

Good morning,

My name is Gordon Hunt. My wife and I have been residents of Chain Hills for 9 years. We live at number 29 which is in the small group of houses at the start of Chain Hills. When doing due diligence before our purchase I asked the DCC whether or not there were any plans to provide town or foul water supply to Chain Hills Road and the answer was no. We were aware at the time that the owner of the large farmland lots beside and further up the road from us, (numbers 21,43,55,65,75) had previously advertised these blocks of land for sale and we thought that these would be sold and built on individually. Fast forward to early June 2021 when we received notice that as we were within 50 metres of the proposed rezoning site, we had 10 working days to understand what was being proposed, what effects this would have and make a written submission.

Along with a large number of submitters we oppose the rezoning and development to rejected areas RS153 and RS204. Both these sites have already been through a rigorous process governed by the rules of 2 GP Variation 2 and were found to be unsuitable and therefore rejected. I think that the reasons for rejection are still valid and in light of recent DCC reports by their officers, I think this decision is still correct.

The original reason for rejection for RS 153 was that the site has a central gully, has areas of South facing slopes, is very steep in parts and that any development would be complex and less efficient. Site RS204 was initially rejected because the site is fairly isolated and fails to support the compact form/city policies. As I live on the boundary of RS204 I have concentrated most of my presentation on this area.

Objective 2.4.6 in the section 32 report states .The character and visual amenity of Dunedin's rural environment is maintained or enhanced. In my opinion the addition of a large number of houses built on the plateau of Chain Hills will not meet this objective.

The reports supplied by both landscape architects Mr Moore and Mr McKinlay stated that giving consideration to important green spaces, visual landscapes and vistas, their opinion was that the rezoning would have moderate to high adverse effects on these values.

The LVA supplied by Mr Moore questions the appropriateness of a node of relatively intense residential development on the hilltop, separated from Mosgiel (and other existing urban areas) by steeper hill slope and concludes that landscape and visual effects will be adverse / moderate – high and that the Rural Residential zoning should be retained in this area. Mr McKinlay states that he agrees with this assessment.

The developer proposes to create 60 GR1 sections in areas E, I, and K. From my understanding GR 1 sections can be 500 sq m with the possibility of this to be reduced to 400 sq m. Furthermore duplex units may be allowed to be built on this size section. To me this is a serious breach of controls and objectives of the Section 32 report. I have read that one of the councils requirement is to ensure that "the type of development integrates with existing residential character in any particular locale . This proposed high density development is nothing at all like the existing residential character of Chain Hills

My second area of concern is the plan to link Chain hills road with Irwin Logan Drive. I consider this to be an ill conceived idea by the developer with no thought given at all to current residents of either Chain Hills , Gladstone subdivisions , Morris Road and Fairfield.

My opinion is that this link road would quickly become a secondary main route to and from Dunedin and Mosgiel. I think this aspect has been minimised by the developer . I feel that Morris and Chain Hills Roads already carry enough traffic .The safety aspects of a marked increase in traffic flow warrants serious consideration. I would urge the panel (if they arent already familiar with these roads) to drive up and back from the motorway exit at Fairfield. Morris road is winding and only has a narrow gravel shoulder on one side for pedestrians and pets.Morris Road is used by a lot of cyclists and there is no real room for them to ride safely to the left of the tarmac. There are safety issues also around the two school crossings in Fairfield should this link road be approved. I can certainly envisage traffic congestion occurring at the Fairfield off ramp / Old Brighton Road intersection

My driveway on Chain Hills Road is right on the crest of a hill and sight lines up the road are very poor.Our neighbours on either side of us are in a similar situation . My wife and I have had numerous close calls when exiting our driveway.There are only split seconds between the road being clear till having another vehicle suddenly appear.On several occasions I have had to quickly veer to the right hand side of the road to avoid an accident .Road gritting is required in the winter months because of snow and ice. At the other end of this proposed link is Irwin Logan Drive which is a residential street exiting onto Gladstone Road.

I am heartened to read the reports from DCC transport staff who highlight several issues being safety,no footpaths or cycle lanes and the huge costs that would be incurred to bring these roads up to standard. Another concern would be the steepness of the terrain through the farmland and down to Irwin Logan Drive. I note that the site also ranked poorly in relation to likely carbon emissions from commuting.

My third concern is for the 3 water infrastructure needed to service the sites.

In the DCC reports the officers highlighted various issues, firstly regarding potable water,

the existing infrastructure is inadequate, supply constraints in peak demand, low pressure,booster pumps required,additional reservoir storage, significant network upgrades required.

Regarding wastewater,the southern end is distant from a connection point, network upgrades required

and regarding stormwater...no infrastructure, and to quote from the DCC report by Bruce Saunders and Jared Oliver.

There are known and significant flooding issues downstream of the proposed site and concerns from residents at Woodland Avenue, business in the Gladstone Road South Industrial area and East Taieri School. Some of the other developments adjacent to the proposed site have implemented stormwater management poorly, resulting in issues for residents and DCC. The fragmented nature of the stormwater management approach has exacerbated this.

The DCC 3 waters team assessed this site, and concluded that ... there are issues associated with

water supply, wastewater and also concerns regarding stormwater management, which may be expensive. In the absence of 3 Waters support for the proposed rezoning, I consider that rezoning would result in a conflict with Policy 2.6.2.1.d.ix.

Which brings me to the conclusion as written on pages 245 and 246 of the section 42A report

Overall, based on the expert evidence, I am unable to recommend rezoning either RS153 and/or RS204 at this time and I therefore recommend the existing zoning is retained

Thank You

I am certain that if I had the same resources as the developer I could have commissioned a suite of reports from planning experts that would be in direct opposition to those they have presented.

Thank you.