

# Resource Management Act 1991

## Submission on Notified Proposed Plan Change to Central Otago District Plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

### (FORM 5)

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

### Details of submitter

Name: Leanne Downie \_\_\_\_\_

Postal address: \_25 Sunderland Street Clyde 9330

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone:

\_0276343864\_\_\_\_\_

Email:

\_dam.buster@me.com\_\_\_\_\_

Contact person: Leanne Downie

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name & designation, if applicable)

**This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).**

**I am not\* a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308B](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991**  
(\*select one)

**The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:**

(Give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

1. Lot size of 200 sq mtr. This is too small, people who live in/move to Clyde seem to like toys such as boats, RV's etc. The loss of the extra 50 sq mtr would be the difference between some green space on the lot or not.

2. The Dam end of Clyde is narrow and bounded by high land as such it gets quite a lot less sun hours than even the Alex end of town, crowded infill will make this worse. See the effect 17a Holloway has had on 15.

3. I have concerns that the only protection Clyde Heritage area and Clyde in general has from inappropriate infill is the sewerage being septic tanks. Once reticulated sewerage is in place this protection is removed and any plans and protections covered in this Plan will not yet be in play. What protection is planned to keep inappropriate development being rushed through in the interim.

4. Breaking up larger lots into 200 sq mtr lots will not equate to affordable housing in Clyde but the loss of Clyde's lovely gardens which delight so many visitors as they walk and bike around town. Small shrubs and tussocks don't provide summer shade in our hot summers but there will be little room for large deciduaous shade trees on these small lots.

---

---

---

**This submission is:**

*(Attach on separate page if necessary) Include:*

- *whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and*
- *the reasons for your views.*

I oppose specific parts of this plan as above \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

**I / We seek the following decision from the consent authority:**

*(Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)*

Keep smallest lot sizes within the current guidelines \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

- **I support / oppose the application OR** *(select one)*
- **I wish / to be heard in support of this submission** *(select one)*
- **\*I / We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission**  
*\*Delete this paragraph if not applicable.*

**In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.**

---

---

Signature: Leanne G Downie

Date 28 August 2022

## Submissions close at 4pm on Friday 2 September 2022

Submissions can be emailed to [districtplan@codc.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@codc.govt.nz)

### **Note to person making submission:**

*If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.*

*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.*