

Site Evaluation

Roading:

The applicants have suggested Formby Street is a local road.

Unfortunately Formby Street has long been considered a shortcut from the plains to the Middelmark highway. The traffic movement stats provided do not indicate the nature of the traffic only volume. Formby Street, despite its very narrow width in the south, is regularly used by truck transport in the form of Fonterra tankers, logging trucks, stock truck and trailer units and Willowcroft contracting, Huntly Road. While it has a heavy traffic restriction this only applies to 44 tonne H rated transport, 50 max with different axle configuration are permitted.

It is very common to witness trucks straddling the centre line as they travel between Huntly Road and Three Kings Court entrance, making this stretch of road very hazardous. Hedging on the eastern side encroaches on seal and makes visibility poor.

This narrow section of road is heavily used by kids heading to school, Mums with pushchairs, other pedestrians and cyclists.

The sites already developed by Mr Horne, bounding directly onto Formby Street are all below the road level and rely on submersible electric pumps to discharge their storm water, any foot path development on this side of the road will need to ensure they can continue to maintain their storm water discharge.

It is my opinion that the proposal for a foot path on the western side of Formby is flawed. The purpose of any foot path would be to safely convey children to and from Outram School therefore any foot path, if there can be only one, should be on the eastern side of the road to enable children to have a direct route with no road crossing involved and no backing hazard from properties on Formby Street. This footpath should be elevated and with a significant curb to ensure no vehicle encroachment into pedestrian safe space. Obviously the cost should be borne by the applicants. A more appropriate solution would be to widen the road to the 20 metre, NZTA standard for a through road given the potential addition of around 500 more traffic movements per day.

Huntly Road is equally narrow. Despite its narrow width, seems to attract a high level of speedsters.

The applicants landscape plan shows two entry/exit points opposite 47/53 Huntly road with a through road configuration and one entry/exit point in Formby St opposite the rugby grounds.

This offers a 'through traffic' option to take a 'shortcut' to the rugby grounds, or beyond and for some it will be hard to resist. Roading within the subdivision will have a wider road reserve than Formby Street, an added incentive to shortcut. Both Balmoral and Maungatua View contain only cul de sacs for this very reason.

High Class Soils:

Mr Horne's expert evidence touched on the loss of high class soils and included a brief calculation of the loss his proposed subdivision would cause. I offer you a more graphic model of the actual loss of this soil to Outram. Outram was once the food bowl of Dunedin. Super market control of the food chain bought about its demise. The need for quality fruit and veg has not diminished, but we now rely on a fossil fuel transport chain. If we diminish our ability to source our food locally by destroying our high class soil, we will become totally dependent on polluting transport systems. Local food source equals carbon neutral.

Please study my map, which shows the extent of the high class soils at Outram. My map indicates in red the area of the proposed subdivision, the boundary of the high class soils are indicated in black and I have marked the river boundary in blue. Any high class soils to the right of river boundary must be considered nonviable for food production as it sits in a flood ponding system, as demonstrated by page two of my handout indicating the extent of Chinese horticulture activity in the 1960's, this land was never historically farmed for good reason. You will also note the most intensive Taieri food production was directly adjacent to Outram, and farmed in small lots. The loss of these three sites is substantial.

The National Policy Statement for the Protection of Highly Productive Land is about to be announced. It is not appropriate to allow subdivision of class one soil before this Policy is in effect.

Storm Water:

Mr Horne's report regarding storm water mitigation offers a few calculations but there is no real evidence of how he might manage his onsite storm water. He talks of many options but nothing is qualified with factual evidence or plan to substantiate his claims. Nor does his street plan incorporate any ponding site. DCC has not completed the promised Three Waters Review of Outram (2021), including a study of the effects of overland flow paths within our township. This leaving us with no comprehensive storm water management plan for our settlement, therefore it is impossible to appreciate the effectiveness of any plan Mr Horne might provide.

The applicants' request for planning approval, before developing any storm water management plan is not acceptable, particularly on a flood plain and after a year of the worst flood disasters on record. Mr Horne's expert opinion is very brief given the mitigation of storm water in Outram is the single most significant issue of all. DCC Three Waters have indicated the application should be rejected based on inability to manage storm water, I see no further evidence to counter this.

NATURAL DISASTER

How safe is Outram? Who knows, but we should certainly be questioning the intelligence of placing more million dollar residential assets behind a bit of mounded dirt in today's climate change environment. (various expert opinion in handout)

2022 will be etched in our memories as the year of the big floods. We have new phrases such as "atmospheric rivers" to add to our vocabulary and for those on flood plains, insurance bills will now reflect heightened exposure to loss.

The Taieri river has the second largest catchment in Otago, stretching as far north as Nasby. All flood waters from this catchment funnel through Taieri Gorge and discharge onto the Taieri plains adjacent to the Outram township.

Outram has a long history of flood events and we can see the evidence of historic river changes etched into our township via the overland flow paths such as the Oxbow.

The ORC manage a flood bank asset as part of a network of flood protection systems designed to minimise any potential flood damage to Outram, and afield. The last significant physical review of the flood bank and storm water management system was undertaken in the late 1980's after the flood disaster of 1980. Due to government funding constraints not all the recommended work was completed and only two of the recommended eight pumping stations were installed at the time. The recorded flow rate at the time of the flood was 2500 cumecs. This is the bench mark used for any subsequent flood protection improvements, so how realistic is this bench mark given the recent rainfall experienced in the upper South Island? When will we see this bench mark tested? And will it be exceeded?

We saw the riverbank protection scheme of the 80's severely tested in July 2017, with an initial estimated flow rate of 2000 cumecs revised later to 1700 cumecs, heavy piping in the vicinity of the electricity substation at the end of Huntly road necessitated the evacuation of Orme, Bell and Railway lane. Anzac court was inundated with several houses partially or fully flooded despite having the recommended floor level of 7m above sea level.

All access to Outram was cutoff. Residents were offered self-evacuation to the local school or town hall. Power was lost to the entire town at 4am.

The ORC has been working since the 2017 flood to fund and engineer a suitable fix for the piping issues and recently received a Provincial fund allocation to commence work. This is a \$48 million project. Will this future proof the flood bank? Who knows, only time and another significant flood will tell. There is also continuing concern with other sections of the river bank adjacent to the township including the portion near Balmoral subdivision which saw significant piping in the 2018 flood event.

Over the last hundred or more years it has become clear Outram township is vulnerable, with climate change posing a very real and increasing danger, yet the DCC has allowed three subdivisions in recent times adding around \$70 million worth of new assets to be built in a Hazard 2 flood risk area. If this subdivision is permitted another 70+ houses will be built and the total will climb to \$140+ million of new and potentially uninsurable homes. When the DCC issues title to land albeit with restrictions such as floor height, it sends a message of security and safety to the home owner. But who becomes culpable when the river bank fails.

The ORC has responded negatively to this application for more residential development, they have a clear understanding of their ability to protect land and property but can never predict the ferocity of any individual storm event.

They are forever playing catch up, repairing weak areas of their flood protection after a storm. By doing so they are giving false security to prospective residents who imagine the flood protection is instead being future proofed and their new homes are secure. Known as the "Escalator Effect".

There is always a lag time between destructive storm events and flood protection improvement, often 5 years or more. Once improved flood protection is installed there is a renewed feeling of safety but these improvements are always retrospective not proactive.

For the Taieri 2500 cumecs is and will always be the bench mark. To improve this bench mark the only method is extensive modifications to the river bank, an increase in height which will involve an increase in foot print and subsequently the loss of housing adjacent to the existing flood bank. This would be unrealistic and unaffordable.

At present Outram's options during a flood event are limited. As demonstrated in 2017 our town becomes isolated very quickly. We also regularly lose power. ~~At present~~ the volunteer fire brigade are responsible for management of any evacuation process but by allowing urban sprawl in Outram, and associated population growth, how will they cope?

I note there was no consultation with the local emergency response services

I believe the answer is pretty obvious, do not allow anymore subdivision of land in Outram in the face of the unpredictable and ever-increasing risk of major flood.

Septic tanks

What can I say apart from it's third world and we have no right to shovel our wees and poos into the best soil in all of Otago.

Shut!

If it's the DCC's decision to allow this subdivision to proceed based on 70+ more houses each distributing up to 2000 litres per day of their nitrate laden waste into a permeable aquifer, then at least manage the process more carefully via a ground water protection zone covering all of the residential development area of Outram.

Many tanks are poorly serviced and many residents have no idea of how to use their tanks efficiently. Stringent regulation is the only method of preventing a disaster.

7 Sept
Visit

Walking Tour.

Demand:

Developers are highly motivated by profit - flat land, in a pleasant environment with no sewer reticulation presents an opportunity not to be missed.

The purpose of the 2GP amendment 2 is to secure appropriate and sufficient residential land for the expansion of Dunedin city in the short to medium time frame. Therefore first and foremost the question of demand must be answered.

Five years ago Outram had around 300 households. Three recent subdivisions have added 68 new building sites. A 23% increase. If planning permission is gained for this new development using the 73 site proposal there will be a total increase in housing capacity of 141 sites or 47%. This is a huge increase in the size of Outram and a huge increase in demand for services such as schooling, medical care and emergency evacuation during storm events. I note no community consultation was undertaken with these services by the planner, a serious omission.

The applicants' evidence is heavily based on hearsay.

I have taken a more detailed assessment of recent subdivision to establish more accurate statistics around demand and a review of immediate supply.

Maungatua View Subdivision, provides the opportunity for an analysis of the type of property buyer who is attracted to Outram.

There are 35 sections in the subdivision, mainly 1000m²

8 sections remain undeveloped.

Of the 27 developed sites, over half (14), are owned by young families, with a total of around 22 children, predominantly in the 0-6 age group.

Another 4 homes are owned by young couples with no children as yet.

7 are mature couples & 2 retired. Not farmed
My conclusion is the most likely buyers of property in Outram are young families. This trend is also significant in other property sales within Outram.

The majority
All to my knowledge travel to either Mosgiel or
Dun. for work.

These families are highly mobile often with double incomes, two cars and time poor so unlikely to use public transport if it were available.

We live in changing times, the most likely demographic to be feeling the "pinch" right now are also the most likely buyers of property in Outram. High interest rates and fuel costs for this demographic have huge impact, therefore I predict a downturn in demand in the short to medium term for Outram property.

At present there are 16 undeveloped sections in both Maungatua view and Balmoral subdivision. Two are actively being marketed. Willowfield, a retiree option, has five sites available. There are also around half a dozen undeveloped sites within older residential town boundaries.

There are five fully developed properties on the market, two in Willowfield subdivision and three others around town.

I see no shortage of residential stock in Outram, for Outram demand.

The evidence provided by real estate agents is the most conflicted opinion of any submitter but it is clear that demand is Taieri wide not Outram specific.

The recent approval of a large residential subdivision in Mosgiel of around 500 sites will be sufficient to cover demand for the immediate and medium term as required by the 2GP amendment 2.

The 2gp amendment 2 is focused on providing affordable resilient housing.

The applicants have suggested their development will provide exactly that to potential Taieri residents.

Mr Horne recently sold 113 Formby street. This 1000m2 site was initially marketed as offers over \$400,000, an indication of the value he would put on any new properties he developed.

All sites in Outram are subject to the installation of septic tank, an additional \$20,000 to \$25,000.

Foundations are costly depending on Geotech information. Fuel costs are outrageous. Living in Outram is an expensive lifestyle considering the entry level value of a new build is around one million dollars. (recent sales data)

I believe there are sufficient housing options for local demand, Outram's storm water and wastewater constraints and loss of precious high class soils should make it the least attractive land for subdivision on the Taieri.

! our water comes from boxes
adjacent to the river
not! Mosgiel
