

## Submission of Philip Driver

1. My name is Philip Driver and along with my wife, Michelle Driver we have lived at (LOT 1 DP 55849), 290 Bradleys Road for the past 3 years.

Our property is directly affected by the proposed development and that is why we have taken a particular interest in Private Plan Change 31

2. We are not experts in planning, Infrastructure or Civil Engineering and are novices in the workings of Council Policy

Because of our inexperience in these areas we engage a group made up of numerous disciplines with years of experience to review all the relevant information to plot a course of action that meets our needs whilst taking into account the needs of others.

How do we do this? By voting in elections for a Government to set Policy and a Council to implement that policy in a way that suits the particular needs of the local community.

Having reviewed the planning process we have been impressed by the amount of work that has been put in by the Council and the outcome that has been delivered.

The challenge as we all know is to balance the needs of the existing population whilst catering for the significant growth that the District is experiencing. The Proposed District Plan is the outcome of years of work by the Waimakariri DC to meet the needs of its population both now and in the future.

In contrast the private plan applicant has adopted an approach that meets their needs ( a successful return on their investment) with little regard for the population of Waimakariri as a whole.

3. We have chosen to focus on those items we originally raised that remain uncovered or unresolved between the various experts involved

### 4. Item 1.2

- 4.1 In Item 1.2 we brought up the proposals about Landscape Treatment along Bradleys Road

In the applicant's proposal Plan 185 it shows a 10m strip running across the frontage of 290 Bradleys Road.

A 10M strip adjacent to Bradleys Road significantly encroaches the boundary of 290 Bradley's Road. This land is privately owned and cannot be included in this proposal without permission of the owners ie my wife and me.

- 4.2 The applicant continues to persist in submitting proposals that involve a 10 m strip of land alongside Bradleys Road. Initially it was for Landscape treatment A and now appears to have developed into a shared pedestrian / cycleway.

I would like to reiterate our point that this includes land that is privately owned by us and cannot be considered part of their development activities. A request for any use of our land has not been sought and would not be given.

4.3 Undeterred the applicant continues to have their plans encroach on our property. We have now discovered that in Figure 1 of the evidence submitted by their Urban Design expert Ms Lauenstien they propose to run a shared pedestrian / cycleway along the Northern side of our property.

4.4 All of this shows scant regard for detail and in our opinion calls into question the accuracy of the rest of the applicant's evidence!

## 5. Item 1.4

5.1 In item 1.4 we referred to:

Environment Canterbury Regional Development Plan 2018, Section 9. Moving Toward our vision: action plan, Table 9.1, page 25, in the Medium Plan 2018 -2028 states:

*"Transit Orientated development is supported, by ensuring urban development is focused on locations near public transport corridors, through future reviews of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and District Plan. -*

5.2 A transport corridor and associated strategy has been designed to support the addition of 5,000 to 7,000 homes. The applicant has indicated that their experts believe the WDC's New Development Area in that transport corridor will only deliver 3,200 to 4,400 dwellings a shortfall of 1,800 to 2,600.

850 new homes in Ohoka is not a solution to this problem. It is not even 50% of the shortfall.

Placing an additional 850 homes in Ohoka can only be justified with the addition of currently non-existent transport solutions to service the development.

If the applicant is right, what is required is a detailed review of the current strategy that will deliver the expected quantity of homes that the council needs to provide capacity for.

This can then be supported by the necessary infrastructure which may be an extension of the existing transport corridor or the development of a new corridor with sufficient housing volume to support a regular and efficient transport service.

Providing a part solution that will require investment in transport infrastructure will only deliver a fragmented and unreliable outcome.

5.3 If the Council's plans are wrong as the submitter suggests then, the WDC, ECAN and associated authorities need to replan, not accept the proposal from a Private Developer who has failed to consider the big picture.

## 6. Item 1.7

### 6.1 Potential Loss of Productive Land

The applicant's 7.3.3. Summary states

"At least 98% (Table 3) of the soils are Poorly or Very Poorly Drained. Poor drainage, limited aeration, moderate to slow permeability, heavy soil structure and waterlogging vulnerability (Table 2) significantly limits the soil's suitability for horticulture and several arable crop options (Section 7.3.2)."

6.2 We are keen to understand how their assessment has changed from an area that has and I quote, "98% of the soils are Poorly or Very Poorly Drained. Poor drainage, limited aeration, moderate to slow permeability, heavy soil structure and waterlogging vulnerability". To, in the words of their Polo expert Mr Charles Wood, I again quote'

"18.3 The site is ideal in terms of suitability. Polo fields require well **drained**, flat, wide and expansive land...."

6.3 The lack of consistency in their application again calls into question the reliability of their evidence.

6.4 All we can do is share what we see. There has been a dairy farm on this land for years and it is there now. When we first brought our property and met the farmer over the fence, he was proud to point out the size and condition of his herd, we wouldn't see any like it in Canterbury! The land is productive now and can be productive for years to come.

## **7. Item 1.11**

- 7.1 The applicants proposal states: “It is considered viable to establish a community drinking water supply within the plan change area, with an estimated total of four (4) new bores required to provide N+1 redundancy.

We submitted that, there is no statement on how they would ensure continuity of supply to the affected properties within the area during the proposed development.

- 7.2 We now learn from Mr Steffens who states in paragraph 49

It is also noted that many of the shallow neighbouring bores are listed as being used for domestic supply. In the unexpected event that a full well interference assessment identifies neighbouring bores that could be adversely affected by well interference, mitigation options are available for potentially affected bore owners, which could include expanding the extent of the Ōhoka reticulated public water supply network.

When we hear the phrase ‘In the unexpected event’ it always fills us with caution.

- 7.3 Due to the uncertainty around the impact on existing bores we propose that there is a permanent covenant on the applicant to guarantee the continual supply to existing properties on the site either through their existing wells or by connection at their expense to the new supply infrastructure.

## **8. Item 1.13**

- 8.1 The applicant stated in Item 111

“Subject to the above road widening, the traffic effects of the proposed Plan Change are considered to be acceptable.”

We stated that:

The upgrades to the SH1 Waimakariri crossing have been designed to promote the use of multiple occupancy vehicles and buses joining via Tram Road travelling West. This means the traditional issue of traffic joining SH1 from Tram Road travelling East remains. The addition of 470 cars per hour, joining at peak times should, at the very minimum, have been assessed for the impact on SH1 southbound traffic, as this is the traditional choke point not traffic local to the proposed development which is the focus of Appendix H. There is potential to return to the long tail backs experienced in the past if too much traffic is fed through the Tram Road on ramp.

- 8.2 I would also like to point out that when Mr N Fuller considers, in para 23 of his transport assessment regarding the Tram Road / Bradleys Road Intersection and I quote:

“having some movements at intersections operating at Level of Service E is acceptable at peak periods. Although this indicates that delays are increasing, they are tolerable, and drivers would not become frustrated.”

We can advise you that I exit the Bradleys Road / Tram Road junction every working day and in the last 2 months I have witnessed multiple examples of frustrated drivers exiting McHughs Road failing to observe the Road Code by not giving way to vehicles exiting Bradleys Road.

Perhaps he would care to canvass the opinion of the Mandeville residents to seek their view?

I’m afraid his assessment of what constitutes a level of frustration to North Canterbury drivers is significantly off the mark!

## 9. Item 3.1

### 9.1 The applicant is proposing to

Amend definition of village character of Ohoka to state, *“where larger allotments surround smaller properties which form a walkable community around the village centre.”*

*Our response was*

There is no requirement to specifically identify the CENTRE of a rural character village. By its definition it has developed over the years and has natural meeting points in its geography ie: Garage; Reserve; Village hall; School.

With reference to the Waimak Rural District Character Assessment, 6 June 2018: Forward from David Ayres:

*“People love to live in the Waimak district for many reasons. One of those reasons is that we provide so many different living choices.”*

Ohoka (a rural village without centralised amenities) is a living choice in its own right.

*“The district offers the very best of Town and Country”*

Ohoka is the very best of country. This proposed development would make it a town and destroy one of the jewels in the Waimak crown. A benchmark in country living.

### 9.2 Earlier in this hearing Mr Carter stated that:

“Ohoka has always had a good name and people are attracted to living there but there is currently a serious lack of amenities at present to support this interest. With only a garage and an irrigation supplier.”

We may only have a garage and an irrigation supplier but a community’s heart is achieved through what its people do, not what it has. Maintaining the berms and ditches , picking up litter on the side of the road, reporting issues to the council on the , Snap, Send and Solve App, sharing local security concerns on Facebook, or volunteering to improve the shared reserve, that is what makes a community and gives a village its heart.

- 9.2 Has Mr Carter ever considered that the reason people are attracted to live in Ohoka is due to the lack of amenities in contrast to other developments in the district?

Living in Ohoka is a lifestyle choice we were lucky to have but will be denied to people in the future if this development goes ahead.