

Resource Management Act 1991

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

(FORM 6)

19/221



To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340

Name of person making further submission

Name: (Annetta and Ross Cowie)

Postal address: (5 The Stonestack, Clyde)
(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: (449 2621 or 0274 362424)
Email: (Ross-Annetta@xtra.co.nz)

Contact person: (Annetta or Ross Cowie)
(Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan.

I am: We are

1. A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest, the grounds for saying this being:

.....; or

2. ^{Persons have} A person who has an interest in the proposal that is great than the interest the general public has, the grounds for saying this being: ²²

Property owners within defined area.....; or

(Please state whether you are a person who may make a submission under 1 and/or 2 above and also specify/explain the grounds for saying that you come within category 1 and/or 2)

3. The local authority for the relevant area.

^{We}
~~I~~ support (or oppose) the submission of:

..... ^{Medium Density Housing Change} on Plan Change 19
(Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission point number of the original submission)

The reasons for my ^{our} support (or opposition) are:

..... ^{See attached!}
.....
.....
.....

(Please give reasons and continue on an additional page if necessary)

^{We}
~~I~~ seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (~~or disallowed~~):

.....
..... ^{See attached}

(Please give precise details)

^{We} wish (or do not wish) to be ^{heard} ~~heard~~ in support of my ^{our} further submission.
(Please strike out as applicable)

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.
(Please delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

..... ^{Gu Louie} 

Signature of person making Further Submission
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)
(A signature is not required if you make a submission by electronic means)

Date: ^{20.12.22}

Email: ^{Ross-Annetta@extra.co.nz}

Telephone No: ^{449 2621 / 0274 362424}

Postal Address: 5 The Stonestack
Clyde
.....

Contact Person(s) Ross + Annetta Cowie
(name & designation, if applicable)

Submissions close at 4pm on Tuesday 20 December 2022

Submissions can be emailed to districtplan@codc.govt.nz

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious;
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- it contains offensive language;
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Resubmission for Plan 19 Changes

In our first submission, we queried the rationale behind the initial proposal and particularly the need for medium density housing within the proximity of the Clyde heritage area. Our views on this have not changed – we still do not understand the rationale!

From your report following submissions, there has been reference made to Precinct 1 which is within or near the Clyde Heritage Precinct and the potential to impact on the character of the Heritage Precinct. We are heartened however to note that within Precinct 1, any development in this area has the potential to impact on the character of the Heritage Precinct. Exactly what we referred to in our original submission. A lower height limit is applied and development within the precinct needs to be considered in its relationship with the Heritage Precinct. However, we would like to be reassured that a Plan Change would still be required to rezone this area in the future.

We would also ask why Alexandra, Clyde and Cromwell, are all being considered under the same plan? Within your very own Council, as outlined in the Central Otago Destination Management Plan, (see information below) the emphasis on retaining the essential character of small towns – Clyde is in this category. Comparing Alexandra and Cromwell with Clyde is in our opinion contrary to this point. (Extract from Newspaper Article below).

Tuesday November 29th

Personnel, Role Changes at Tourism Body

How tourism needs to be developed and managed in a way that protects the things that matter most to the communities in the region and some of these things are non-negotiable.

- *wide open spaces*
- *essential character of small towns*
- *and freedoms residents enjoy and that they are willing to share with visitors*
- *the place of mana whenua*

A note here, We have tried to search for the above-mentioned plan on your website, but had no luck in finding it. We also searched for Clyde Heritage Plan and there is nothing there which is up to date.

During this process we have spoken to a number of property owners within the village who have absolutely no idea of the proposal and planned changes as set out in Plan 19. Ideally, if a person is directly affected by any changes, surely they should be communicated with directly, and Council not assume that everyone uses the same source to glean any information. To us, the number of people who responded to the Satisfaction Survey is testament that not everyone is aware of what Council is proposing on many matters – maybe that is the idea! When we became aware of the Satisfaction Survey, it was already closed – 180 odd replies is very unsatisfactory given the number of ratepayers within the Central Otago Council.

Below is feedback from the report which expresses our concerns far more eloquently.

Communications and engagement (23 comments) – Council website isn't very intuitive and people find it difficult to find what they are looking for; frustrations with consultation and feedback processes, suggestions to engage with the community in different ways other than just surveys to reach a wider demographic; more regular updates on council projects and governance decisions; frustrations that community feedback is not genuinely listened to; better, more simplified communication.

In our original submission, a major concern of ours was the village aspect being lost with the proposed plan for medium density housing eroding the character within the centre of the

village. Only today, Tuesday 20 December, while visiting the local garage, was I heartened to see the number of people photographing buildings etc. and particularly street scape in Sunderland Street.

Since the time of our original submission, we have given considerable thought as to what is the best way to future proof a jewel in the Central Otago area. Clyde, as you will be well aware is a new tourist hot spot and any decisions on its future requires careful and considered thought, and decisions not be made in haste specifically the medium density proposal. In view of the importance of Clyde as an attractive and desirable heritage destination within the so-called Central Otago as a '*point of difference*' region, 200 sq.metre sections within or around the heritage township will quickly destroy any qualities that exist now. You just need to look at the terrible structures being built at the Wooing Tree Development in Cromwell and North Lake in Wanaka to get some idea of what we mean. These will be tomorrow's slums. If this happens to inner Clyde, not only will the community lose the value of its heritage, but also the beautiful green areas that exist here now. Unlike the large cities and towns in New Zealand, where inner city developments such as you propose for Clyde do have advantages in allowing people closer access to their working environment, shopping and recreation areas, none of this exists in Clyde. We have some restaurants, a 4 Square and Cycle Businesses which are all easily accessible by foot from anywhere within the town boundary!

The timeframe on this resubmission is totally unreasonable. Due to the short time given to respond and the closing date being only four working days prior to the Christmas break, many people are distracted with work break-ups and summer holiday plans which may well cause them to overlook this very important proposed change. Again, we must ask, why the haste? Was this to meet a Council deadline? And, we ask why mid January was not considered, it would have given a little more time for more reasoned debate. We know Council certainly won't be reviewing this over the holiday period!!

In conclusion, we wish to reinforce our objection to the Proposed Plan Change 19 which would allow Medium Density Development within the designated area surrounding the historic township of Clyde. In our opinion, it should not happen. Clyde should sit comfortably in the same category as Naseby, Roxburgh and Ophir. Little gems in a beautiful landscape. Treasure what you've got. Concentrate industrial and commercial developments in the appropriate areas – Alexandra and Cromwell and leave Clyde to be a small but well-formed jewel to be proud of.

Annetta and Ross Cowie
5 The Stonestack
Clyde

Handwritten signatures of Annetta and Ross Cowie in blue ink.