

Submission of Susan Walker: **GF14: 336 and 336A Portobello Road, The Cove – Rezoning from Rural Residential 2 (RR2) to Township and Settlement (T&S)**

1. Resident at 343 Portobello Road since April 2002.
2. I have no objection to the rezoning and more houses but think the developer's submissions and evidence gloss over, minimise or overlook key issues and constraints.
3. Do not agree with "an estimated feasible capacity of 5 – 8 dwellings" but with S32 "feasible capacity of 5 dwellings".
4. Remain unconvinced that an acceptable **TRAFFIC** outcome possible, even with ITA and Ms Ryan's assessment, and support the conclusion of the S42A report.
5. All residents who gain access via Weller St will be greatly affected by construction and final layout, and should be considered affected parties.
6. Existing residents told firmly that developer's road beyond the existing Weller St will be private. Brings future liability into question and contrasts with Ms Ryan.
7. The 5 year crash assessment (pre 2021) irrelevant given increase in speed to 70 km in October 2020.
8. First Average Annual Daily Traffic assessment before we moved down to alert Level 1.
9. Problem of the right turn greatly understated, and is simply unsafe. People with children have to use it a lot for school. I disagree that it will significantly improve the safety of the intersection.
10. 2-3% increase of peak from one development significant and cumulative.
11. Subdivision will also lock in increased car use: worsens safety for existing cyclists and is inappropriate and unsafe for new residents to use bikes.
12. No assessment of safety of access for residents of lane (in front of numbers 338 to 343, and 346); e.g. blind rise on a single lane below number 338; existing lane residents must continue to trundle waste negotiating increased slopes and traffic.
13. A very significant issue for the lane residents (338 to 343) is that the proposal appears to assume that the Council will waive the standard setback requirement for the **retaining wall for the developer's road on the boundaries of our properties**. This major issue may be being downplayed.
14. Present residents (excepting the developer's close relations at 340) will not assent to this setback waiver if we have a choice. It would have large adverse effects on us, and would not be, or support, best practice urban design outcomes.
15. Effects on us might not be fully assessed because the total site area (7.3 hectares) may bring earthworks under major earthworks threshold despite all being in the rezoned one hectare.
16. The setback standard **of as far as the wall is high** provides a key buffer to geotechnical failure of the retaining wall. Especially important if the new road will be a private way because of future liability for failure and maintenance.

17. Setback would be a critical buffer from substantial associated footing excavations on geotechnically problematic land, their effects on our adjacent land, and local visual (proximity, 'looming', privacy), and landscape effects.
18. We wish Council to uphold setback requirements as good practice.
19. The neighbours are very pleased that Stantec upheld our **GEOTECHNICAL** concerns and recommended requirement for detailed geotechnical investigations, testing and assessment.
20. Add that investigation should include investigation of a report of possible tunnel gully erosion, and geotechnically signed off building sites for each lot (or we may face mismatched buyer expectations and multiple future hazards above us).
21. 'Good ground' is actually **tuff - slippery layers of volcanic ash - not bedrock**. Concerned that recommends deep footings in slippery tuff for retaining walls right on our boundaries, and didn't investigate actual depths (which will be >2m).
22. Concerned about 1000s of cubic metres of **clay overburden, which cannot be used as fill, and must be removed**. If dumped locally, much of it may end up in the harbour.
23. These are some of the strong reasons that an NDMA is needed.
24. Acknowledge that the current subdivision proposal is to avoid the amended SNL and I support the council's opinion that it should stay that way.
25. Proposed retaining wall right on 338 to 343 boundaries will have major adverse visual effects for residents and remove key established trees and fauna habitat.
26. Intertwined privacy issues (lower neighbours 'don't live facing north', sightlines into key living spaces) are also not acknowledged.
27. Difficult to believe that increased stormwater from all the proposed new hard surfaces will have less than minor effects on the receiving environment, which is the harbour, and this is of concern to me as well as manawhenua.

SUMMARY

- If traffic hazards can be resolved, then the subdivision needs to be governed by an NDMA.
- Reasonable to hope the council doesn't relax standards but upholds them.
- Any retaining walls need to be set back from boundaries by at least the permitted standard amount to avoid major effects.
- All roads, driveways and building platforms will need detailed geotechnical design and signoff before any sections are sold.
- These safeguards should bring the number of dwellings sites to that which the land can realistically support.