

Good afternoon. I'm Myles Thayer and I live at No 10 Sretlaw Place, on the private driveway that's on the title of No 18, directly opposite the driveway between No's 22 & 24.

I wish to make it clear from the outset that I am not objecting to the actual re-zoning of the property known as 23 Sretlaw Place to residential.

What I do want to object to is the proposed sub-division plans that have been submitted and their access from the private driveway that is on the title of No 18.

The two original plans, one for 12 sections and the other for 17 sections envisage either 3 or 4 sections to be accessed by way of a driveway between No's 22 and 24.

I have recently become aware that a further late submission involving a one-way street has been made that would envisage all 16 sections using this driveway. That would be create an impossible situation

for the existing residents. *eg. Our property + our ^{all 9 of our} neighbours ~~on~~ the driveway would face 3 times the present traffic when arriving home. You can see the issue ^v on photograph A. quite clearly*

My first point is that the private driveway that is on the title of No 18 is at present used by 10 residences. All three of the sub-division plans proposed so far, would exceed the DCC policy on the maximum number of sections on private driveways.

Apart from the turnround area at the eastern end, this driveway is only 4.9m wide as measured between the kerbs. As you can see on photograph A, there is just enough space for two normal vehicles to pass on this driveway. There is however a problem when the two vehicles are both heavy trucks. This necessitates one of them making a dangerous reversing manoeuvre that is a hazard to pedestrians, and especially to children.

At present the traffic is able to cope because of the small no. of residents.

There is also a problem turning from this driveway into, or out of, the narrow No 23 driveway between No's 22 & 24. We have had experience of heavy vehicles having to use the footpath in order to complete this turn. The footpath is not constructed to a standard to withstand heavy vehicles and in one instance this produced disastrous effects, see photograph B. This is what happened just 4

years ago when the refuse truck used the footpath to avoid another vehicle coming down the driveway.

Now, to address the narrow driveway between No's 22 & 24.

This driveway is only 3.9m wide as measured between the neighbouring fences. You can clearly see on photograph C that there is no way that opposing traffic can pass each other on this driveway. It has quite clearly been built to service a single section. The 3 proposed sub-division plans all have a small section as the first one going in (i.e. going north) on the left hand side. By the time the owners of that section build a house on it, there will be little or no off-street parking available. So whenever they have visitors their vehicles will get parked out in the shared driveway that is on the title of No 18. That means there will be ^{either} ~~either~~ limited width for the users of the driveway, or there will be limited turning available at the eastern end of the driveway. It is therefore my submission that any approved sub-division plan have a restriction that limits this driveway, to the use of a single section.

The third issue that I wish to raise is the maintenance and repairs of the driveway that is on the title of No 18.

At present there are 10 of us who share this driveway. To do any maintenance or repairs, it requires us to get the approval of all 10. If any of the proposed sub-division plans are approved, that number would increase and the difficulties would also increase. There is then the potential, ^{in fact} and almost the certainty that disputes would arise between those who use part of the driveway and those who use it all. This is a situation ^{simply} that ~~must~~ be avoided.

Apart from the issues of who should pay (and how much), there is also the added burden of extra payments likely to be needed resulting from the extra traffic, especially during the construction of the dwellings. This would ^{be} compounded dramatically if the proposed one-way sub-division plan is allowed. This extra cost is a totally unfair burden on the existing residents and it is therefore my

further submission that if any more than one section is approved for the driveway between No's 22 & 24, the DCC should be compelled to take over all responsibility for the maintenance and repairs of the driveway that is on the title of No 18.

In conclusion:

If the panel decides to allow the re-zoning to residential to take place, it is absolutely essential that an approved sub-division plan is included, and that the access issues I have identified are addressed.

And :

~~Same~~ It has been mentioned earlier that some form of agreement may have been reached with the owners of No 18 for the purchase of the ~~right of way~~ ^{driveway}. I have a question over whether the residents with access by way of a right of way also have a say or rights regarding the ownership and status of the driveway.

Photograph A



Photograph B



Photograph C

