

Good morning

We are Neil and Linda Brown.

We have owned and lived at 175 Wakari Road since 1978.

We consider that any re-zoning and subsequent development of G11 should be at a suitable density and be sensitive to the values that have kept us living in this area for so long.

While our primary concern with the Variation 2 process is with the neighbouring property at 195 Wakari Rd, we value all of the local environment and its ecology and do not wish to see that compromised.

In our submission, we outlined the reasons we think a General Residential 1 zoning is inappropriate for GF11:

- Loss of green space.
- Impact on visual amenity in the transition to the abutting significant rural landscape zone.
- Loss of biodiversity- particularly the significant numbers of native birds currently supported in the area.
- Impact on air quality from reduced vegetation and increased sources of pollution.
- Too high a percentage of hard surface coverage, reducing ground absorption and increasing run-off speeds to Ross Creek and the Leith.
- Increased noise and light emissions.
- Increased traffic on Wakari Road, that already has capacity and safety design issues.

Another submitter - JKS Paddock Ltd - has sought to demonstrate that General Residential 1 is a valid zoning for GF11 by offering their concept for a subdivision at 195 Wakari Road that they consider meets the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.

You have received our response to their document and you will have seen that we believe there is considerable doubt that these requirements can be met.

In fact Mr Darryl Sycamore, on behalf of JKS Paddock Ltd, threw much doubt on it himself when he argued for a separate Residential Transitional Zone before this panel on 22 August.

Regarding development he stated that it 'is unlikely that that will ever be coordinated in unison' and 'to assume that all of the property in GF11 will be developed is in my view a gamble'.

The separate RTZ was sought so that development of 195 Wakari Road (again quoting Mr Sycamore) 'can happen without interaction with adjacent property owners'.

We suggest that this lack of certainty about holistic development occurring in conjunction with other land owners renders their proposal unachievable, particularly in terms of transport connectivity with other land in GF10 and GF11.

What certainly impacts on its achievability is their wish to incorporate part of our land to get a suitable width for the sole route between Wakari Road and the subdivision and our unwillingness to part with that land to enable a subdivision at such a high density.

We think these issues demonstrate that General Residential 1 is an inappropriate and probably unachievable zoning for GF11 land.

Should a density at or lower than Large Lot Residential be placed on GF11, we would be open to discussing options for access if they continued to be necessary.