

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: Peter Raymond BRAYSHAW (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:

Proposed plan change 13: River Terrace

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

My submission is:

Please refer to attached sheet.

(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 proposed plan change 13: River Terrace be rejected and that the status quo remains.

(Please give precise details)

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

P R Brass

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)

20/06/18

Date

Electronic address for service of submitter:

cherrytreefarm@extra.co.nz

Telephone No:

0274 357588

Postal Address:

*422 Ripponvale Road
CROMWELL RD 2*

Contact Person:

Peter BRASS

(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.

Submission to The Central Otago District Council, Plan Change 13.

Submitter: Peter Brass.

Points of objection:

1. The loss of potential valuable horticulture land. An existing orchardist would have purchased this land to develop for further cherry production which is seeing rapid development in the area. Cromwell is seen as being Cherry Capital of New Zealand. The government has signalled its concerns on the loss of prime horticultural land to residential developments.
2. This proposed plan change would set a precedence for future adjacent horticulture land to be used for ongoing residential development.
3. Helicopter use in orchards for frost protection and drying trees after rain events close to residential areas would pose significant noise and safety hazards in the event of an accident. Potential residents in the River Terrace development while waiving their rights of objection to noise and health issues on nearby orchards would undoubtedly voice and argue that such issues are unacceptable to residents in the future. (example Letts Gully residents)
4. There is a major conflict of land use with proposed high density residential dwellings and existing orchard area. The developer is taking advantage of cheaper horticulture land to force through a residential development and so maximise a potential profit. The profit incentive for one group of people should not over ride the wishes of the community. If the residents and community of Cromwell were to decide it was desirable then that should be reason enough for the development to proceed. Council need to be reminded of ratepayers wishes.
5. Health issues for potential residents with harmful sprays used by orchards. Residents could in the future object to the types of sprays used and the timing of spraying. This would restrict orchardists and their ability to have viable operations.
6. Plan change 13 River Terrace would result in further fragmentation of residential Cromwell by creating another subdivision outside of the township which surely is not desirable for existing residents.
7. There is a potential for traffic congestion and access to state highway 6 as well as the access to Cromwell town centre.
8. I feel there is possibly increased infrastructure costs over and above the developer's portion that would need to be met by ratepayers creating a further burden on ratepayers.
9. I would like the council to note there is ample alternative under developed areas of Cromwell ie Waenga Drive area, the existing golf course land that would be better used for residential use. The Freeway orchard at the entrance to Cromwell would be far more desirable as a residential development closer to town. It should be noted that the Top 10 and Wooing tree developments have been approved and are surely more desirable than a new suburb in the area proposed by plan change 13. Council need to be proactive in obtaining these areas or indicating that these areas are next on an updated plan for development by applying rating pressure on undeveloped land. Council should initiate development areas rather than developers applying undue pressure on council resources for their own selfish reasons.

Conclusion: the status quo should remain and valuable land for horticulture use should be preserved for future use. That future social and health issues for residents in the proposed plan change 13: River Terrace will result in ongoing disputes between orchardists and residents.