

below seeks to summarise and simplify community sentiment in relation to the broader question of whether each Future takes South Dunedin in the right direction?

Future	Takes South Dunedin in the right direction			Net Score ²	Rank
	Disagree	Neutral/unsure	Agree		
1	73%	13%	15%	-79.07	7th
2	35%	13%	51%	17.57	2nd
3	33%	18%	48%	12.46	4th
4	25%	16%	59%	39.39	1st
5	34%	18%	48%	13.00	3rd
6	37%	16%	47%	9.36	5th
7	47%	15%	38%	-13.24	6th

Table 1 – Community feedback: Does this Future take South Dunedin in the right direction?

- 25 Some key themes or takeaways from these results include:
- Future 1 – Status quo (keep doing what we are doing) was the least supported, with 73% of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that it would take South Dunedin in the right direction. Many respondents commented that this Future lacks ambition, would result in wasted investments, and no long-term effectiveness. This feedback suggests a strong public mandate for change from the current approach.
 - Future 4 – Space for water (waterways and wetlands) was the most preferred overall, with 59% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that it would take South Dunedin in the right direction. It was also viewed as being the most well-balanced and cost-effective approach, though there was concern about high residual flood risk.
 - Future 7 – Let water in (large scale retreat) was the only other Future to receive a negative net score, with 47% of respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that it would take South Dunedin in the right direction. It was viewed as being very disruptive, expensive, and the displacement would have negative impacts on community wellbeing and inequality. That said, some felt it was the most sensible long-term solution.
 - Futures 2, 3, 5, and 6 received mixed support, though all had positive net scores (between +17.57 and +9.36), indicating respondents saw a range of merits in these different approaches. This suggests an openness from community and stakeholders to different approaches for managing risk and adapting to the impacts of climate change.
- 26 No single Future stood out as strongly providing choice about where people live, although Futures 2, 3, and 4 were seen as offering more flexibility in that regard. Futures 1, 6, and 7 were viewed as offering limited choice.
- 27 When asked how each Future might impact quality of life, most respondents thought Futures 1–5 would lead to life staying about the same. Futures 4 and 5 had a significant number of respondents expecting some improvement in quality of life. Futures 6 and 7 were largely seen as likely to significantly reduce quality of life.

² Net scores were calculated by applying the following factors to each of the six potential responses (strongly disagree [-1.5], disagree [-1.0], neutral or unsure [0.0], agree [+1.0], strongly agree [+1.5]), summing the totals, and then combining the six responses to three simpler categories.

- 28 When asked a more direct question about which Future respondents felt we should be aiming for, Futures 2 (27%) and 4 (29%) were most preferred; while Futures 1 (2%) and 3 (7%) were least preferred. While this more direct line of questioning resulted in Futures 4 and 1 retaining their positions as most and least preferred respectively, results for other Futures varied.
- 29 Two prominent themes emerged in the feedback across all futures, including that council should build more infrastructure in the short term, to reduce present day flood risk, and that stakeholders wanted more information about any potential managed retreat process, including in regard to location, timing, and policy and process for property buy-outs.

Tolerance of flooding

- 30 A series of questions were asked to understand respondent's experiences with flooding and whether they had been affected before, how often flooding occurs, and under what circumstances. Respondents were also asked when they believe South Dunedin might become 'unliveable' due to flooding. These questions were aimed at better understanding tolerance for flooding, which helps inform design of potential adaptation actions, for example, seeking to limit flooding in buildings to once every 50 years (versus shorter or longer timeframes).
- 31 Respondents had the least tolerance for flood water entering their homes, with 83% of the 270 responses indicating that South Dunedin would become 'unliveable' if flood water entered their homes (with responses spanning periods from 1-50 years). Almost 20% of respondents indicated their home had previously flooded. Most respondents said that flood water ponding on their lawn, local sports fields, and in public car parking areas would never make South Dunedin unliveable – suggesting increased tolerance of 'nuisance' flooding, but clear intolerance of flooding entering homes.

Who should help pay?

- 32 When asked who should help pay to fund South Dunedin's future, most respondents selected Central Government (24%) and Local Government (22%). This was followed by property developers (15%), and Dunedin residents and businesses (13%). Respondents had the option of selecting multiple answers.
- 33 When asked whether they would support rates increases to reduce flooding, responses varied:
- a) if rates were the only source of funding, 50% of respondents said they would support a 10% rates increase and 10% supported a 25% increase, while 26% said they would not support any increase; however
 - b) if rates were to cover the full cost, support dropped, with 39% of respondents supporting a 10% rates increase and 18% supporting a 25% increase, while 30% said they would not support any increase.
- 34 These results suggest that while many respondents are open to contributing through rates, support is higher when costs are shared more broadly.

Targeted stakeholder engagement

- 35 In addition to public surveys, workshops, and drop-in sessions, a series of targeted engagements were undertaken with key sectors, including infrastructure providers, financial institutions, property stakeholders, government agencies, and community representatives. These stakeholders brought specific insights based on commercial interests, operational responsibilities, asset holdings, or community services and connections.

of adaptation actions, and the resulting residual risk (i.e. risk remaining even after various adaptation actions have been implemented).

- 43 The modelling will inform further technical and economic analysis and enable development of pathways for each of the three shortlisted Futures. These pathways will show anticipated change at different intervals, likely periods of 25 years, including at 2050, 2075, 2100 and beyond. The shortlisted Futures will include more detailed information on the useful life of adaptation actions, linking together different actions such as infrastructure investment, creating green space, and potential managed retreat, into viable pathways, where changes in approach result from pre-agreed signals and triggers, so change only occurs if or when necessary to manage risk.
- 44 The fully-developed shortlist of potential adaptation futures for South Dunedin is expected to be completed in late-2025 and presented to Councils in early-2026.

Signatories

Author:	Jonathan Rowe - Programme Manager, South Dunedin Future
Authoriser:	Scott MacLean - General Manager, Climate and City Growth

Attachments

	Title	Page
↓A	South Dunedin Future Engagement Report – Stage 4 Engagement: 7 Potential Adaptation Futures for South Dunedin	79
↓B	SDF Programme Overview A3	183

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Fit with purpose of Local Government

This decision enables democratic local decision making and action by, and on behalf of communities. This decision promotes the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities in the present and for the future.

Fit with strategic framework

	Contributes	Detracts	Not applicable
Social Wellbeing Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environment Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts and Culture Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Waters Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Future Development Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrated Transport Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Recreation Strategy	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other strategic projects/policies/plans	✓	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The SDF Programme is a horizontal initiative, working across a range of strategies, groups, and budgets.

Māori Impact Statement

Accurately reflecting and integrating the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and Crown’s partnership with Māori, is a central element of the SDF Programme.

Sustainability

Sustainability will be a central component of the SDF Programme as it seeks to develop climate change adaptation options for South Dunedin over short-, medium- and long-term timeframes. This work will be integrated with the wider climate change work programme, including aligning with DCC’s Emissions Management and Reduction Plan 2022 and Zero Carbon Plan 2023.

Zero carbon

Adapting to the impacts of climate change in South Dunedin has the potential to materially increase or decrease both city-wide and DCC emissions, depending on the adaptation option selected. The criteria for assessing each potential adaptation future includes carbon emissions and waste, meaning options that act to reduce emissions will receive more positive assessments (for that specific criteria).

LTP/Annual Plan / Financial Strategy /Infrastructure Strategy

The SDF programme has dedicated resourcing in the current 9-year plan (2025-2034). Selected activities that result from the SDF programme, including mid-scale and medium-term investments in 3 waters infrastructure (for example), are also included in the 9YP. It is anticipated that the adaptation master plan for South Dunedin, scheduled for completion in December 2026, will inform a range of strategic land use-, finance-, and infrastructure-related decisions for South Dunedin as part of future 10-year planning processes.

Financial considerations

The cost of the SDF programme is fully budgeted for within the existing SDF programme budget. No decisions have been made about funding for potential adaptation work that may arise from the SDF programme.

SUMMARY OF CONSIDERATIONS

Significance

This issue is considered high in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy. Community engagement is and will continue to be a central element of the SDF Programme, and extensive engagement is planned in future stages, in accordance programme plan and with relevance council polices.

Engagement – external

Extensive external engagement has been undertaken with a range of partners, stakeholders, and affected communities on the topics covered in this paper. Mana whenua have partnered with SDF throughout the development of the programme. Engagement has included (but is not limited to): central government departments, state owned enterprises, crown research institutes; private sector organisations and industry groups; community groups and affected communities.

Engagement - internal

A large number of internal individuals, teams, and departments across DCC and ORC have been engaged in development of the SDF programme strategy and related work described in this report.

Risks: Legal / Health and Safety etc.

There are no anticipated legal or health and safety risks associated with this report. Risks relating to the SDF Programme are described in this or previous Council reports.

Conflict of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest identified.

Community Boards

Community Boards have not been directly involved with the development of this report; however, all Community Boards have an interest in climate adaptation.