

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: Trevor Robert Haig Tinworth
(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:

Land Use
Cromwell Aerodrome
Reverse Sensitivity
Economic and Social Well Being

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

My submission is:

Land Use

The Proposed Development would be a suitable fit within surrounding environment. The development at a guess, would generate at an estimated 22ha of its 49ha (45% based on maximum house size) as hard man-made surfaces (concrete foundations and roads). Where as the neighbouring surrounds are an orchard with virtually no hard man-made surfaces and Highlands Motorsport Park with an estimated guess of 8ha (4.1km track, 20m wide) 10% of its 76ha as hard man-made surfaces otherwise it is rolling green space. Therefore, this development would provide a big discontinuity in the environment and should be rejected.

The proposal uses a cooker cutter house design for most of the houses reusing the same house designs over and over and grouped together in clusters. These cluster designs are then repeated throughout the development. It generates a bland looking cloned community that is very structured and uniform in appearance. It does not incorporate the randomness of nature.

As a resource and under Section Five of the Resource Management Act this land could be better used as an orchard to produce fruit for an ever-increasing population. There seems to be an ever increasing need to

sacrifice productive land for residential housing. As a productive orchard it would not only provide a source of healthy food for years to come but also both permanent and seasonal employment.

Planting of an orchard could also contribute to the Governments goal of planting of one billion trees in the next 10 years.

Cromwell Aerodrome

No consideration has been given to the Cromwell Aerodrome. The proposed development lies on the centreline and within approximately 600m of the runway threshold. As take-off and landing are deemed critical phases of flight and a significant number of incidents and accidents occur during these phases (CAA Advisory Circular AC91-3).

Also, fleets of helicopters use the aerodrome during frost fighting and during the cherry season as a base of operations as they operate throughout the district. As result during these times there would be an increase in aircraft movements over the proposed development. This could result in complaints from residents and conceivably limit future aircraft operations putting a local multimillion dollar export industry at risk.

Reverse Sensitivity

The proposed development would be an economic and social disaster for the Cromwell area. Reverse sensitivity standards have been incorporated in the proposal in section 20.7.7 but in time I believe they will have little effect. The arguments from the developers are that the Reverse Sensitivity conditions will be adequate but, by the time this becomes an issue they would have realised their profits and have no further interest in the Development or local community.

Speedway, motorsport and orcharding, to an extent, are noisy by their nature. Residents of the proposed development over time will band together and put collective political pressure on the council and its elected officials to restrict activities at these sites to improve their individual quality of life and improve capital gains in their property. Effectively nulling and voiding the Reverse Sensitivity conditions.

This has been seen at several venues around the country that have been encroached on by residential development, such as Western Springs Speedway, Ruapuna Raceway and Bay Park Speedway to name a few. The approvers of this Plan Change would be remiss not to take these examples into account and the potential issues the Council and therefore ratepayers would face in the future if the Proposal was accepted. This would also be including any potential cause for Council liability.

The current rights for neighbouring properties need to preserved:

- Central Motor Speedway has been part of Cromwell's fabric and culture since the 1980s. It attracts visitors to its meets from all over the country boosting the local economy.
- Highland Motorsport Park is a world class multimillion dollar venue. It runs successful international and national motorsport events as well as provides a destination for locals and tourists alike. It provides a wide open natural resource for people to visit as an individual or come together as like minded individuals to enjoy day of motorsport.
- Highlands Motorsport Park is also a great corporate citizen of Cromwell. It supports Cromwell events provides free community events such as Christmas concerts, Easter egg hunts and track walks. It also provides course for winter driving in a controlled environment.
- The reverse sensitivity clause in the Proposed Plan for Highlands Motorsport Park is valid only for the term of the current resource consents RC150225 and RC150281 (Rule 20.7.7.vii.b.ii). This rule should be in perpetuity for the life of Highlands Motorsport Park.

Economic and Social Well Being

If the Speedway or the Motorsport part were restricted in their operations it would also have a negative effect on the wider Cromwell economy such as reducing number of nights of accommodation in local hotels due to reduced events. It will also turn away high wealth investors and tourists that have an interest in motorsport.

The complaints to limit activities of the Speedway and Motorsport Park from the residents of the Proposed Development would create also social divide in the community pitting the currently existing community against the new development.

In an effect the proposed development would turn Cromwell into a commuter town instead of a upbeat valued destination.

(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:

Reject Plan Change 13 to the Central Otago District Plan.

(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)

Trevor Tinworth (Submitted electronically)

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)

19 June 2018

Date

Electronic address for service of submitter:

T.Tinworth@xtra.co.nz

Telephone No: 022 6034115

Postal Address:

21 Magnetic Place
CROMWELL 9310

Contact Person:

Trevor Tinworth
(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.