

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 Mead, Robert David Stark as trustees of the McKay Family Trust

This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 14 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:

All aspects of the proposal

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

My submission is:

See separate attachment

(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 the proposal be rejected in its entirety

(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)


.....
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)

..... 16/12/2019

Date

Electronic address for service of submitter: alanmckay@xta.co.nz

Telephone No: 0344561611

Postal Address: 346 Kawarau Gorge Rd RD 2
..... Cromwell 9384

Contact Person: Alan McKay
(name & designation, if applicable)

SUBMISSIONS CLOSE IN RESPONSE TO PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14 ON
WEDNESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2019

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.

The McKay Family Trust owns a 20-ha block of rural land at the Northern side of the junction of SH6 and Sandflat Rd. The property is not simply a lifestyle block but is a fully functioning orchard comprising 8 ha of sweet cherry, with about 11ha of very suitable land for orchard expansion. The house on the property is oriented to the North and a large part of the PC14 land forms part of our view.

Our submission is as follows:

- A) The effect of the plan change will be to put approximately 168 new residential homes in what is now a rural area. The same issues regarding reverse sensitivity with noise and spray drift that were submitted on in PC 13 will arise with PC14. There will be an inevitable conflict which will dramatically affect the ability of orchards to continue their normal day to day activities. The current issues at Letts Gully near Alexandra serve as an example of what will happen.
- B) The proposal appears to be in conflict with the Cromwell Masterplan.
- C) The transportation assessment appears deficient as it does not consider the effect of an additional 900 vehicle movements a day when an event is being held at the Cromwell racecourse. On for example a race day there is a very large number of cars going both ways for much of the day. I consider the turnoff at the racecourse will be less safe but I feel traffic experts should be asked to consider this. I suggest there should be some safety improvements made by the proponent.
- D) Currently the house on our property enjoys an unrestricted rural view. There are two prominent features in our view namely the mountain backdrop of the Pisa Range and the SAL area in the East Gully on the subject property. We enjoy this view considerably and believe it to be special and gives us a real flavour of Central Otago and home. We contemplated including photos of the view however judging by the views shown in the landscape report photos do not do the view justice. The photos make it look distant which it is not. Our preference is to have the report writers and those who adjudicate on the matter come to our home and take in the view. I am confident they will see what we refer too. The proponent wants to establish houses, roads and vegetation on this SAL area. That will significantly alter and in our view ruin our outlook during the day and at night with lights. Our rural outlook will become more urbanised. Our amenity will be significantly altered and instead of having a truly Central Otago landscape we will have hill scars, vegetation, houses, roads and lights at night. One needs only to look at the development by Schooner Developers on Ripponvale Road as an example of the effect. SAL areas are there for a reason. No development should be allowed which detracts from our landscape amenity