## **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 JOHN MOEN. (Full name)
This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 13 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).
I could/e <del>ould-net*</del> 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 that- (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) 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:
THAT RIVER TERRETE RESENRE AREA BO COMPREHENSIUBLY
DELBUCAS FOR URBAN ACTIONS.
(Please give details and continue on additional page if necessary)
My submission is:
I Oppose THE CHANGE FROM THE RURAL RESOURCE AREA
TO A DEUSCOPMENT FOR CIRBAN ACTIVITIES.
PLOASE REFSE TO ATTACKED.
(Please include:
<ul> <li>whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>reasons for your views;</li> <li>and continue on additional page if necessary)</li> </ul>
I seek the following decision from the local authority:
THAT THE ARBA REMAINS AS A PROAL RESOURCE AREA
THAT THERE IS NO CHANGE.
(Please give precise details)
I wish/do not wish to be heard in support of my submission. (Please strike out as applicable)

(Please delete if you w	vould not consider presenting a joi	oint case)	
Signature of Subm (or person authorised (A signature is not req	to sign on behalf of submitter) uired if you make a submission by	y electronic means)	
Electronic address	for service of submitter:	PAMOEN @ XYE4 . CO. NZ	
Telephone No:	3 445 1965		
Postal Address:	9 Cooxers G	) Derak	
Contact Person:	(name & designation, if a	applicable)	

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

# 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.

### **Attachment to Form 5**

### Plan Change 13

Submitter: Peter John Moen

I oppose the change from the Rural Resource Area to a development for urban activities for the following reasons:

Access onto State Highway 6
 The Sandflat Road-State Highway 6 intersection is dangerous.

#### 2. Noise

Noise is a constant at Highlands Motorsport Park. The race track is in use throughout the year. It can be heard most days in the background within much of Cromwell township. Being close to Highlands and the stock car track will be a continual irritation if anyone were to live in the proposed sub-division. Those who initially buy the sections may accept this as part of their neighbourhood, but pursuant buyers in years to come will expect a quiet space, and will complain loud and long about the noise. This area should be kept rural/commercial. Highlands is unique to our community and valued for its presence. And its existence depends on a rural setting.

3. Chemicals and Proximity to orchards

Proposed houses would be very close to large orchards. People who are not familiar with orchard operations do not realise the large amount of spraying which goes on throughout the year in the production of fruit. They will buy sections, build houses, and at a later date realise the health impact. Then they will rightly apportion blame for issues such as asthma, eczema etc on the chemical and organic (also harmful) orchard sprays and spray drift from the orchards across the fence and over the road.