

David Shearer

2GP Variation 2 Greenfields

Site RS110

Hearing 4 - 24 August 2022

Good afternoon and thank you for hearing from me today. My name is David Shearer and I live with my wife Sarah and our 2 pre-school aged daughters, Lucy & Hannah, at 25 Sretlaw Place (that is Lot 20 on the original submitter's drawings). I'm speaking today in support of our opposing submission to the proposed re-zoning of 23 Sretlaw Place, which neighbours our property.

I work as a licensed cadastral land surveyor here in Dunedin. I have 12 years experience since completing my Masters degree at Otago University. My professional background in land development and planning has helped to shape our opposition to the proposed subdivision at 23 Sretlaw Place.

Amenity is a big reason why we are opposing development of 23 Sretlaw Place to the levels proposed in the original submission. I realise why amenity is given little weight when assessing re-zoning applications such as these. But the effect on our amenity would be huge. We currently enjoy a very quiet spot at the end of Sretlaw Place, with little light & noise pollution, and very little traffic. We currently share the ROW with the original submitter, another family with pre-school and primary school aged children, and lastly Te Whakaruruhau, which is a shared home offering a residential recovery service for young people aged between 13 and 18 years who are affected by mental health issues.

The visual effects have been focussed on by the original submitter, but I think other amenity aspects such as noise, increased traffic, light pollution and years of construction make the impact on our amenity very large.

We are worried about traffic and have even less confidence in what is being proposed after seeing the one-way system, which further impacts our property by almost surrounding it by accessways. Our children, along with the children across the ROW, are learning to ride their bikes and explore their surroundings more and more with each day. The sheer number of new allotments proposed, along with the construction traffic does give us concerns as to traffic safety given the restrictions of the right-of-ways.

In the original submitter's expert evidence, two options are offered as 'technical solutions' to the transport issue. I'll discuss them out of order and talk about the 2nd solution first. This is that the right-of-way and parts of 27 & 28 Sretlaw Place are purchased via a compulsory acquisition process. As an aside - I assume that it is an oversight that a portion of our property has been left out of this suggestion, as it can be seen that any widening to create a legal road would extend past the right of way we own into our actual property. I want to state the obvious that we don't support this rather extreme solution and would find it very distressing if Council was using its compulsory acquisition powers to purchase land that, by the Council planner's own recommendation, is not suitable for residential development to the densities proposed.

My next point concerns paragraph 14 in the expert evidence. I believe that the right of ways have been confused in paragraph 14 when it is stated that the "the majority of the further submissions spoke to ongoing issues with the formation of the Right of Way A and the need for this to be upgraded". I count 2 submissions that specifically discuss ROW A, 4 that specifically discuss ROW B, 2

that discuss both and 5 that don't mention either. The reality is the opposite of what is being suggested in the expert evidence.

The other option put forward, or the first option is the 'one way' structure plan. There wasn't really any discussion of this plan in the evidence so I assume that the idea is to try to reduce effects by halving the traffic at each entrance. However, ROW B already has 10 users. If we have 16 – the number of allotments that would be using the one-way system, we get 8. So, 8 plus the original 10 gives 18, far over what the 2GP suggests is appropriate. This is before we even get into other unexplained complexities that the one-way would result in, for example

- Would existing users of ROWs A & B be compelled to travel through the new subdivision?
- If not, how would the one-way system be controlled, keeping in mind this would be a private access? It seems like a recipe for conflict. Would we have to be constantly appealing to someone or some entity when users of the cul-de-sac inevitably decide to short-cut straight up the hill, by-passing the one-way system?
- What are the safety implications of having part of the ROW (our part) two-way, and the rest one-way?
- A one-way system would increase the number of people that would need to be coordinated in order to maintain and repair the road. The situation would be at least as complex as the previously put-forward plans.

I don't think the one-way solution constitutes suitable access as would be required by DCC Transportation.

Public access is a benefit of the subdivision that has been promoted by the original submitter. How is this to be achieved given the access is over private land with several opposing submitters having existing rights over this land? I haven't seen any details of how this would function, other than a vague suggestion of compulsory acquisition of land.

I believe that, even if Council were to accept the grossly under-width access as a public road, that it is extremely unlikely that the original submitter will be able to achieve this given the number of opposing submissions from existing ROW users. To approve the rezoning application as it is currently being promoted would put Council in a tough situation at the resource consent stage, when the inevitable occurs – by this I mean that the consensus of current ROW users will not be able to be gained and Council will be under considerable pressure to approve rights-of-ways that have previously been deemed unsuitable.

The DCC planner has stated that, should the re-zoning proceed, that the structure plan be adopted. I see this as risky and I know that Council has had trouble with attempts to implement ill-thought-out structure plans in other parts of the City – the East Taieri Structure Plan is a good example. This is especially true with the 'one-way' driveway plan. I've already outlined what I believe to be the issues with this proposal.

A last point I'd like to make is that, even in the 17 lot structure plan that has been proposed, the average site size is 828m². Seeing as the minimum site size in the Residential 1 zone is 400m², is this proposal even within the scope of Variation 2? The Section 32 report states that Rural sites were considered for rezoning to Gen Res 1, Township & Settlement and Large Lot Residential 1. Neither the 17 lot plan, or the 12 lot plan, which has an average site size of 1350m², fit into any of these zones. The submitter has essentially conceded that even they don't think more than 17 lots is appropriate, I see this as another indication that a General Residential 1 zoning is inappropriate.

It might seem from all this that we are opposed to development of any kind at 23 Sretlaw Place. This is not the case – but we are strongly opposed to development at the densities that are proposed. We haven't had any indication that the submitter is willing to compromise on the densities, so we ask that Council reject the application to re-zone outright.

Thank you for hearing me today, I appreciate it's been a busy few weeks for everyone. I'm happy to clarify anything that I've spoken to today, otherwise that's my submission. Thanks.