. We consider that these changes alter the Section 32 Evaluation Report notified with this variation only in a minor way.

1.4 Statutory Considerations

13. The matters that must be considered when deciding on submissions to change a district plan are set out in Part 2 (sections 5-8, purpose and principles) and sections 31, 32 and 72-75 of

the RMA. District plans must achieve the purpose of the RMA and must assist the council to carry out its functions under the RMA.

14. The Section 42A Report provided a broad overview of the statutory considerations relevant to Variation 1. These include Section 31(1)(a) of the RMA territorial authorities have functions for the review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.
15. These statutory requirements have provided the foundation for our consideration of submissions.

2 HEARING

16. No submitters appeared at the hearing. The Oil Companies tabled a statement of evidence related to their submission points 750659-OS-Change 1.37 and 750659-OS- Change 1.38 on boundary treatments (landscaping) rules.
17. Hearing Committee members:
 - Councillor David Benson-Pope (Chair)
 - Councillor Christine Garey
 - Commissioner Ros Day-Cleavin
18. Appearances for the Dunedin City Council were:
 - Mr Paul Freeland, Senior Planner (Planning Assistant to the Hearing Committee)
 - Mr Peter Rawson, Reporting Officer
 - Jenny Lapham, Governance Support Officer
19. A tabled opening statement was provided by Mr Rawson in response to the Oil Companies tabled statement.

3 DECISIONS ON SUBMISSIONS

3.1 Definition of driveways (Change 1.3)

3.1.1 Submission

20. *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.3)* sought to:

‘Amend the Family Flats Design performance standards in the residential, rural and rural residential zones (Rules 15.5.14.2, 16.5.14.2 and 17.5.13.2 respectively) by replacing the words 'vehicle access' with the word 'driveway' in sub-clause a.iv of these rules.’

3.1.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

21. The Reporting Officer recommended that the submission by the *Dunedin City Council* to amend rules 15.5.14.2, 16.5.14.2 and 17.5.13.2 be accepted as these performance standards

should refer to the entire access (defined as 'driveway' in the 2GP rather than the 'vehicle access').

3.1.3 Decisions and reasons

22. We accept the submission from *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.3)* that the Family Flats Design performance standards in the residential, rural and rural residential zones (Rules 15.5.14.2, 16.5.14.2 and 17.5.13.2) should refer 'driveway' rather than 'vehicle access' (as defined in the 2GP) because the performance standard should apply to the entire accessway which is defined as 'driveway' in the 2GP.
23. Amendment to rules 15.5.14.2, 16.5.14.2 and 17.5.13.2 are shown in Appendix 1.

3.2 Rule 4.5.7 Number, Location and Design of Temporary Signs (Change 1.17)

3.2.1 Submission

24. *University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.17)* sought to:

'Amend Rule 4.5.7.1.b to add the list of areas where illuminated signs are provided for to include the Campus Zone.'

3.2.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

25. The Reporting Officer recommended that the *University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.17)* submission to allow for illuminated temporary signs in the Campus Zone is unnecessary because they are a permitted activity under the definition of campus activity if carried out by the University of Otago or the Otago Polytechnic. For this reason, he did not support the amendment of Rule 4.5.7.1.b to add the Campus Zone as an area where illuminated temporary signs are provided for.

3.2.3 Decisions and reasons

26. We reject the submission from *University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.17)* that sought provision for temporary signs being illuminated in the Campus Zone. We consider this change is unnecessary because campus activity already provides for the University of Otago or the Otago Polytechnic carrying out temporary activities which includes temporary signs and does not preclude them from being illuminated. In reaching this view we note the submitter did not attend the hearing to respond to the reporting officer's recommendation on this matter.

3.3 Building Length (Change 1.32)

3.3.1 Submission

27. *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.32)* sought to:

Amend Rule 15.6.1.1 Building Length, as follows (note the changes proposed are highlighted in **bold**, so they can be differentiated between the Variation 1 amendments proposed to this rule):

1. New buildings and additions and alterations **to buildings** must not result in a building with a continuous dimension (building length) that is greater than 20m measured parallel to boundaries, except along any boundary length where the building shares the wall with the adjacent building ~~include or~~ result in any wall with a continuous length that is greater than 20m, if the wall is visible, in full or in part, from an adjoining public place.

3.3.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

28. The Reporting Officer supported *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.32)* for the reasons outlined by the submitter. These reasons were that the amendments are minor and will provide greater clarity that the building length rule applies to new buildings and additions and alterations to buildings only, where the wall of the building is more than 20m in length and is visible, in full or in part, from an adjoining public place (for example a road). This amendment will also clarify that this rule does not apply to additions and alterations to structures.

3.3.3 Decisions and reasons

29. We accept the submission from *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.32)* to amend Rule 15.6.1 Building Length as we consider that these amendments will provide greater clarity that this rule applies to new buildings and additions and alterations to buildings only and does not apply to additions and alterations to structures.
30. The proposed revised wording of Rule 15.6.1 Building Length, is shown in Appendix 1.

3.4 Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping (Change 1.37) and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments (Change 1.38)

3.4.1 Submission

31. *The Oil Companies (750659-OS-1.37 and 750659-OS-1.38)* sought to remove the need for demolition and removal for relocation to comply with the boundary treatment standards (Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping, in commercial and mixed use zones and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments, in industrial zones).
32. *The Oil Companies* considered that the requirement for landscaping, for demolition and removal for relocation, is inappropriate because there is a high likelihood that sites will be redeveloped, and any landscaping would therefore be more appropriately designed and implemented in the context of the new development. In addition, they considered that the landscaping requirement may act as a disincentive for the removal of rundown or derelict buildings, where a landowner must invest in landscaping or obtain resource consent, and therefore result in a worse outcome for streetscape amenity.

3.4.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

33. The Reporting Officer disagreed with *the Oil Companies* and described that it was appropriate, where demolition or removal for relocation is undertaken, and redevelopment does not occur in a timely manner, that resultant vacant sites should be landscaped to ensure that streetscape amenity is maintained. He also considered that there is a risk of streetscape amenity being compromised if buildings are demolished or removed and vacant sites remain without landscaping.
34. He was also doubtful that the requirements for landscaping would act as a disincentive for the removal of rundown or derelict buildings and noted that only relatively small parts of industrial zones have been identified on the 2GP Planning Map as amenity route mapped areas (for example Portsmouth Drive) and these areas are expected to provide a higher level of streetscape amenity (than other parts of the industrial zone), which is important to the City.

35. The Reporting Officer recommended that the amendments proposed by Change 1.37 and Change 1.38 (in relation to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments) be retained without amendment.

3.4.3 The Oil Companies tabled hearing statement

36. *The Oil Companies* tabled a hearing statement from Georgina McPherson, 4Sight Consulting Limited on behalf of *the Oil Companies* (dated 3rd June 2020). This hearing statement responded to the Reporting Officer's recommendation to retain the amendments to Rule 18.6.1 and Rule 19.6.1 proposed by Change 1.37 and Change 1.38.
37. *The Oil Companies* were concerned that the landscaping rules could be applied to the removal of small-scale buildings and structures that are ancillary to the primary activity on the site (e.g. a rubbish enclosure, sign or underground fuel tank), and their removal would have negligible or no adverse effect on streetscape amenity.
38. Therefore, *The Oil Companies* proposed alternative relief that the boundary treatment rules (18.6.1 and 19.6.1) apply to 'demolition or removal for relocation of buildings other than ancillary buildings'.
39. Therefore, the demolition or removal for relocation of structures and ancillary buildings would not trigger the requirement for landscaping under rules 18.6.1 and 19.6.1.

3.4.4 Reporting Officers opening hearing statement

40. The Reporting Officer provided an opening statement at the start of the hearing where he described that it was unclear what would constitute an 'ancillary building' due to lack of a definition and he considered that there are instances where large buildings, for example storage areas ancillary to a commercial or industrial activity, would have adverse effects on streetscape amenity if they were demolished or removed. He also noted that the demolition or removal of buildings which are not visible from the street frontage would not have any adverse effects on streetscape amenity.
41. Therefore, the Reporting Officer proposed amendments to Rule 18.6.1 and Rule 19.6.1 to exempt where 'the building subject to demolition or removal for relocation is not visible from the street frontage'.

3.4.5 Decisions and reasons

42. We accept in part *the Oil Companies (750659-OS-1.37 and 750659-OS-1.38)* submission and have decided to amend Rules 18.6.1 and 19.6.1 to reduce the circumstances when landscaping is required.
43. We agree with the Reporting Officer that a requirement for landscaping is unnecessary if a building is demolished or relocated and it is not visible from a street frontage because it will not have adverse effects on streetscape amenity.
44. We also agree with the Oil Companies that the demolition or removal of a structure should not trigger a requirement for landscaping because structures are often small, and their demolition will have little or no adverse effect on streetscape amenity. Therefore, we have decided that the landscaping requirement should apply to 'demolition or removal for relocation of buildings' (and not the demolition or removal of structures).

45. We agree with the Reporting Officer that it is unclear what an ‘ancillary building’ would apply to and there is potential for ancillary buildings to be large and the demolition or removal of these buildings may create adverse effects on streetscape amenity. We have therefore decided not to exempt the demolition or removal for relocation of ancillary buildings from the requirements of the ‘boundary treatments and other landscaping’ performance standard requirements of the 2GP (Rules 18.6.1 and 19.6.1).
46. Amendments to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping and Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments, are shown in Appendix 1.

3.5 Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking (Change 1.41)

3.5.1 Background

47. The intent of Change 1.41 was to avoid the potential for confusion about whether the activity status for contravention of clause 2 of Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking is a restricted discretionary or a non-complying activity. Clause 2 of Rule 18.6.8 requires compliance with Rule 18.6.1. Boundary treatments and other landscaping.
48. Change 1.41 proposed the deletion of clause 2 of Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking and the insertion of a new note, as follows:

2. Parking areas on sites that do not have a building within 1.5m of the front boundary are subject to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary treatments and other landscaping.

3.5.2 Submission

49. *The Oil Companies (750659-OS-Change 1.41)* submission supported the intention of Change 1.41 but thought that the wording of the new note is likely to result in further confusion and requested it be amended to better reflect the requirements of Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping, so that it reads as follows:

2. Parking areas on sites other than those addressed by Rule 18.6.8.1 above, are subject to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and other landscaping.

3.5.3 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

50. The Reporting Officer supported the intent of *the Oil Companies* relief but clarified that in commercial and mixed use zones, all development in heritage precincts (except the View Street Heritage Precinct) or on sites that adjoin a primary pedestrian street frontage are subject to both performances standards Rule 18.6.1 – Boundary treatments and other landscaping and Rule 18.6.8 – Location and screening of car parking. He therefore recommended that the wording of Note 18.6.8A.2 be amended to make it clear to Plan users that development subject to Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking is also subject to compliance with Rule 18.6.1 Boundary treatments and other landscaping. The Reporting Officer recommended that Note 18.6.8A.2 be amended to read as follows:

2. New or additions to parking areas are also subject to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary treatments and other landscaping.

3.5.4 Decisions and reasons

51. We accept in part *the Oil Companies (750659-OS-1.41)* submission and agree with the Reporting Officer’s recommended amendment, which we think will make it clear to Plan

users that development subject to Rule 18.6.8 Location and screening of car parking is also subject to compliance with Rule 18.6.1 Boundary treatments and other landscaping.

52. The proposed revised wording of Note 18.6.8A.2 Other relevant District Plan provisions, is shown in Appendix 1.

3.6 Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in Relation to Boundary (Change 1.47)

3.6.1 Submission

53. *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.47)* submission sought amendment to Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in relation to boundary in the Campus Zone to clarify that the height in relation to boundary performance standard is intended to apply to new buildings and additions and alterations to buildings only (not structures) and clarify that Rule 34.6.6.1.b applies to a site not used for standard residential activity and to ensure that wording aligns with the 2GP Style Guide (DCC, 2019 - https://www.dunedin.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/715867/2GP-Style-Guide.pdf).

3.6.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

54. The Reporting Officer supported the further amendments to this rule proposed by the *Dunedin City Council* and considered that these changes will improve alignment with part a. of this rule and the 2GP Style Guide, which will provide additional clarity and so certainty to Plan users.

3.6.3 Decisions and reasons

55. We accept the *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.47)* submission and agree with the submitter and the Reporting Officer that the amendments to Rule 34.6.6.1.b 'Height in relation to boundary' will provide greater clarity and certainty for Plan users and better alignment with the 2GP Style Guide.
56. Amendments to Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in relation to boundary, are shown in Appendix 1.

3.7 Reference to Policy 2.3.2.2 and Policy 2.4.3.4 in assessment rules for retail and office activities (Change 1.59)

3.7.1 Background

57. The focus of policy 2.3.2.2 and policy 2.4.3.4 is to restrict the distribution of retail and office activity to maintain or enhance the vibrancy and density of activity in the CBD and centres zones.
58. Variation 1 change 1.59 added reference to policy 2.3.2.2 and policy 2.4.3.4 and objectives 2.3.2 and 2.4.3 in the discretionary and non-complying assessment rules for retail and office activity in management zones and major facility zones, including in the Campus Zone (Rule 34.11.2.1 Assessment of discretionary land use activities – office and Rule 34.12.2.1 Assessment of all non-complying activities).

3.7.2 Submission

59. The *University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.59)* submission sought to 'retain original 2GP text. Do not reference policy 2.3.2.2 and policy 2.4.3.4, together with Objectives 2.3.2 and 2.4.3, in the Major Facility – Campus zone'. The *University of Otago* considered that the

proposed changes to these assessment rules would undermine its existing appeals on the 2GP.

3.7.3 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

60. The Reporting Officer did not support this submission point and recommended it be rejected. He considered that although there is a connection between Objective 2.3.2, Policy 2.3.2.2, Objective 2.4.3 and Policy 2.4.3.4 and the University of Otago appeals, the reference to these objectives and policies in assessment rules in the Campus Zone will not undermine or frustrate the *University of Otago* achieving the relief sought in its appeals.
61. He also described that as a result of resolving other appeals to the 2GP, it had been decided to amend how strategic directions are referenced in assessment rules to include revised headings called 'Relevant objectives and policies (priority considerations)' and 'Related strategic directions'. To ensure consistency with how strategic directions are referenced in other parts of the 2GP, he recommended that this approach is also followed in the Campus Zone.

3.7.4 Decisions and reasons

62. We reject the *University of Otago (750231-OS-Change 1.59)* submission to retain the original 2GP text (and not reference policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.4.3.4 and objectives 2.3.2 and 2.4.3 in assessment rules) and agree with the Reporting Officer that Change 1.59 will not undermine or frustrate the University of Otago achieving the relief sought in its appeals.
63. We also agree with the Reporting Officers recommendation to amend how strategic directions are referenced in assessment rules in the Campus Zone to include revised headings called 'Relevant objectives and policies (priority considerations)' and 'Related strategic directions'. We agree that it is beneficial for Plan users to ensure consistency with how strategic directions are referenced in other parts of the 2GP. In reaching this view we note the submitter did not attend the hearing to respond to the reporting officer's recommendation on this matter.
64. Amendments to the assessment rules in the Campus Zone (Rule 34.11.2 and Rule 34.12.2), are shown in Appendix 1.

3.8 Rules that apply to pedestrian street frontage mapped areas (Change 1.60)

3.8.1 Submission

65. The *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.60)* sought amendments to Rule 18.6.16.1.b and c (Setback from road boundaries). The amendment sought to Rule 18.6.16.1.b was to refer to 'new buildings and additions and alterations to buildings', instead of 'new buildings or additions and alterations to buildings' to be consistent with how other rules that apply to these two activities are drafted. The amendment to Rule 18.6.16.1.c was to refer to 'road boundary' instead of 'street frontage' as it is a specific location from which measurements to buildings can be taken and it is defined in the 2GP.

3.8.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

66. The Reporting Officer supported the amendments sought by *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.60)* because they are minor in nature and will improve the clarity of this rule.

3.8.3 Decisions and reasons

67. We accept *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.60)* submission to amend Rule 18.6.16.1.b and c (Setback from road boundaries) as we consider that the changes sought are minor in nature and will improve the clarity of Rule 18.6.16.1. Setback from road boundaries.
68. Amendments to Rule 18.6.16.1. Setback from road boundaries, are shown in Appendix 1.

3.9 Land between Hartstonge Avenue, Reid Avenue and Factory Road (Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)

3.9.1 Submission

69. The *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)* sought to; 'Change the zoning of the land between Hartstonge Avenue, Reid Avenue and Factory Road from General Residential 1 to General Residential 2 and include within the Mosgiel Infrastructure Constraint Mapped Area and Mosgiel Mapped Area.'
70. The *Dunedin City Council* identified an error in the Section 32 Report (Figure 9, page 129) and in the 2GP Planning Map, which will be corrected by the submission.

3.9.2 Recommendations in Section 42A Report

71. The Reporting Officer supported *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)* because it was a minor mapping amendment which corrects an error in zoning.

3.9.3 Decisions and reasons

72. We accept the *Dunedin City Council (750356-OS-Change 1.64 and Change 1.65)* submission to rezone and agree with the reasons of the submitter and the Reporting Officer that the changes sought are minor in nature.

APPENDIX 1 – AMENDMENTS TO THE DECISION VERSION OF THE 2GP (2018) AS A RESULT OF DECISIONS ON SUBMISSIONS TO VARIATION 1

1 AMENDMENTS TO FAMILY FLATS – DESIGN PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION 750356-OS-CHANGE 1.3)

Amend the Family Flats – Design performance standards in the residential, rural and rural residential zones (Rules 15.5.14.2, 16.5.14.2 and 17.5.13.2 respectively), as follows:

15.5.14.2 Family Flats – Design

a. Family flats must:

- i. ...;
 - ii. ...;
 - iii. be on the same household electricity account; and
 - iv. share the same ~~vehicle access~~ driveway as the primary residential unit.
- b. Standard residential activity that contravenes this performance standard is a restricted discretionary activity.

16.5.14.2 Family Flats - Design

a. Family flats must:

- i. ...;
 - ii. ...;
 - iii. be on the same household electricity account;
 - iv. share the same ~~vehicle access~~ driveway as the primary residential unit; and
 - v.
- b. Standard residential activity that contravenes this performance standard is a restricted discretionary activity.

Rule 17.5.13.2 Family Flat - Design

a. Family flats must:

- i. ...;
 - ii. ...;
 - iii. be on the same household electricity account;
 - iv. share the same ~~vehicle access~~ driveway as the primary residential unit; and
 - v.
- b. Standard Residential activity that contravenes this performance standard is a restricted discretionary activity.

2 AMENDMENTS TO RULE 15.6.1. BUILDING LENGTH (DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION 750356-OS-CHANGE 1.32)

Amend Rule 15.6.1. Building Length as follows:

1. ~~New buildings and additions and alterations to buildings must not result in a building with a continuous dimension (building length) that is greater than 20m measured parallel to boundaries, except along any boundary length where the building shares the wall with the adjacent building any wall with a continuous length that is greater than 20m, if the wall is visible, in full or in part, from an adjoining public place.~~
2. ~~Except that this standard does not apply where the wall is shared with a building on an adjoining site.~~
3. ~~2.~~ For the purposes of this rule, the length of walls will be measured parallel to the boundary of the site.
4. ~~3.~~ For the purposes of this rule, a 'continuous length' will be measured as follows for walls that modulate: where modulation involves a step-back of 1 metre or more in depth it will be counted as a new wall, but where modulation is less than 1 metre in depth it will be considered a continuous length.
5. ~~4.~~ New buildings and additions and alterations that contravene this standard are restricted discretionary activities.

3 AMENDMENTS TO RULE 18.6.1 BOUNDARY TREATMENTS AND OTHER LANDSCAPING AND RULE 19.6.1 BOUNDARY TREATMENTS (THE OIL COMPANIES SUBMISSIONS 750659-OS - CHANGE 1.37 AND CHANGE 138)

Amend clause 1 of Rule 18.6.1 Boundary Treatments and Other Landscaping, as follows:

1. New buildings, additions and alterations that increase the gross floor area of a building, demolition or removal for relocation of buildings and new or additions to parking areas must provide, if not already present, a A landscaping area with a minimum width of 1.5m must be provided along the full length of any road boundary that does not have a building within 1.5m of that boundary (except for where vehicle access is provided), except that this standard does not apply where:
 - a. The building subject to demolition or removal for relocation is not visible from the street frontage.
2. ...

Amend clause 1 of Rule 19.6.1 Boundary Treatments, as follows:

1. New buildings, additions and alterations that increase the gross floor area of a building, demolition or removal for relocation of buildings and new or additions to parking areas must provide a A landscaping area with a minimum width of 3m must be provided along the full length of any road frontage that is identified as an amenity route mapped area (except for where existing or permitted vehicle access is provided), except that this standard does not apply where:
 - a. The building subject to demolition or removal for relocation is not visible from the street frontage.

2. Landscaping areas must:

a. ...

4 AMENDMENTS TO NOTE 18.6.8A OTHER RELEVANT DISTRICT PLAN PROVISIONS (THE OIL COMPANIES SUBMISSION 750659-OS – CHANGE 1.41)

Amend clause 2 of Note 18.6.8A Other relevant District Plan provisions, so that it reads as follows:

2. New or additions to parking areas are also subject to Rule 18.6.1 Boundary treatments and other landscaping.

5 AMENDMENTS TO RULE 34.6.6.1.B HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY (DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION 750356-OS-CHANGE 1.47)

Amend Rule 34.6.6.1.b Height in relation to boundary, as follows:

a. ...

b. ~~At the boundary of the Campus Zone along road frontages, On a site not used for standard residential activity, and where the Campus Zone boundary is within the adjoining road or on the road boundary of the site, all other~~ new buildings and additions and alterations to buildings or structures along road frontages must not protrude through a plane rising at an angle of 30 degrees from a starting point 12m vertically above ground level measured at the zone boundary of the Campus Zone, except:

- i. gable ends or dormers may protrude through the height in relation to boundary angle by a maximum of 1m (see Figure 15.6.6.1F); and
- ii. rooftop structures are exempt from the performance standard for height in relation to boundary.

c. ...

6 AMENDMENTS TO THE ASSESSMENT RULES IN THE CAMPUS ZONE (RULE 34.11.2 AND RULE 34.12.2) (DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION 750356-OS-CHANGE 1.59)

Amend Rule 34.11.2 Assessment of discretionary land use activities - Office (other than campus-affiliated office and registered health practitioners), in the Campus Zone, as shown below:

34.11.2 Assessment of discretionary land use activities		Guidance on the assessment of resources consents
Activity		
1.	Office (other than campus-affiliated office and registered health practitioners) Restaurants not ancillary to campus Supported living facilities (other than student hostels).	<p><i>Relevant objectives and policies (priority considerations):</i></p> <p>Objective 2.3.1 Objective 34.2.1 Restaurants not ancillary to campus activity, office (other than campus affiliated office and registered health practitioners) and supported living facilities (other than student hostels): are related to, or are necessary to support campus activity, or have other operational requirements which mean they need to locate in this zone; and support the efficient and effective operation of campus activity; and are not more appropriately located in another zone in line with Objective 2.3.2 and its policies; and are designed and operated in line with Objective 34.2.2 and its policies (Policy 34.2.1.5).</p> <p><u><i>Related strategic directions:</i></u></p> <p><u>Objective 2.3.2 and Policy 2.3.2.2</u> <u>Objective 2.4.3 and Policy 2.4.3.4</u></p> <p><i>Potential circumstances that may support a consent application include:</i></p> <p>d.f. ...</p>

Amend Rule 34.12.2.1 Assessment of all non-complying activities - All non-complying activities in the Campus Zone, as follows:

34.12.2 Assessment of all non-complying activities		Guidance on the assessment of resources consents
Activity		
1.	All non-complying activities	<p><i>Relevant objectives and policies (priority considerations):</i></p> <p>a. The activity does not detract from, or preferably contributes to, the strategic directions objectives, including, but not limited to, those related to: Dunedin has a hierarchy of vibrant centres anchored around one Central Business District (CBD), which provides a focus for economic and employment growth, driven by: attraction of businesses to these areas based on the high level of amenity and density of activity in the area; opportunities for social interaction, exchange of ideas and business cooperation; public investment in public amenities and other infrastructure in the CBD; and opportunities for agglomeration benefits from the co-location of activities (Objective 2.3.2).</p> <p>b. The activity is compatible with the operation of campus activity or is not most appropriately located in another zone (Policy 34.2.1.6).</p> <p><i>Related strategic directions:</i></p> <p><u>c. Objective 2.4.3 and Policy 2.4.3.4</u></p> <p><i>Potential circumstances that may support a consent application include:</i></p> <p>e. <u>d.</u> ...</p>

7 AMENDMENTS TO RULE 18.6.16.1.B AND C SETBACK FROM ROAD BOUNDARIES (DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL SUBMISSION 750356-OS-CHANGE 1.60)

Amend Rule 18.6.16.1.b and c Setback from road boundaries, as follows

18.6.16.1 Setback from road boundaries

a. ...

- b. New buildings and additions and alterations to buildings must be built within 400mm of any road boundary that is a **secondary pedestrian street frontage mapped area** for 60% of the length of the **secondary pedestrian street frontage mapped area**, except a setback of up to 1.5m for a maximum width of 3m may be provided to allow for a recessed pedestrian entrance.
- c. On a **secondary pedestrian street frontage mapped area**, any part of a building not built within 400mm of the ~~street frontage~~ road boundary, must be set back a minimum of 1.5m from the street frontage, in order to meet Rule 18.6.1.
- d. Activities that contravene this performance standard are restricted discretionary activities.

8 AMENDMENTS TO LAND BETWEEN HARTSTONGE AVENUE, REID AVENUE AND FACTORY ROAD (CHANGE 1.64 AND CHANGE 1.65)

