



SECOND GENERATION DISTRICT PLAN

Variation 2 – Additional Housing Capacity

Section 32 Report

Appendices

February 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.1 Appendix 1 - 2GP Objectives and Policies referenced in Section 32 Report (December 2020)
- 1.2 Appendix 2 - DCC 3 Waters Memorandum on rule changes (December 2020)
- 1.3 Appendix 3 - General Residential 1 Assessment of Effects on Residential Character and Amenity (January 2021)
- 1.4 Appendix 4 - Sites assessed for rezoning but not included in final proposal (December 2020)
- 1.5 Appendix 5 - Site Assessment Criteria Table (December 2020)
- 1.6 Appendix 6 - Site Assessments
- 1.7 Appendix 7 - DCC Memorandum from Landscape Architect (January 2020)
- 1.8 Appendix 8 - DCC Memorandum from DCC Biodiversity Advisor (November 2020)
- 1.9 Appendix 9 - Medium density character assessments (January 2021)
- 1.10 Appendix 10 - 2GP Map Amendments (January 2021)



SECOND GENERATION DISTRICT PLAN

Variation 2 – Additional Housing Capacity

Section 32 Report

Appendix 5

Site Assessment Criteria Table

February 2021

Table of Contents

Slope.....	1
Aspect – Solar Access.....	1
Accessibility – public transport	1
Accessibility - Centres	2
Accessibility – Schools.....	2
Rural character/visual amenity	2
Impacts on productive rural land.....	3
Reverse sensitivity	4
Significant indigenous biodiversity	4
Natural landscapes and natural coastal character	5
Access to the coast and water bodies.....	5
Significant Trees, heritage items, important vistas or viewshafts, important green	6
Residential character and amenity	7
Natural Hazards	7
Potable water supply	8
Wastewater supply	9
Stormwater management.....	10
Transport effects (local)	11
Transport effects (wider network).....	11
Compact city – proximity to existing residential areas.....	12
Compact city - ability to develop land efficiently	12
Effects on Manawhenua values	13
Issues for:	13
Other constraints on development (encumbrances, owner aspirations, appeals)	13
Feasibility for MD development - lower quality housing stock more likely to be developed	14
Feasibility for MD development - market desirability	15

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
Slope	Objective 2.6.2 Policy 2.6.2.1.c.i Policy 2.6.2.3.d	Sites were assessed based on their average slope.	No issues	Flat or gently sloping.		
			Some issues	Slope likely to reduce yield over site.		
			Significant issues	Likely to be challenging to develop.		
Aspect – Solar Access	Policy 2.6.2.3.d.ii (proposed Medium density areas)	Sites were assessed based on their dominant aspect.	Very good	Flat or generally north facing.		
			Good	Generally east or west facing.		
			Ok	Generally south facing and average slope less than 7°.		
			Poor	Generally south facing and average slope greater than 7°.		
Accessibility – public transport	Objective 2.2.2 Policy 2.6.2.1.c.iii Policy 2.6.2.3.c.ii	Sites were assessed based on their distance to a bus stop.	Very good	400m or less to a high frequency bus stop or 200m or less to any other bus stop.	In relation to potential medium density areas, this criterion also reflects the NPS-UD requirement in Policy 5, which requires consideration of accessibility by active or public transport to commercial services in relation to providing for density of urban form.	
			Good	400-800m to a high frequency bus stop or 200-400m to any other bus stop.		
			Ok	800m-1.2km to a high frequency bus stop or 400-800m to any other bus stop.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
			Poor	Over 1.2km to a high frequency bus stop and over 800m to any other bus stop.		
Accessibility - Centres	Objective 2.2.2 Policy 2.6.2.1.c.ii Policy 2.6.2.3.c.ii	Sites were assessed based on their distance to a centre, including the centre hierarchy (e.g. whether a principal centre, suburban centre, or another centre).	Very good	400m or less to a principal/suburban centre or 200 or less to any other centre.	In relation to potential medium density areas, this criterion also reflects the NPS-UD requirement in Policy 5, which requires consideration of accessibility by active or public transport to commercial services in relation to providing for density of urban form.	
			Good	400 - 800m to a principal/suburban centre or 200-400m to any other centre.		
			Ok	800m - 1.2km to a principal/suburban centre or 400-800m to any other centre.		
			Poor	Over 1.2km to a principal/suburban centre and over 800m to any other centre.		
Accessibility – Schools	Objective 2.2.2 Policy 2.6.2.1.c.ii, v Policy 2.6.2.3.c.ii	Areas were assessed based on the distance to the nearest primary school.	Very good	Primary school within 2km.		
			Good	Primary school within 2-5km.		
			Poor	Primary school over 5km away.		
Rural character/visual amenity	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ii Objective 2.4.6	A site visit was undertaken.	No issues	No or minor effects on rural amenity and character.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
			Some issues	Some local impacts but overall minor effects at a broader scale.		
			Moderate issues	Moderate impacts on rural character and amenity.		
			Significant issues	Significant impacts on rural character / amenity.		
Impacts on productive rural land	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.i Objective 2.3.1 Policy 2.3.1.2	A high-level cost benefit analysis was undertaken for sites assessed as having highly productive land (HPL) or mapped as having high class soils. ¹ A site visit and knowledge of nearby activities was used to assess whether there were highly productive rural activities nearby.	No issues	No highly productive land (HPL).		
			Some issues	HPL with relatively small loss of primary productive capacity compared to housing gains.		
			Moderate issues	HPL with moderate loss of primary productive capacity compared to housing gains.		
			Significant issues	HPL with significant loss of primary productive capacity compared to housing gains.		

¹ Dunedin Productive Land Cost Benefit Analysis (Property Economics and Beca, November 2020). Note that this analysis also includes several appeal sites that are not within the scope of Variation 2.

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
Reverse sensitivity	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.i Objective 2.3.1	Overlap with specific mapped areas and designations on the 2GP plan maps were considered. In addition, a site visit and knowledge of nearby activities was used to identify other possible reverse sensitivity issues. Consultation with KiwiRail was undertaken in relation to proximity to the rail corridor.	No issues			Existing 2GP performance standards around setbacks and acoustic insulation.
			Some issues (manageable)	Proximity to a road, railway or scheduled mining activity.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Overlap with a 2GP Hazard Facility mapped area, Radio Transmission mapped area, Invermay Farm mapped area, Dunedin Airport noise area, Taieri Aerodrome flight fan, or being within 12m of the National Grid.		
Significant indigenous biodiversity	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.iii Objective 2.2.3 Policy 2.2.3.5	A desktop and/or site assessment was undertaken by DCC's Biodiversity Officer in relation to all sites ² . Overlap with an ASBV or Urban Biodiversity mapped	No issues	No / low biodiversity values.		Exclude existing ASBV and UBMA mapped areas. Apply an ASBV where sites meet the relevant criteria or (for small,
			Some issues (manageable)	Site has areas of biodiversity worthy of protection but that do not meet ASBV or UBMA criteria.		

² 2GP Variation 2 s32 Appendix 8 - Memorandum from DCC Biodiversity Advisor, 30 November 2020.

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
		area (UBMA) was considered a significant issue.	Significant issues (manageable)	Site overlaps an ASBV or UBMA or contains limited areas meeting ASBV / UBMA criteria.		discrete areas), use a structure plan mapped area rule to manage vegetation clearance.
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Significant part of site overlaps an ASBV or UBMA or contains areas meeting ASBV / UBMA criteria.		For other areas of biodiversity identified as being worthy as protection, use a structure plan mapped area rule to manage vegetation clearance.
Natural landscapes and natural coastal character	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.iv Policy 2.6.1.2.d.v Objective 2.4.4 Objective 2.2.5	Areas were assessed based on overlap with a mapped landscape or coastal character area (ONF, ONL, SNL, HCC, NCC).	No issues	No overlap with landscape or coastal character area.		Exclude mapped landscape and coastal character overlay zones.
			Significant issues (manageable)	Overlap with landscape or coastal character area, able to be excluded from rezoning area.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Significant overlap with landscape or coastal character area.		
Access to the coast and water bodies	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.vi Objective 10.2.4	Areas were assessed based on whether the site adjoined the coast or contained a water body.	No issues	Not by coast or water body.		Existing 2GP rules require subdivision activities along the bank of a water
			Some issues (manageable)	By coast / water body, access can be maintained.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
		Mapped esplanade reserve areas are noted.	Significant issues (manageable)	By coast / water body, access can be maintained.		body with an esplanade strip mapped area to provide an esplanade strip of a minimum width of 20m.
			Significant issues (not manageable)	By coast / water body, access cannot be maintained.		Access to other waterbodies can be considered through the subdivision resource consent process.
Significant Trees, heritage items, important vistas or viewshafts, important green or open spaces	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.vii Objective 2.4.1. Policy 2.4.1.7	Overlap with a scheduled heritage site, archaeological site, heritage precinct, scheduled tree or scheduled heritage building/structure was considered. A site visit was undertaken to assess other amenity aspects.	No issues	No relevant features.	Note that there are no important viewshafts or vistas identified in the 2GP.	Existing 2GP rules require resource consent for activities affecting scheduled trees and scheduled heritage buildings.
			Some issues (manageable)	Presence of a small number of scheduled trees or heritage buildings.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Presence of a number of scheduled trees or heritage buildings, or an important green space, but impacts can be managed.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Many / significant features, impacts not manageable.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
Residential character and amenity	Policy 2.6.2.3.c.iii.5 Objective 2.4.1 (Medium density sites)	For potential new medium density areas, assessment of the impacts of intensification on residential character was undertaken (see Appendix 9).	No issues	Area can absorb intensification without significant effects on existing character.		Existing 2GP rules require consent for new development of 3 or more residential units to manage effects on streetscape amenity and character. Design guides are proposed to be developed to assist the design of new buildings. Areas that may be significantly impacted by GR2 intensification have been excluded from rezoning.
			Some issues (manageable)			
			Significant issues (manageable)			
			Significant issues (not manageable)			
Natural Hazards	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.vii Objective 11.2.1	Overlap with a mapped hazard area in the 2GP (including the hazard type and category), old landfills mapped as a HAIL site, or other mapped HAIL sites, was considered.	No issues	No or low risk hazards only.		Areas of high hazard were either excluded from rezoning, or a structure plan mapped area applied, with a rule
			Some issues (manageable)	Medium risk hazards, but manageable.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	High risk hazards, but manageable.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
		A site-specific hazards assessment was also undertaken ³ . This categorised sites as having either low, medium or high level hazard.	Significant issues (not manageable)	High risk hazards, not manageable.		requiring a hazard assessment as part of the subdivision assessment and preventing development prior to that taking place. Existing 2GP rules impose additional restrictions or consent requirements in relation to earthworks, development and/or residential land use in identified hazard overlays.
Potable water supply	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ix Objective 2.7.1 Policy 2.7.1.1	An assessment was undertaken of the ability and cost to service the site for potable water. Where servicing was not possible (outside DCC's serviced area or insufficient capacity in the network), an	No issues	Site can be readily serviced	The assessment made for self-servicing considered rainfall events and relied on standard assumptions of roof area and tank volume (25m ³).	Self-servicing is required where a site cannot be serviced. In parts of the city, water restrictions
			Some issues (manageable)	Minor or moderate upgrades required and included in draft 10 year plan; or outside DCC service area and can feasibly be self-serviced		

³ Memorandums from Stantec: Re-zoning – Group 1 Hazards, August 26 2020; Re-zoning Group 2 Hazards, September 3 2020; Re-zoning - Additional Sites Hazards, October 28 2020.

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
		assessment was undertaken as to whether self-servicing would be possible and appropriate.	Significant issues (manageable)	Significant upgrades required and included in draft 10 year plan; or cannot be serviced and can feasibly be self-serviced.		may be required to manage dry periods.
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Significant upgrades required but not funded; or cannot be serviced or feasibly be self-serviced.		
Wastewater supply	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ix Objective 2.7.1 Policy 2.7.1.1	An assessment was undertaken of the ability and cost to service the site for wastewater. Where servicing was not possible, an assessment was undertaken as to whether self-servicing is possible and appropriate.	No issues	Site can be readily serviced.		Self-servicing is possible in Large Lot residential zones and un-serviced township and settlement zones. for self; -serviced sites, a 'No DCC reticulated wastewater mapped area' will be applied. An assessment rule requiring use of communal wastewater detention is proposed for some sites. These are limited to sites /
			Some issues (manageable)	Minor or moderate upgrades required and included in draft 10 year plan.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Significant upgrades required and included in draft 10 year plan or impacts can be managed (detention tank or self-servicing).		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Significant upgrades required but not funded; and impacts cannot be managed through detention tank or self-servicing.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
						areas that can provide a minimum of 50 houses, to minimise ongoing maintenance costs (see also Change F3-2).
Stormwater management	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ix Objective 2.7.1 Policy 2.7.1.1	An assessment was undertaken of the ability and cost to service the site for stormwater.	No issues	No issues, no management required.	Known flooding issues and a lack of information in some areas in relation to the capacity of downstream stormwater infrastructure / channels means that many sites will be required to attenuate stormwater so that post development peak run-off does not exceed pre-development.	An assessment rule requiring preparation of stormwater management plan for new greenfield areas, to demonstrate how stormwater run-off will be managed / attenuated is proposed (see also Change F2-2). Application of a stormwater mapped area for new GR2 areas where the stormwater network is constrained (see also Change F2-7).
			Some issues (manageable)	Some issues, management required.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Significant issues, management possible.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Significant issues, management not possible.		
	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.x		No issues	No upgrades required		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
Transport effects (local)	Objective 2.7.1 Policy 2.7.1.1 Objective 2.7.2	An assessment was undertaken of effects on the road network and any likely roading upgrades required. Consultation was undertaken with NZTA. Any required (or undesirable) roading connections were considered.	Some issues (manageable)	Minor upgrades required or issues to be considered at time of subdivision.	Transportation upgrades needed to service growth areas are proposed to be included in the 2024 10 year plan.	Rules in structure plan mapped area regarding transport connections. Private development agreements to provide site specific transport infrastructure.
			Significant issues (manageable)	Moderate / significant upgrades required / issues to be resolved, can be managed.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Moderate / significant upgrades required / issues to be resolved, cannot be managed.		
Transport effects (wider network)	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.x Objective 2.7.1 Policy 2.7.1.1 Objective 2.7.2	A high level assessment was undertaken of effects on the road network considering clusters of sites together, including sites that are no longer proposed for rezoning. This identified issues that may be dependant, to some extent, on the final number of sites developed within an area. Further investigation will be required at the time of subdivision. Consultation was undertaken with NZTA.	No issues	No upgrades required.	Transportation upgrades to service growth areas are proposed to be included in the 2024 10 year plan. NZTA identified in interest in the impact of zoning on the state highway network, particularly on the functioning of particular intersections. It is acknowledged that development, particularly cumulative development in some areas, will affect levels of service at some intersections. This may	
			Some issues (manageable)	Minor upgrades required or issues to be considered at time of subdivision.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Moderate / significant upgrades required / issues to be resolved, can be managed.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Moderate / significant upgrades required / issues to be resolved, cannot be managed.		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
					result in the need for intersection upgrades in some areas. These have been identified as significant issues but are assumed to be manageable.	
Compact city – proximity to existing residential areas	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.xi, Policy 2.6.2.1.d.vii.6 Policy 2.6.2.3.c.iii.6 Objective 2.2.4	The proximity of greenfield areas to existing residential zoning was considered.	No issues	Site is currently residential, or contiguous to residential zoned land and reflects an appropriate extension of the residential area.	Note that other factors assessed above (e.g. proximity to public transport and centres) are also relevant considerations in determining the overall consistency with this objective.	
			Significant issues	Site does not meet above criteria.		
Compact city - ability to develop land efficiently	Policy 2.6.2.1.d.xi Policy 2.6.2.3.c.iii.6 Objective 2.2.4	An estimate of the overall number of feasible sites and the type (density) of zoning that could be achieved, was considered.	Very good	Feasible capacity 50 sites or more GR1 or GR2 density.	Note that other factors assessed above (e.g. proximity to public transport and centres) are also relevant considerations in determining the overall consistency with this objective.	
			Good	Feasible capacity from 25 - 49 sites GR1 or GR2 density.		
			Ok	Feasible capacity up to 25 sites GR1 or GR2 density.		
			Poor	Cannot be developed at GR1 or GR2 density (Large lot density required).		
	Objective 2.5.1		No issues	No issues		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
Effects on Manawhenua values	Policy 2.5.1.2	Areas were assessed based on consultation with Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou and Kati Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki.				Exclude wāhi tupuna areas of concern from rezoning areas.
			Some issues (manageable)	Overlap with a wāhi tupuna site.		
			Significant issues (manageable)	Site will be self-serviced for wastewater in proximity to a waterbody, effects can be managed.		
			Significant issues (not manageable)	Effects cannot be managed.		
Issues for: - network utility operators - Southern District Health Board - Ministry for Education - Fire and Emergency New Zealand - KiwiRail	NPS-UD	Consultation was undertaken with Aurora, OtagoNet, Chorus, 2 degrees, Spark, Vodaphone, Southern District Health Board and Ministry of Education and Fire and Emergency New Zealand.	No issues			Existing 2GP rules require acoustic insulation within 70m of railway lines, and setbacks from network utilities for earthworks.
			Some issues (manageable)			
			Significant issues (manageable)			
			Significant issues (not manageable)			
Other constraints on development	Objective 2.6.2	The certificates of title for sites in potential new	No issues			
			Some issues (manageable)			

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
(encumbrances, owner aspirations, appeals)		residential areas (greenfield sites) were examined for to identify constraints or encumbrances that may affect development. The degree of existing development of rural residential areas was considered, as this may affect the ability for conversion to residential development. Landowner wishes in regards to future development were considered.	Significant issues (manageable)			
			Significant issues (not manageable)			
Feasibility for MD development - lower quality housing stock more likely to be developed	Policy 2.6.2.3.d (medium density)	The proportion of houses in an area built before 1950, and/or with a value less below the lower quartile house value in Dunedin.	Very good	> 60% of area pre-1950 housing, or worth less than Dunedin lower quartile house.		
			Good	30-60% of area pre-1950 housing, or worth less than Dunedin lower quartile house.		
			Ok	10-30% of area pre-1950 housing, or worth less than Dunedin lower quartile house.		
			Poor	<10% of area pre-1950 housing, or worth less		

Criteria being assessed	Relevant objective / policy	How measured and evaluated	Scoring key	Explanation of scoring key	Comment	Options for managing issues that arise
				than Dunedin lower quartile house.		
Feasibility for MD development - market desirability	Policy 2.6.2.3.d (medium density)	Results from the housing preferences survey were used to assess market desirability of areas for smaller households.	Very good	Area located in the inner or outer suburbs.		
			Good	Area located in Mosgiel.		