

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 FORM 5 SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED
PLAN CHANGE**

TO CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Central Otago District Council PO Box 122 ALEXANDRA 9340

Name of Submitter: Alan Duncan Beaton

(Full name)



This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 13 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).

I could/could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

(* Select one)

I am/am not* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission) (* Select One)

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

The high-density urban development proposed – maximum of 900 residential units.

The minimum lot size of 160 m², and the 12m road width for neighbourhood roads (p255).

The restrictive no-complaint covenants to be created in favour of the three adjacent properties.

(Please give details and continue on additional page if necessary)

My submission is:

I oppose the plan change.

It is an inappropriate use for rural land and depletes the land bank available for future rural based development that is the basis for Cromwell's past and recent growth.

The high – density residential proposal undermines the District Plan, has had no community input, and destroys the wide-open spaces feeling that Cromwell provides. It appears to be a new town created on the outskirts of Cromwell with its own proposed amenities that has no obvious link to Cromwell. It is misnamed – the land is not a river terrace - being 450 to 500 metres from the Kawarau Arm of Lake Dunstan - which is neither visible nor directly accessible from the site.

There will potentially be 900 x 3 restrictive no-complaint covenants on each Title issued in favour of 3 adjacent neighbours. Maintaining these covenants through future years and subsequent sales is tenuous, with no guarantee they will not be challenged. This puts these enterprises at risk in the future. There is no way of ensuring that future residents will be made aware "orcharding activities" can and does include helicopters and wind machines operating all night and that "motorsport activities" includes the "racing taxi" that can and does operate all day, every day especially in the summer.

(Please include: whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views; and continue on additional page if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

That Plan Change 13 be amended to ensure the "Rural" status of the land is maintained by zoning all the land Rural Residential and any residential development proceeds within the rules and objectives of the Operative District Plan.

(Please give precise details)

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.

-2

.....
Signature of Submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter) (A signature is not required if you make a submission by electronic means)

DATE: 18 June 2018

Electronic address for service of submitter: beaton@xtra.co.nz

Telephone No: 03 445 1054

Postal Address: 138 Hall Road

**Bannockburn RD 2
Cromwell 9384**

Contact Person: Alan Beaton

(name & designation, if applicable)

**SUBMISSIONS CLOSE IN RESPONSE TO PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 13 ON
WEDNESDAY 20 JUNE 2018**

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 a 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.