

I am Steve Shaw and I am speaking for myself and my partner Tania Brady who cannot attend today.

We are not opposed to rezoning or development in principle.

We are opposed to the rezoning GF14 because of the scale of the proposed development by GTJM and the resulting pressure that the intensity of planned dwellings puts on neighbours, neighbouring properties, the rural outlook, roading and other infrastructure.

Our particular concern is the proposed upgrading of Weller Street itself, especially the logistics of any improvements required to facilitate any development of proposed dwelling sites further up the street.

How that might physically impact our property at 333 Portobello Road, including proposed changes to our shared driveway street access concerns us deeply.

1. **Infrastructure.** Infrastructure insufficiencies are already well documented in previous submissions by residents and noted in the evidence summary report submitted by the DCC. To those issues already identified can be added that the sewage pumping station is currently not working properly again, even with the current numbers of dwellings and recent heavy rain once again resulted in huge silting of the harbour from the Weller Street stormwater outlet. The scale of GTJM's proposal impacts on all of those previously mentioned areas of concern. While land instability issues and storm water management under NDMA rules are major concerns, so is GTJM's application to have a "new development mapped area" removed while also opposing the imposition of any infrastructure conditions on themselves. This apparent reluctance to conform to the rules appears to be for maximising the scale of any development and over-maximising their profits.
2. **Professional Opinions.** We appreciate that some aspects identified in appendix 6.12 of the Section 32 document and in our initial submissions have been partly addressed in proposals and professional opinions submitted by GTJM, but we do not deem them to be addressing the issues at a level that makes enough positive difference to how existing residents go about their lives. Specifically, for us, in the Transport report submitted by Traffic Engineer Ms Ryan, the scale of the required engineering to "improve" Weller Street (including excavating, retaining and storm water management as well as the safety features) and to also address the intersection with Portobello Road is not proportional to any improvements expected to occur. Many of the points made in the report are merely detailed current situation notes, not practical solutions that improve upon the most recent intersection upgrade made in 2020 (that, ironically, the writer was herself involved with). This report supports GTJM's potential to "improve" the current situation but does not manage to quantify any benefits of those changes sufficiently for us ie. It's just not a feasible benefit because the input required far outweighs the hoped-for outcomes.
3. **What is Weller Street?** It is currently only a street by name. It is, to all practical purposes, a shared driveway. It is not treated as a street by mail services, rubbish collection services or maintained as a street by the DCC.

Where and how it changes to a shared lane or to a private road is not clear (and Google Maps has got it terribly wrong too). All addresses are Portobello Road addresses, not Weller Street addresses.

The plan to modify our neighbouring shared driveway (in gradient and connection/access) in order to ease any proposed improvement of Weller Street and the intersection with Portobello Road is not desirable to us as it both physically complicates our street access (from separate access for three addresses to shared access for over twenty) and makes our Portobello Road address into another of these street vs address anomalies. Weller Street already requires DCC attention which, if addressed, might make it “adequate” for limited development, but to cynically claim it to now needs to be considered a real street and upgraded for GTJM’s purposes is not acceptable. This proposed upgrade is not for the betterment of the residents, or the safety of the intersection, but because the proposed development is too large. The scale of proposed development is the issue and “improving” Weller Street is not a proportional or feasible solution.

4. **Encroachment on the SNL.** While this has been modified recently, it is of concern this was planned by GTJM from their first proposal to facilitate a number of lots far greater than the recommended number. During this process it has already reduced that number from 12 (and with 9 of them encroaching the SNL) to 9. This is still too many when “a feasible capacity of 5” was the DCC starting point recommendation in the Section 32 document. Proposing 12, with 9 of them encroaching indicates too great a willingness to bend the rules. Very recent changes to the SNL (since the proposal of 9) should already be leading to a further rethink on the number of lots proposed. Proposing less of them mitigates any encroachment on such “out of bounds” areas at all (which is already recommended elsewhere in the Council Evidence report in the context of avoiding some “land instability” areas too).
5. **Liability.** Our house is directly above the lower end of Weller St. where excavations and major retaining are proposed and where construction traffic will pass. Our house insurance specifically excludes damage resulting from either land removal or from land vibration - both of which will be occurring. EQC will only commit to a “maybe” if any subsequent slippage, even years later, coincides with areas where land was previously excavated or retained. DCC say they will cover damage occurring after one year from any completion date while GTJM and their contractors are responsible for damage occurring while developing and for that first year. Appropriate insurance is presumed, but the passing of liability for it from one party to the next over time does not inspire confidence. While any damage to our house caused by disturbing the foundations might be remedied, we might well be majorly inconvenienced too.

Conclusion: We oppose the rezoning because, should it be approved, GTJM’s plans are out of scale with the existing community. Planning too many dwellings on a site that is limited by geology, ecology, infrastructure issues and poor quality access affects we the neighbours, our lifestyles and our properties more negatively than positively.