

My name is Edward Anderson, aged 91 years, and my work was in management at the local public hospital. I live with my wife at 23B Meadowbrook Drive, a house that is built very close to the boundary of this proposed development. However, that is **NOT** the argument I shall be using to ask the Commissioners to reject this proposal.

I will put forward reasons regarding flooding, but first I want to point out that statements from experts in support of the application, acknowledge three facts:-

1. That they will be using **productive rural land**,
2. That adjacent residents are "**affected parties**" i.e. that the applicants activities **are** going to have an effect on existing residents,
3. That a previous application for land use changed **failed** because of flooding issues. Since then the land has not changed in any way, flooding will still occur and due to climate change will more likely be more severe than anything we have experienced up to now.

Mr Preston's conclusion that it is "more likely than not that residential subdivision will occur" is not sufficiently **positive** enough to be taken as a basis for making a decision on whether this piece of land is **safe** for people to live on.

Mr Asgar's recommendation (3.4 a & b) for performance standards to a structure under Rule 22.6.2.1 can be said to be flood hazard mitigation as defined in the "Regional Policy Statement". Now that document was written for a purpose, presumably to guide decisions regarding flood-prone land such as we are considering today. That statement says that, given a choice, **not** building on such land must be chosen over mitigating the effects of flooding. The actual wording of Clause 9.2.c is "flood hazard avoidance **must** be preferred to flood hazard mitigation". Please note the word "**must**", which carries with it a certain imperative.

Another thing that is there for a reason are the floodgates at Milson. Now floodgates when in operation need somewhere for the floodwater to go, hence we have the designated spillway to do just that. Horizons in their statement say :the drainage scheme has **not** got any capacity to handle additional stormwater, as it already operates at capacity during relatively commonly occurring flood events".

And then there is climate change, which is a reality, driving unprecedented rainfall and flooding in Germany, and closer to home, recent destructive floods in Ashburton and Gisbourne. This gives you further cause to have all the area you can get, available to take stormwater at such times. I see this land every day, I know it does **not** drain well, because even after the few showers we have had lately, there are puddles of water lying on the surface. The ground is quite boggy, not at all the sort of conditions I would want to build **my** house on.

Now I come to our own unique situation. Before we built our house, we were given dispensation by the City Council to build without a "living court" and without the obligatory distance between house and boundary. The reason given at the time was that there was "plenty of space over the boundary" and that "the land would never be built on". Whether that should have been said or not is irrelevant, it **was** said and we built accordingly and cited our home with a large "picture" window only 1.1 metres from the boundary. Currently we enjoy the amenity of uninterrupted sunlight, a large proportion of which we would lose if the indicated 1.8 metre fence was erected along the boundary. Such a fence would also remove the feeling of "space" we now have and as a result we would become non-compliant with the building regulations.

Consequently **if** this application for land use change is approved, we make the request that the panel instruct the council or the developers to put in place some conditions to mitigate the worst of the disadvantages that would ensue. I did list some of such measures in my original written submission.

Finally, to boil it all down as simply as possible. In spite of all the assurances that this development can be done safely, we suggest that it would only be common sense to recognise that this land is a spillway for floodwater, so **do not** allow houses to be built there.

I certainly would not want the responsibility of putting people and property at risk.

Thank you.

23 B Meadowbrook Drive

03 June 2022

We are agreed that the one thing that we do not want is a high, solid fence, because of the loss of sunlight and also we worry the lack of air flow would make the path behind it slippery and dangerous.

Our preference would be a reserve behind us.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Edward Anderson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Edward Anderson