

## Your Comment on the Maitahi Village Extension application

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to [substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz](mailto:substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz).

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organisation name (if relevant)			
First name	Peter		
Last name	Olorenshaw		
Postal address			
Home phone / Mobile phone		Work phone	
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)			

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct
-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

Please provide your comments below, include additional pages as needed.

### Reply to Applicants Reply to Fast Track Mahitahi Development Application

#### Directly Affected Adjacent Residents Submission

##### 1. Insufficient Responses

###### 1.1 Factually Incorrect replies given

The Dennes Hole route has never flooded and is 3m above river levels at the lowest point - See below:









In the 30 years since we have lived in the area, this area has never flooded, it is simply untrue to say that it is at risk of flooding (Note tape is bent but is measuring 3400 which gives the 3m height above river level). We are asking for it to be properly formed 2m wide.

### **1.2 Directness of Cycle Routes Not sufficiently answered:**

Adding two needless crossings of both the Maitai Valley Road and the River not addressed. This is not a quiet country road but is one frequented by logging trucks and horns loving the sound of their exhaust echoing off the valley side walls.

The 500m difference between the short, pleasant route around the back of Dennes hole (picture attached) and going out of your way up and over Ralphine Way is actually a 25% increase in trip length over a 2km journey to town. This is not insignificant

The needless climbing up and over the Ralphine way hill is brushed aside as suggesting it is insufficient to deter people biking. But if it is too steep to bike and you have to get off and push unless you have an e-bike then that is an impediment.

Compounding impediments - While any one thing of the multiple issues that the proposals have might not be sufficient to deter cyclists, it is the panels job to look at cumulative effects. It is the cumulative effects of going away from your intended destination, going up over a hill too steep to cycle without dismounting and walking, going 1/4 the distance again than you might have been able to, having to cross a dangerous road twice, cross the river twice, having to cycle alongside the most intimidating heavy traffic - open wheeled log truck and trailers instead of serenely through Branford Park build on each other and amounts to significant impediment to cycling.

Pleasantness of the Dennes Hole route (see above photo) compared to crossing in front of and biking alongside logging trucks twice needlessly is not addressed. I suggest the developers have not experienced the difference crossing in front of and biking alongside these intimidating open wheeled vehicles.

### **1.3 Wasting Money Not Addressed**

Cycle bridge jeopardisation of a 2 lane bridge being installed not addressed (the new concrete cycle bridge proposed for alongside the existing Gibbs bridge will have a chilling effect of ever installing a 2 lane bridge there which is a better alternative than the two new shared path bridges proposed

The applicant did not address the waste of money (and carbon emissions) through needlessly building two new concrete bridges to give people on bikes a second rate biking infrastructure from the new development. This should not be ignored - they can save a substantial amount of money if they opted for the Dennes hole link instead

Biking further up the valley on the road is distinctly unpleasant due to the narrowness and windy nature of the road with zero shoulders and zero visibility corners common. Most people coming up the valley prefer to bike on the riverside track from the town side of the Gibbs bridge. So the proposed bridge alongside the existing one lane bridge would be little used.

End of Reply

**Thank you for your comments**