

**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:** ..... Gary Carl Hyndman and Deborah Lee Hyndman .....  
(Full name)

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

**I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. (\***  
Select one)

**I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that-**  
(a) **adversely affects the environment**

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

Proposed Plan Change 13 : River Terrace - the proposition that Land in the River Terrace Resource Area be developed into medium to high density residential activity, retirement living, a neighbourhood centre, a possible school, with associated open space network, walkways, roading and infrastructure

**My submission is:**

**We are opposed to this proposed change of land use as we believe:**

**it is currently unnecessary**

**it will negatively impact on existing successful businesses in the area**

**it will negatively impact on lifestyle properties that exist in this rural location**

**(see additional pages)**

- 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 the proposed change of zoning from Rural to Medium to High Density Housing not be allowed .  
That substantial boundaries including visual and noise barriers between the proposed development and existing neighbours be a condition of the development should it be allowed to go ahead.**

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**

Gary Carl Hyndman and Deborah Lee Hyndman

**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** 18/06/2018

**Electronic address for service of submitter:** gary.deb@xtra.co.nz

**Telephone No:** 03 445 1616

**Postal Address:** 131 Pearson Road  
RD2  
Cromwell

**Contact Person:** Gary Carl Hyndman (joint property owner of property bounding the proposed development).

**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.

## Concerns re Proposed Property Development

Our concerns re the medium and high density residential property development proposed by River Terrace Developments Limited for land situated alongside Sandflat Road, Cromwell.

This land is currently zoned as 'Rural' and when we purchased our property situated at 131 Pearson Road, Cromwell, it was on the understanding that the property located next to us was zoned as such.

Our property is zoned 'Rural Residential' meaning that we live on a 2.2 hectare block that we are unable to subdivide even if we wanted to.

Our property is located down a long driveway and much of its appeal is that it is away from the noise of the road and other residences.

We operate a small homestay on our property and the overwhelming comments by guests are that they love the peace and quiet that we enjoy at our property.

We are concerned that the development of high density housing on the land located next to us is going to bring with it the noise and dust that is associated with such a development, causing us loss of privacy and enjoyment as well as income from our homestay.

We are anticipating that this noise and dust could exist for a number of years until the land is fully developed.

We are also concerned about issues air pollution, noise, the loss of privacy and security with having a large number of buildings located right next to our eastern boundary.

We have a large number of implements/machinery associated with an orchard that we run on our property and we have concerns re the security of that property as well as the health and safety issues with having families with children living next door and having easy access onto our property during our absence.

The proposed development appears to be suggesting that building platforms could be as close as a meter off our boundary fence and that our properties

will only be separated by a hedge that the developer is going to plant (and maintain?)

We purchased our property 8 years ago to live in a private quiet area and on the understanding that the land in question was only ever going to be used for horticulture/viticulture.

In our opinion to change the zoning from 'Rural' into 'Medium and High Density Housing' is a drastic and unnecessary proposal which lacks any sort of consideration for the residential and business properties that have existed in this area for some time.

We believe that this development will **negatively impact on the residential properties** by:

- Loss of privacy
- Increase in noise
- Security concerns
- Noise and dust caused throughout construction/development process
- Loss of income
- Loss of small intimate community feeling
- Increase in air pollution
- Increase in traffic
- Complaints from residences re existing rural activities such as the use of machinery, chain-sawing, slaughter of livestock, pest eradication, electric fencing and the regular burning of orchard prunings.
- Problems with urban dogs worrying livestock
- Decrease in property values

We also believe that there will be **issues with existing businesses** such as:

- Noise complaints against Highlands Motor Sport Park
- Noise complaints against Cromwell Speedway
- Noise complaints against the local water bottling plant
- Noise complaints against Jones' Orchard
- Complaints about bird scaring/firearm use by Jones' Orchard.
- Noise complaints re machinery and vehicle use on Jones' Orchard and our own orchard
- Complaints about chemical sprays being used at Jones' Orchard and our own orchard.

These businesses are all well established and create employment for Cromwell locals.

We are concerned that a large property development located amidst these businesses would have a **detrimental effect and could potentially result in the closing of such businesses, and the loss of local jobs.**

The Highlands Motor Sport Park is a major complex which brings a lot of visitors to Cromwell and has been instrumental in influencing a number of motor enthusiasts to either move to Cromwell or to purchase holiday homes in Cromwell.

It doesn't make sense to place a housing development directly across the road from a 'noisy' motorsport park and speedway despite proposed clauses to prevent complaints about the noise.

The closing down of Western Springs is a clear indication on how residential complaints will eventually 'win the day'.

We don't believe that there is a need for a high density housing development at this location as Cromwell currently has a number of other housing developments underway at present.

We believe it makes more sense for housing development to be completed at these other locations before considering this drastic zoning change.

These other more suitable housing development areas are:

- Gair Avenue development
- Wooing Tree development
- The Chalets development
- Alpha Street development

These developments are all better located to be part of the Cromwell township expansion and in our opinion would be more likely to be supporting local shops and services than if they were located as essentially a satellite township of Cromwell.

In our opinion the proposed high density housing development beside Sandflat Road would probably become an affordable housing area for workers from Queenstown, and would be of very little benefit to Cromwell.

Cromwell already has two fairly substantial retirement complexes as well as an arguably underutilised shopping mall, two local primary schools and a secondary school.

We don't believe that a proposed retirement facility located across the road from the motor sport park is a logical proposition.

Apart from the noise issues the location is remote from Cromwell township and its facilities.

Likewise we don't think it is in the interest of the existing Cromwell retail community for a shopping centre to be created in this satellite township.

We don't believe that the proposed school is a serious proposition.

It appears that the developer has already spent a considerable amount of money in landscaping the boundary of the proposed development situated closest to state highway 6.

Hedging has also already been planted around the property owned and occupied by Rex Edgar despite concerns that he has raised with the developer.

These actions infer that the developer seems to believe that to that this proposed plan change is a 'done deal' and he has planted his hedge around the Edgar's property in spite of Mr Edgar's protestations.

We are concerned that a property developer may be more concerned about making a profit than co-operating and considering the impact on the local and extended Cromwell community.

In the developers submissions at 6.1.3 'Bell and Hopper Shaft' there is a blatant mistake. The proposal states as follows :

*The Bell & Hopper Mine Shaft is located on the western boundary of number 131 Pearson Road approximately 130m from the proposed subdivision boundary (Appendix A, Figure 1b). **The current landowner of 131 Pearson Road confirmed that he has never seen any evidence of the Bell & Hopper Shaft on the ground surface.***

As the current landowners of 131 Pearson Road we would like to know exactly who the developers or their representatives spoke to in order to be able to state the above.

They have not spoken to us.

**If the proposed development is still to go ahead we personally seek the following:**

- A green area of 10 meters between existing neighbours and the proposed development.
- A planted mound suitable as a visual/sound barrier be located on the green area between existing neighbours and the proposed development.
- That the proposed planted mound be created and maintained by the developer.

**If the proposed development is still to go ahead, on behalf of well established businesses in the area, we seek the following :**

- Provision is made that no complaints can be made in relation to noise
- Provision is made that no complaints can be made in relation to orchard activities
- Provision is made that no complaints can be made in relation to everyday farm activities such as the slaughtering of livestock, burning of orchard prunings or any other activities relating to the functioning of the businesses that are already existing.