7

ATTACHMENT 7

Dunedin City Council Pre-Application Consultation Feedback

Karen Bain, Associate Senior Planner, Dunedin City Council

DUNEDIN CITY COUNCIL | kaunihera a-rohe o Ōtepoti

20 February 2025

Southern Link – Logistics Park
C/- s 9(2)(a)
Port Otago
15 Beach Street
Port Chalmers 9023

Via email: s 9(2)(a)

Dear Joanne

DCC FEEDBACK FOLLOWING PRESENTATION

Following the consultation meeting on 12 February, the following comments from various DCC departments comprise a preliminary (and not exclusive) indication of the matters the DCC would like to see included in the Southern Link – Logistics Park proposal.

Transportation Matters

DCC Transport will require the section of Duke's Road North north of Stedman Road to be widened and a right run bay implemented, as identified in the integrated transport assessment that was circulated prior to the meeting on the 12th. As part of this, a footpath connection should be added to connect to the existing footpath on Stedman Road. This will require liaison with KiwiRail as part of the level crossing upgrade to make sure there is appropriate provision for pedestrians. Duke's Road North is a high productivity motor vehicle ("HPMV") route and to the south of Stedman Road is formed to an appropriate standard. There are known issues on the Mosgiel network around travel time delay, safety and the volume of heavy vehicles traveling through the centre. The volumes of heavy vehicle movements identified in the ITA are unlikely to significantly worsen these issues. The overall objective of shifting more freight to rail is likely to have a positive effect, especially on carbon emissions, safety and amenity on SH88.

There are aspects of the ITA that are not clear, or where further information would be helpful to understand the impacts on the transport network. Specifically:

- The ITA should include a little more information about the proposed new rail movements, including any identified impacts on other level crossings including Beach St and Wickliffe Terrace in Port Chalmers and St Andrew Street. The ITA alludes to increased rail movements south from the site but doesn't identify if this will be new rail services, or can be accommodated on existing services.
- The assessment of truck volumes would benefit from clearly stating the assumptions around what growth in freight volume is expected from the existing Dynes/Icon logistics movements, and what movements are anticipated from other companies using the site. Currently the ITA doesn't appear to show any growth in Icon logistics movements using heavy vehicles.
- The existing Icon logistics movements outlined in the ITA don't clearly show which heavy vehicle movements will shift to rail, which will remain on road and which are no longer be needed due to more efficient operation. This assessment could be presented more clearly and would benefit from including vehicles per day and well as annualised volumes. It is unclear at present how much of the existing icon heavy vehicle movements to and from the south via SH1 will travel on SH87, or can be shifted by rail.

- The assessment of freight volumes assumes that all movements associated with Sawyers Bay, 88 Parry St, T'Shed and the container depot on Strathallan will shift. If these sites are no longer used by Dynes/Icon logistics, other logistics or industrial uses may operate from these sites and some assessment of the potential for new uses to generate heavy vehicle movements should be included in the ITA.
- Clearer timing for the different stages would be helpful in assessing impacts on the overall transport network.
- The ITA indicates that 250 vehicles per day will be associated with the site, but only provides information about the anticipated 20-25 heavy vehicle movements. Some information about how the 250 vehicles per day figure was reached and what light vehicles movements are anticipated should be included in the ITA.
- Details of whether the internal site roads will be public or private, and what standards these will be constructed to would be helpful.

DCC contact: s 9(2)(a) , senior transport planner
Email: s 9(2)(a)

Noise and Light Spill
The DCC would appreciate seeing an acoustic assessment for the site/proposal as soon as possible, and anticipates that this will address construction noise and construction noise standards, with modelling for the site over various stages of development, and details of the mitigation measures proposed. It is expected that the acoustic assessment will detail the types and levels of construction and operational noise; and will include a draft noise management/mitigation plan.

Information regarding sources and levels of light-spill would also be helpful, together with details of the measures proposed to manage these.

DCC contact: s 9(2)(a) , acting team leader Environmental Health and Alcohol Licensing
Email: s 9(2)(a)

3 Waters
Information regarding the following matters would be helpful:

(Water)
- Details of anticipated treated water consumption, excluding fire flows. Estimated average daily consumption (annual average), daily peak use (maximum daily use) and peak hour use.
- A description of what treated water would be used for on site.
- An estimated number of people on site after full establishment of site.

(Stormwater)
- An outline of the event(s) that the stormwater management system for the site is designed for. (3 Waters would expect to see the system be designed to detain a 1% AEP event, and release at no greater than a 10% AEP event).
- In the event that retention of stormwater for firefighting is proposed, DCC would expect that this be removed from total detention volume calculations. (Draining the system manually prior to a rainfall event introduces an increased risk that the system will fail.)

(Wastewater)
- An estimate of daily wastewater flow from site (including any trade waste).
- A description of what items on-site would be connected to wastewater from the site.

(General)
- Clarify firefighting provisions.
- How much onsite tank storage is planned?

- Is pond stormwater retention required to meet firefighting requirements?
- How much extra tank storage would be required in the event stormwater retention wasn't viable?
- 3 Waters would like to see provisions made for stormwater to be utilised for non-potable applications on site.

DCC contact: s 9(2)(a) , subdivision support officer City Growth Team
Email: s 9(2)(a)

Geotechnical / Natural Hazards
The DCC notes that, from a natural hazards perspective, the underlying soils are alluvial flood sediments, with deep soils. The site lies to the east of any areas mapped as potentially liquefiable, so it is likely that normal foundation design from relatively shallow investigation is all that would be required.

Stormwater flows are a significant issue, and there are recognized overland flow paths, both flood and ephemeral. While any stormwater controls and amendments to existing overland flow will need to be reviewed by the Otago Regional Council, the DCC is likely to have a number of requirements for any earthworks on site. Details of how such works will be undertaken so as to avoid displacing stormwater onto neighboring properties, or creating undue concentrated flows would be helpful (noting that any bunding would have to be lower than the true left flood bank to avoid increasing risk to the residential zone on the south side of Silver Stream). Information about proposed flood protection works would be appreciated.

DCC contact: to be confirmed, but in the interim Karen Bain, associate senior planner
Email: s 9(2)(a) z

Hopefully this summary is helpful to you. Please keep in touch – the DCC would appreciate early and ongoing involvement as you progress your proposal.

Ngā mihi
s 9(2)(a)
Karen Bain
Associate Senior Planner