

## ***Written Submission***

I oppose the proposed

- (i) rezoning the land immediately west of Chain Hills Road to become General Residential 1, and
- (ii) the new roading intended to link Irwin Logan Drive to this portion of Chain Hills Road.

### **The reasons for my support (or opposition) are**

I first acknowledge (a) an obvious conflict of interest in so far as being a resident of Chain Hills and thus appearing as patch protective, (b) the current housing pressure faced by Dunedin City, which are being intensified by multiple demographic, economic and climatic pressures, and (c) the urgent need to lessen urbanisation of high-quality soils, most notably on the Taieri plains, when the surrounding hillsides have inferior soil quality that makes them more suitable for housing. Notwithstanding the latter/third point, I oppose this proposal for multiple reasons, unless the developer pays the full expense of overcoming them. (i) the road is unsuitable for the increased traffic volume, particularly cycling and walking between Morris Road and the proposed new road (~81 Chain Hills Road), especially the steep, south and east facing section, which is steep and prone to icing, has no footpath, and no curbing or parking. Walking and cycling on that section in winter will be more hazardous (ice and darkness, and severe sunstrike going up Morris Road and up to 31 Chain Hills Road). (ii) there is no water or sewage infrastructure. (iii) development this far from Dunedin CBD will further increase traffic to/from Dunedin and thus also parking congestion in Dunedin, whereas higher density housing closer to the CBD would facilitate active transport and energy efficiency in housing and infrastructure. (iv) it is implausible for the developer to suggest that this proposed rezoning could provide for affordable housing. The fact that it is suggested is itself a cause for concern in view of the infrastructure and urban sprawl implications mentioned above.

### ***Oral submission/clarification***

Tēnā koe koutou katoa.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to my submission, which opposed the rezoning of land and the new roading link due to the gravity of unconsidered effects. My reasons are conveyed in writing, as is my potential COI in being a local resident. I have asked to speak to you, the council and the developers, to address reasons 1, 3 and 4, and implore you to create positive legacy, whichever outcome occurs. If I could please provide some context that directly reflect those three reasons.

- I commute through this zone to work, as a Professor of Exercise and Environmental Physiology. I am also a member of CHiRP. I am speaking in a personal capacity and partly as a representative of people and species that stand to be affected but have no awareness of voice.
- I am greatly concerned how modern lifestyles are degrading our population's fitness, health system and our planet at an unprecedented rate; in our secular, private vehicle dominated urbanised society we have lost more fitness across this last single generation than is possible to regain even if they undertook long term supervised exercise training – if indeed that were ever likely. Today's youth are, on average, increasingly incapable of meaningful active transport to and from a subdivision such as this. And, humans, like all species, are

genetically programmed to minimise energy use, so the transport and health outcomes are predetermined.

- Meanwhile, both our govt and our city council have made declarations of a climate emergency, thereby committing to action to reduce our carbon footprint.
- I bike or bus every day to work in an effort to maintain health and reduce my footprint. I see first hand the volume of traffic, the nature of traffic, the almost non-existent active transport from Mosgiel, and the vastly greater preference for single-occupant private travel over public transport. The unseen danger of vehicles' nitrous oxide emissions kills at least three people for every one 'road fatality'.
- Additionally, the supposedly "much needed third link road between Mosgiel to Dunedin" is substantially prone to sunstrike and will become more dangerous to active commuters riding uphill and thus far slower than cars within the 80 kph zone of Morriss Road.
- With this proposed expanding of roading options and relatively low density population it is disingenuous to suggest that this subdivision will not directly worsen private vehicle usage and thus the health of active commuters and the passive commuters, our human and native wildlife populations, and our city's greenhouse gas contributions.

In the report submitted by Ms Peters, a consultant, on behalf of the applicant, she noted:

*"The vision for this land is to provide a range of housing choice in a way which is sympathetic and responsive to the environment and people's well being."*

With respect, this viewpoint considers only the immediate beneficiaries with sufficient wealth to belong. A much larger number of people are adversely and severely impacted by such expansive urban sprawl due its disproportionate reliance and impact on fossil fuel usage. For perspective, these decisions exacerbate climate change, sea level rise and ecological degradation, such that if we consider humans alone - and ignore the approximately 1 million species facing extinction - local displacement from south Dunedin will be inevitable and approximately 2 billion people are projected to become climate refugees from the tropics within 30 to 50 years. A resource intensive subdivision such as this serves neither local nor tropical climate refugees well, neither now (when mitigation remains possible) nor in the future (when migration is obligatory).

If you consent to this subdivision, please consider mitigating measures, such as:

- Solar panels
- Water storage
- Pesticide usage
- Cats
- ....

i.e., experts within the council and university, along with developers have the capacity to make this a more constructive proposition and thus have a positive impact for the future.

Thank you.