### **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: MARL (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) l am/am not\* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission thatadversely affects the environment; and (a) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition. (b) (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: (Please give details and continue on additional page if necessary) My submission is: (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:

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

(Please strike out as applicable)

(Please give precise details)

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)

13. TUNC 20|8

Date

Electronic address for service of submitter: Mark@Southair.com2

Telephone No: M. 0274.352517

Postal Address: 9. FAIRFAX 5.T.

MAORI HILL

DUNEDIN 9010

Contact Person: Mark Paterson

(name & designation, if 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)

## 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.

# Coventry Classics Ltd

## Classic Jaguar Recreations in Alloy

P.O. Box 50 Mosgiel Otago New Zealand Directors Brian Dwyer Mark Paterson

Mobile 0274352517

mark@southair.co.nz

Central Otago District Council P.O. Box 122 Alexandra 9340

13th June 2018

Re Proposed Plan Change 13, River Terraces Developments Ltd, Sandflat Road, Cromwell.

Dear Sir,

I am very surprised that the Council is considering Plan Change 13 as a viable and workable housing development due to its proximity to the Highlands Motorsport Park and the Cromwell Speedway.

I am making this submission for two reasons.

Firstly I am a member of the Highlands Motorsport park and I also own an industrial section there and believe that the proposed subdivision if established would spell the end of the Motorsport Park within a short period of time.

Secondly I own an aircraft maintenance business at Taieri Airfield in Dunedin and I am fully aware of the reverse sensitivity issues surrounding Taieri Airfield since a subdivision was allowed to be developed on its boundary recently. It is likely that the airfield will eventually close due to the effects of the aviation activities on the nearby residents and the inherent danger that now exists. I do not feel that it is wise that a similar situation should be allowed to develop at Highlands.

The owners of Highlands have invested a massive amount of private money into developing the motorsport facility. It is one of the best in Australasia and is now a major tourist attraction and has created many jobs in the area. Highlands has huge potential for the development, testing and construction of motor vehicles from classics to modern to race cars. If the proposed subdivision is approved, then the potential for growth at Highlands will be lost for good.

It is all very well to place covenants on sections stopping complaints about noise etc but such covenants are notorious for not applying to subsequent purchasers and over time they lose any real legal force. Eventually the residents of a subdivision of 850 residential units would gather enough momentum to severely restrict any activity at Highlands.

I purchased one of the first sections sold at Highlands and plan to shift my company Coventry Classics to Highlands eventually. We restore classic Jaguar cars and construct toolroom copies of classic Jaguar race cars which are exported all over the world. I would certainly not go ahead with that plan if 850 residential units, a school and a commercial retail centre were to be established beside Highlands.

I find it very difficult to understand why a residential development is even being considered next door to a motorsport park that has cost millions to develop, has put Cromwell on the world map and that has such great potential for automotive research and development. An industrial zone would be fine but a residential development makes no sense whatsoever. At the very minimum there should be a substantial buffer between Highlands and any residential development, at least 2 km to minimize the effects of the Highlands activities on future residents.

I also suggest that if further residential development in the Cromwell area is urgently needed then specific areas need to be allocated under a comprehensive scheme designed by the Council and not established piecemeal by allowing developments instigated by developers in inappropriate areas. Sandflat Rd is obviously an inappropriate area for any residential development for the reasons given above. There must surely be better areas around Cromwell for such residential development.

I submit therefore that the proposed Plan 13 change be declined.

Yours faithfully

Mark Paterson

Coventry Classics Ltd