## **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

т.,	Control Otogo District Council		(2)
To:	Central Otago District Council PO Box 122		= 19 JUN 2010 =
	ALEXANDRA 9340	010	DISTRICT J
Name	of Submitter:	O'Donnell	A BONDINA
		(Full name)	1211191
This	s a submission on proposed Plan Ch	ange 13 to the Central Ot	ago District Plan (the proposal).
l cou	d√could not* gain an advantage in trac	de competition through the (* Select one)	his submission.
l am/a (a) (b)	am not* directly affected by an effect of adversely affects the environment; a does not relate to trade competition (Delete entire paragraph if you could not g	and or the effects of trade co	mpetition.
The s	pecific provisions of the proposal tha		to are:
	See a	Hached	
	(Please give details and	d continue on additional page	if necessary)
My su	bmission is:		
	see a	xtached	
		(Please include:	
	<ul> <li>whether you support or oppose</li> </ul>		h to have them amended; and
	and continue	reasons for your views; on additional page if necessa	ary)
l seek	the following decision from the local	authority:	
	Se.	e attached.	
	(Plea	ase give precise details)	
	do not wish to be heard in support of		
(Please	e strike out as applicable)		

-2-

	imilar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. would not consider presenting a joint case)
	to sign on behalf of submitter)
(A signature is not re-	quired if you make a submission by electronic means)
Date	
Electronic address	s for service of submitter: Scott, Odonell@hwv.co.nz
Telephone No:	29 2334401
Postal Address:	11 Powk Street Invercargili
Contact Person:	Scott O'Donnell (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.

# Form 5: Submission by Central Land Holdings Limited on Plan Change 13 to the Central Otago District Plan: River Terrace

Name: Scott O'Donnell (SO) 11 Park Street Invercargill

Phone: 029 233 4401

Contact: Scott O'Donnell (scott.odonnell@hwr.co.nz)

- 1.0 This is a submission on Plan Change 13: River Terrace
- 2.0 SO could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 3.0 The specific provisions of the proposal that this submission relates to are:
  - The plan change in its entirety;
  - The failure to adequately consider, avoid or mitigate the reverse sensitivity effects of the Plan Change on the Highlands Motorsport Park and the consequential economic effects;
  - The effects on rural productivity;
  - The site is not a suitable location for urban growth;
     The failure to adequately consider alternative locations.

#### 4.0 Submission:

- 4.1 SO is a member of Highlands Motorsport Club.
  - 4.1.1 Over the last 8 years significant investment has gone in to developing the motorsport park and establishing it as a national and international attraction. The motorsport park has become a pivotal economic asset to Cromwell with the single weekend Highlands 101 event alone generating over \$1.5 million expenditure and directly and indirectly creating the equivalent of 26 full time jobs<sup>1</sup>. The overall annual contribution to the Cromwell economy is much greater and the facility also provides a valuable social and recreational asset to the Central Otago and Lakes Districts.
  - 4.1.2 The events that take place at the motorsport park have the potential to generate high levels of noise and traffic, which is why the facility is ideally located in its semi-rural location away from residential development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Highlands Motorsport Park/Central Otago District Council 'Visitor Survey Analysis Report', Emma O'Neill, March 2015.

4.1.3 Plan Change 13 proposes to enable the development of up to 900 residential units, including retirement units and high density residential sections, on land immediately to the east of the motorsport park. This has the potential to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects relating to the motorsport park and significant consequential economic effects.

## 4.2 Reverse Sensitivity

- 4.2.1 The Assessment of Effects on the Environment that forms part of the plan change documentation considers the reverse sensitivity effects of the Plan Change on the motorsport park. The assessment acknowledges that there is potential for reverse sensitivity effects arising from the location of residential activity near to the existing motorsport park.
- 4.2.2 The assessment states that the proposed plan provisions require that all titles within the River Terrace residential area are subject to a land covenant that prevents any owner from complaining about or taking any measures to prevent or hinder the motorsports and related activities from being lawfully carried out.
- 4.2.3 The proposed covenant rule is the sole method proposed to address the potential reverse sensitivity effects of the plan change on the motorsport park. SO submits that this approach is woefully inadequate and will not adequately manage the reverse sensitivity effects, as is required by proposed policy 20.4.11C.
- 4.2.4 While a no-complaints covenant is a useful tool in principle, it will not stop complaints from being made. Covenants are enforceable primarily by the parties to the covenant. This means the onus will be on the motorsport park to take action against the complainant. Each time a complaint is made, the motorsport park will have to expend time and money enforcing the covenant. This is an inefficient and unjustifiable use of resources.
- 4.2.5 The no-complaints covenant rule as proposed in plan change 13 'prevents any owner or occupier of the servient land from complaining about or taking any steps to prevent motorsports and related activities lawfully carried out as authorised by the terms and conditions of resource consent numbers RC150225 and RC150281'. The covenant does not provide for any future activities that the motorsport park may wish or need to undertake in order to keep its operation viable. Establishing around 900 residential units in close proximity to the motorsport park is likely to negatively impact on the ability of the motorsport park to further develop.
- 4.2.6 The proposed no-complaints covenants are a General Standard in the proposed rules suite. If a General Standard is not complied with then an activity becomes a Discretionary Activity so there is no guarantee for the motorsport park that no-complaints covenants will actually be forthcoming.

The plan change therefore provides little very little security for the motorsport park.

4.2.7 SO also submits that no-complaints covenants as a sole method will not actually mitigate the real effects of noise on the future residents, which has the potential for adverse effects on health and well-being. In this regard the plan change does not fit with the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

#### 4.3 Rural Productivity

- 4.3.1 The plan change site is located immediately adjacent to productive rural land and has the potential to be developed as a vineyard or orchard in conjunction with existing neighbouring activities.
- 4.3.2 The proposed plan change is an inefficient use of productive, rural land and not sustainable development in this regard.

#### 4.4 Urban Growth

The plan change site is an inappropriate location for urban growth. It is disjointed from the existing urban area and is therefore inefficient in terms of servicing, infrastructure, sustainable transportation and accessibility.

#### 4.5 Alternatives

- 4.5.1 A thorough assessment of suitable alternative sites for residential development has not been undertaken as part of the plan change. Given the significant reverse sensitivity issues affecting the proposed site, alternative locations need to be considered.
- 4.5.2 The Central Otago District Plan is about to be reviewed. This will enable a comprehensive review of all available land in and around Cromwell and identify appropriate rezoning options. Plan Change 13 should be rejected at this time and an appropriate use for the land should be determined through the District Plan review.

### 4.6 Conclusion

- 4.6.1 Overall, the reverse sensitivity effects of Plan Change 13 have the potential to undermine the existing and future operations and viability of the motorsport park. The motorsport park is a valuable asset to Cromwell and the wider region and its operations and viability should be protected. Residential development is not compatible with a motorsport park.
- 4.6.2 The plan change site is an unsuitable and unsustainable location for urban growth and an inappropriate use for productive rural land.

## 5.0 Relief Sought:

5.1 SO seeks the following relief:

The plan change is rejected.

- 5.2 If the above relief or similar cannot be achieved SO seeks that no residential or other noise sensitive activities are enabled through the plan change.
- 6.0 SO does wish to be heard in support for this submission. SO would consider presenting a joint case with others presenting a similar submission.
- 7.0 Submitted 20th June 2018 by electronic means.