

Kia ora koutou,

I oppose the proposed rezoning and subsequent subdivision by Gladstone Family Trust in Chain Hills Rd.

There are a number of reasons for my opposition, most of which relate to the proposed water and transport plans pertaining to the submission. I do not think that this is the most appropriate form or location for urban expansion, despite the attempts by the developers to mitigate the issues raised in the submission process.

Firstly addressing the issue of waste water from Chain Hills Heights, in Section 4.2 of the report on 3 waters the consultant has stated that the number of people per household should be between 3.5 and, with no upper value given. This unfinished sentence is confusing, and doesn't give the layperson such as myself context in terms of how reasonable the modelling is. By this I mean if it is between 3.5 and 4 for example, then the use of 3.5 people in the modelling seems not unreasonable, but if it is between 3.5 and 6 for example, then using the lower limit seems likely to underestimate the problem. I would seek clarification on this and thus a justification of how reasonable the modelling is.

Furthermore, this report also states that the capacity of the downstream wastewater flow has not been assessed, but that if capacity was an issue then a storage solution could be implemented until it could be upgraded. I would like to know if there was any intention to upgrade the wastewater system

downstream of the proposed development, or if the developer is trying to force the council's hand in this respect by creating an increase in wastewater and then demanding existing infrastructure be upgraded to compensate. An alternative suggestion from the consultant's report on 3 waters is that wastewater could be discharged via a pipeline to Fairfield down Morris Rd. I question the feasibility of such a pipeline, particularly in terms of where it would be installed, as both sides of Morris Rd are relatively steep, and also how it would be installed.

Also pertaining to wastewater, but for the proposed lifestyle blocks around our property which will have septic tanks, I am concerned about the location of the dispersal fields. As shown in the 3 waters assessment, the flow paths of surface water end up on our land and then funnel out through the gully. An increase in housing with septic tanks could lead to contamination of our land.

With regards to the stormwater, the report admits that there are known issues with Owhiro Stream flooding. Although the flow path is not expected to change, there will be a significant increase in volume due to an increase in impervious surfaces, and thus exacerbate the problem.

Addressing the potable water issue for the proposed Chain Hills subdivision, I note that in the consultant's report, when modelling the 'peak usage' that 3 people per household has been used. I question why this is different to the 3.5 people per household used in the wastewater modelling, and am concerned that the demand is therefore underestimated. When quite significant water pumping is already required to reach an acceptable pressure at such an altitude, underestimating demand seems a serious issue and I request that this is investigated. This is particularly problematic given the intention of the developer to pay for the installation and vest pumps and associated infrastructure to the council. If they don't put in a powerful enough pump because demand has been underestimated then the council will be left with a costly problem, of either replacement with adequate pumping capability, or expensive and more frequent maintenance. I question whether this location is well suited to residential development because of the difficulty of supplying the required water supply. In addition, I raise the issue of responsibility with this developer, due to the confusion around a retaining wall which collapsed at another of their developments last year.

The report on 3 waters states that they have shown provision of 3 waters infrastructure is *feasible*. Even if it is feasible, it does not in any way address the ongoing costs once vested to council in terms of maintenance or upgrades which are then required to compensate for the development.

I also object to the proposed subdivision on transport grounds. Although the consultant's report has addressed safety issues with Morris Rd and Chain Hills Rd raised in the submission process, even if a large increase in vehicle traffic in the area is unlikely to reduce road safety, it still raises the question whether we want to encourage more cars on the road in the interest of maintaining a compact city. Also, I do not believe that the issue of people using the proposed road link as a bypass has been adequately addressed. I question whether the suggested road narrowing or speed cushions as a way to eliminate this would make it difficult to drive the road in an uphill direction, especially given the steepness in parts. I also note that there has been no mention of lighting with regard to road safety. Currently there is no street lighting on Chain Hills Rd, and I expect that a subdivision would result in pressure to install this on safety grounds. This not only will cause light pollution and ruin the rural feel of the area, it will also significantly increase the visibility of the residential development from Mosgiel.

A minor point I raise is that the proposed subdivision is apparently getting fibre internet from Chain Hills Rd, but Chain Hills Rd does not have fibre.

In conclusion, this still does not seem like the best location to install a subdivision due to the implications of infrastructure resilience and maintaining a compact city. I therefore request that the application for rezoning is rejected.

Thank you for your time.