

## **DCC Hearing 2 September 2022**

I am John Franklin, and my wife and I are resident at 22 Pinfold Place. We've been there 11 years (to the day!). I speak on behalf of other Pinfold Place residents, and some from Irwin Logan Drive.

We oppose the urban development of Chain Hill, RS153, and the proposed road extension of Irwin Logan Drive/Jocelyn Way to connect with Chain Hills Road. I will give 12 reasons.

First, at the entrance of Irwin Logan Drive there is a sign that says 'NO EXIT'. That is, this is not a through road. This delights us because it indicates that this is a contained, quiet neighbourhood, safe for children and walkers, which is why most of us choose to live here. The proposed development, with consequently increased traffic volume, would change that significantly – not mention the presence of construction trucks.

Second, there are aesthetic considerations. The Mosgiel environment is enhanced with green space above it. The proposed development of increased residential use will put that at risk. As a way to enhance the aesthetics, we are in support of the

revegetation of locally appropriate indigenous forest cover, as per Mike Moore's Report p16.

Third, the proposed development is at odds with the values espoused by the Resource Management Act - namely the ethic of stewardship, and the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment. This natural landscape needs to be protected, and enhanced in accordance with the values espoused by the RMA. In his report Mike Moore states "The existing sense of the urban area of Mosgiel being enclosed within a rural context, will be substantially weakened, giving rise to an adverse effect in my assessment". "I have assessed the landscape and visual effects of the rezoning as generally adverse." (pp 19-20). We have a moral responsibility to care for the planet and maintain as many open spaces as possible, and in this case, recover some of the original forest cover.

Fourth, the land in RS153 is currently being used for sheep farming and the grassland is secure. It will cease to be so if it is converted to residential use.

Fifth, the land is both historically and visibly unstable. There is evidence of slipping after the recent heavy rain in August. It is important to note that the instability of RS153 was rejected by the Council.

Hillside slopes in RS204 have been identified as Hazard 1 and Hazard 2, by making them unsuitable for urban development, because of the increased risk of slippage. We don't want another Abbotford.

Sixth, if septic tanks were required anywhere, they would increase the water density in the soil so that some slippage will be inevitable. In addition, there would be health risks for children playing on ground soaked with effluent.

Seventh, it is noted in Grant Fisher's Integrated Transport Assessment that there have been 18 vehicle crashes in Gladstone Rd between July 2018 – July 2021, mainly at the Gordon Rd intersection. There will likely be an increased safety risk to residents and traffic, and likely more accidents if Jocelyn Way is connected to Chain Hills Road. As it is, the Gordon Rd/Irwin Logan intersection is tight, and has very poor lighting at night, making it difficult to turn safely.

Given the number of sections proposed, there will be a significant increase in the volume of traffic. Irwin Logan is a suburban street, not a through-way to Mosgiel from Morris Road. Given the increase of traffic already generated by the current Gladstone Heights development, we have concerns that Irwin Logan will not cope with more traffic, having a

detrimental impact of safety and the quiet nature of the neighbourhood.

Eighth. There is talk of low cost housing, which we applaud in principle. Much of the land in RS153 and RS204 is very steep and it has gullies, making residential development more complex and less efficient, as noted in Variation - Additional Housing Capacity, Section 32 Report Appendix 4, p4. Given the amount of infrastructure, water servicing, and land retention required for new houses to be constructed on the proposed development, it is unlikely that the cost of housing will be low cost and affordable, as purchasers will pay a premium for the infrastructure development from the outset. This means the benefit of low cost housing as a selling point of the proposed development is likely to be false, and should be ignored unless firm evidence is provided that low cost housing is viable.

Ninth. There is no provision made for public transport in the proposal. This suggests that travel will primarily be by private car. This is counter to NZ's commitment to reduce gas emissions.

Tenth. The intensified development of RS153 (and RS204) has the potential to exacerbate storm water and waste water issues. The increased road surfaces

and roofing areas will generate significantly increased rain runoff. The Owhiro stream already floods, and this would make it worse. We noted water issues in winter last year on the current Gladstone Heights development where there were storm water management issues. While we understand the primary problem was cracks in the pipes, it nevertheless highlighted the fragility of the environment.

Eleventh. We respect the need for more housing, and that the DCC has an obligation to source more land for urban development, and we support this. We strongly suggest that less vulnerable sites can be found.

Twelfth. While the Council's Code of Subdivision and Development 2010 states that "All residential neighbourhoods of more than 75 lots or dwelling units shall be provided with more than one connection to a collector street or higher order road", there is already the exit from Heathfield Drive through Woodland Ave to Quarry Rd and the motorway.

Finally, this development will have financial gains for the proposed developers, however it would cause loss to the biodiversity, the habitat of grasses,

insects, birds and sheep, as well as having a detrimental impact on the life style and aesthetic of the neighbourhood, as well as the Mosgiel community at large.

So, in order to protect this quiet neighbourhood, for reasons of aesthetics, safety from increased traffic, environmental protection, issues of water and land instability, we seek the following decision; that the Gladstone Family Trust submission on Variation 2 of the Dunedin City 2nd Generation District Plan be rejected and the current zoning be retained.