

Appendix 'D'

Assessment of Environmental Effects



**THE CLYDE CLAIM LIMITED ,
HOULAHAN ENTERPRISES LTD,
COLIN FOSTER, VICKI GILLIES & OSTEK
CORPORATION LTD**

**ASSESSMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

**Request for a Change to the
Operative Central Otago District Plan**

February 2020

DUNEDIN:

P.O. Box 5933,
Dunedin 9058.

T 03 477 3245

CHRISTCHURCH:

P.O. Box 160094,
Christchurch 8441.

T 03 928 1533

ALEXANDRA:

P.O. Box 103,
Alexandra 9340.

T 03 448 8775

CROMWELL:

P.O. Box 84,
Cromwell 9342.

T 03 445 1826

QUEENSTOWN:

P.O. Box 2645,
Queenstown 9349.

T 03 441 4715

WANAKA:

P.O. Box 283,
Wanaka 9305.

T 03 443 0110

Job No: A4702 & A4723
Date: 27 February 2020
Status: FINAL

Prepared For:
The Clyde Claim Ltd, Houlahan Enterprises Ltd, Colin Foster, Vicki Gillies & Ostex Corporation Ltd

Prepared By:
Peter Dymock
Senior Planner/RPSurv/BSc/DipMgt/MNZIS

Paterson Pitts Limited Partnership (Cromwell Office)
30 The Mall
P O Box 84
Cromwell 9342
Telephone: +64 3 445 1826
Email: peter.dymock@ppgroup.co.nz
Web: www.ppgroup.co.nz

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Affected Persons & Consultation	5
3.0	Effects Relating to Urban Land Supply & Growth.	5
4.0	Effects in Relation to Transportation	6
5.0	Effects in Relation to Infrastructure	7
6.0	Effects in Relation to Natural Hazards or Hazardous Installations	7
7.0	Effects in Relation to Soil Contamination	7
8.0	Effects on Cultural Values & Other Special Values	8
9.0	Discharge of Contaminants & Unreasonable Emission of Noise	8
10.0	Landscape Effects	8
11.0	Effects on Adjoining Properties	8
12.0	Conclusion	9

1.0 Introduction

Section 22 of the RMA 91 requires that

- (2) *where environmental effects are anticipated, the request shall describe those effects, taking into account [[clauses 6 and 7]] of Schedule 4, in such detail as corresponds with the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the change, policy statement, or plan]*

Schedule (4) provides that the following matters taken into account with any such environmental assessment.

(6) Information required in assessment of environmental effects

- (1) *An assessment of the activity's effects on the environment must include the following information:*
- a) *If it is likely that the activity will result in any significant adverse effect on the environment, a description of any possible alternative locations or methods for undertaking the activity;*
 - b) *An assessment of the actual or potential effect o the environment of the activity;*
 - c) *If the activity includes the use of hazardous ... installations, an assessment of any risks to the environment that are likely to arise from such use;*
 - d) *If the activity includes the discharge of any contaminant, a description of –*
 - i. *The nature of the discharge and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and*
 - ii. *Any possible alternative methods of discharge, including discharge into any other receiving environment;*
 - e) *a description of the mitigation measures (including safeguards and contingency plans where relevant) to be undertaken to help prevent or reduce the actual or potential effect;*
 - f) *identification of the persons affected by the activity, any consultation undertaken, and any response to the views of any person consulted:*
if the scale and significance of the activity's effects are such that monitoring is required, a description of how and by whom the effects will be monitored if the activity is approved:
if the activity will, or is likely to, have adverse effects that are more than minor on the exercise of a protected customary right, a description of possible alternative locations or methods for the exercise of the activity (unless written approval for the activity is given by the protected customary rights group).

(7) Matters that must be addressed by assessment of environmental effects

- (1) *An assessment of the activity's effects on the environment must address the following matters:*
- a) *Any effect on those in the neighbourhood and, where relevant, the wider community, including any social, economic, or cultural effects;*
 - b) *Any physical effect on the locality, including any landscape and visual effects;*

- c) Any effect on ecosystems, including effects on plants or animals and any physical disturbance of habitats in the vicinity;
- d) Any effect on natural and physical resources having aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual, or cultural value, or other special value, for present or future generations;
- e) Any discharge of contaminants into the environment, including any unreasonable emission of noise, and options for the treatment and disposal of contaminants;
- f) Any risk to the neighbourhood, the wider community, or the environment through natural hazards ... or hazardous installations.

This assessment takes into account the technical reports in **Attachments 'D' to 'I'** of the Request, which form an integral part of the Request.

2.0 Affected Persons & Consultation

Letters were set out to the following persons who are considered to be affected persons, seeking preliminary comments on the Request:

Address	Person/Organisation	Response
	Otago Regional Council	
	Aukaha	Yes
	NZTA	Yes
	Southern District Health Board	Yes
103 Mutton Town Road	Glenys & Philip Bradley	
84 Mutton Town Road	James & Rosemary Hutton	Yes
89 Mutton Town Road	Maureen Weir	
	John & Patricia Lines	
81 Mutton Town Road	Ester & John Weatherall	
86 Mutton Town Road	Elaine & Hunter Clarke	
83 Mutton Town Road	Mark Weatherall	Yes

Responses received are attached at **Appendix 'A'**.

Several informal meetings were held with Council's Planning & Infrastructure staff. The Requesters have been advised by Ms Julie Muir (Council's Infrastructure Manager) that the Clyde Wastewater Project was being designed to serve future development along Mutton Town Road, including Dunstan Hospital. A public "drop-in" evening was held at the Clyde Bowling Club on Wednesday 12 February 2020.

Approximately 50 people attended and the general response was overwhelmingly supportive. Written comments provided at the meeting are attached at **Appendix 'A'**.

3.0 Effects Relating to Urban Land Supply & Growth.

The supporting document "Clyde Residential Growth & Demand Analysis" prepared by M.E. Consulting considers whether the Request responds to projected demand for additional residential capacity in Clyde. The M.E. report finds that Clyde may expect an additional 274-289 urban households by 2048, assuming no constraints on growth. However the reliance on septic tanks and disposal fields has effectively imposed an "urban growth boundary" around Clyde.

The effects of the imposed “urban growth boundary” are now being felt. Capacity to accommodate projected dwelling growth, even in the short term, is not available. The current zoned urban area is largely developed, and no more zoned Greenfield land remains to be subdivided. Dwelling growth has been slowing as the number of remaining vacant residential lots dwindles and is likely to cease altogether unless additional urban land is zoned (or consented for development). The consequences of high demand and insufficient capacity to grow are being felt in the form of steeply rising house and rental prices and these trends will continue if nothing is done to enable an increase in dwelling supply.

Council have now (2018) invested in a reticulated public wastewater network for Clyde and work is underway, albeit scheduled over a 25 year period. This infrastructure removes the impediment to urban expansion in Clyde and facilitates redevelopment and intensification in the existing urban area, although this is not expected to greatly increase the supply of dwellings in the long term.

The potential for infill development to meet the demand for household growth is limited by the extended staging of the wastewater project and the over capitalisation of much post 1970's subdivision within Clyde.

In response to the opportunity now provided by the wastewater reticulation, the Requestors are seeking to rezone their land on the urban boundary of Clyde to provide much needed greenfield expansion. M.E. estimates that this new capacity would cater for projected growth over the next 10 years or more, based on current data. The economic benefits of enabling future growth in this location are expected to outweigh any economic costs. The plan change will be effective in meeting demand growth in the short-medium term and is a more efficient use of the land than the current rural-residential zoning. The plan change will also facilitate economic growth and opportunities for local and district wide employment.

The request will therefore have positive effects on the environment in relation to urban land supply and population growth.

4.0 Effects in Relation to Transportation

The effects of the Request on associated transportation issues are addressed in the supporting document “Mutton Town Road – Integrated Transport Assessment” prepared by WSP. The Assessment concluded as follows:

- *The amount of traffic generated by the site is unlikely to have a material effect on network performance due to the low baseline and forecast volumes. State Highway intersections with both Sunderland Street and Mutton Town Road have sufficient spare capacity to support background traffic growth and traffic expected from the development.*
- *At the time of writing, full plans for the development were not available, but the concept generally aligns with relevant transport policies and strategies. Opportunity exists to promote active modes through use of the nearby Otago Rail Trail, which would help contribute to local and national mode shift objectives.*
- *The site's proximity to the Otago Rail Trail will make cycling an attractive mode for travelling to Alexandra. It is recommended that this be taken advantage of by clearly*

signposting the route to the existing underpass on Albert Drive and providing adequate facilities to get to the route.

- *The Sunderland Street/State Highway 9 intersection is a 100km/h environment and thus has an inherent risk for high severity crashes. However, the intersection has turning bays on all approaches and ample sight distance in both directions. Limited crash history exists at the site and the calculated crash rate before and after development suggests the existing layout is appropriate. Upgrading the intersection to a roundabout would be costly and provide limited benefits given the low existing crash risk and relatively low current and forecast traffic volumes.*
- *The crash risk at the Mutton Town Road/State Highway 8 intersection has been calculated to increase significantly if used by all southbound traffic from the development, primarily due to poor visibility to the north. Several possible mitigations are presented in Section 7. The most cost-effective option is considered to be providing access to the Clyde Claim Lot (DP 18990) via Sunderland Street only. Additional signage should be provided at the Houlihan lots directing traffic to the highway via Sunderland Street.*

The Request proposes a rule in the District Plan such that access to Lot 2 DP 18990 is via Sunderland Street only, to mitigate adverse effects and the SH8/Mutton Town Road intersection.

5.0 Effects in Relation to Infrastructure

The supporting infrastructure report addresses stormwater disposal, wastewater, water supply, reticulated utility services and roading construction.

In summary, development facilitated by this Request is able to be serviced for infrastructure and no adverse effects will arise in relation to infrastructural services.

6.0 Effects in Relation to Natural Hazards or Hazardous Installations

A search of the Otago Regional Council's Natural Hazardous Database showed that the Otago Regional Council has no record of any natural hazard adversely affecting the site. None of the test pits excavated for the infrastructure report showed any sign of deleterious material. The site is flat and ground slope instability is unlikely to be an issue. Any engineered fills will need to be placed, compacted and certified in accordance with NZS4431:1989. This is addressed at the resource consent/land use consent stage of subsequent subdivision and development of the site.

The proposed Residential Resource Area zoning of the site does not anticipate the use of hazardous materials or hazardous installations, as per existing District Plan Rule 7.3.6(ii) which requires all land use activities to be associated with the use of the site only for residential purposes.

7.0 Effects in Relation to Soil Contamination

The Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) and Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) prepared by Insight Engineering addresses this issue.

The PSI (appended to the DSI) found that there was no risk to human health from the development of Lot 2 DP 18990 and Lots 1 & 2 DP 525753, but that the presence of the top soil on Lot 2 DP 331535 imported from a former orchard required further investigation. Accordingly, a DSI for this site was commissioned including soil testing.

The DSI concluded that it was highly unlikely that there was any risk to human health from development on Lot 2 DP 331535.

8.0 Effects on Cultural Values & Other Special Values

The site comprises of unirrigated pasture, with some pine shelter belts, sheds and several dwellings with surrounding curtilage and outbuildings. The site has been periodically and sparingly grazed for many decades.

So far as the Requestors are aware, the site does not contain any special ecosystems, natural habitats, or sites of recreational, cultural, scientific, historical or spiritual value.

Possible disturbance of unknown cultural remains is best covered at the subsequent resource consent stage of developing the site by conditions of consent imposing an accidental discovery protocol. Possible disturbance of unknown archaeological sites by earthworks is governed by the requirements of the Heritage NZ Pouhere Taonga Act (2014).

9.0 Discharge of Contaminants & Unreasonable Emission of Noise

Wastewater will be discharged to the Council reticulation and stormwater direct to land within the site. The residential zoning of the site will ensure that there will be no emission of unreasonable noise from the site. Noise emission is governed by existing District Plan Rule 12.7.4.

10.0 Landscape Effects

The Request provides for a medium scale residential housing development, immediately adjacent to the existing Clyde residential area.

The immediate receiving environment is a mixture of existing adjacent residential development across Sunderland Street, "lifestyle block" (rural- residential) development along Mutton Town Road and Dunstan Hospital across Mutton Town Road.

When viewed from SH8 and Mutton Town Road approaching the site, the existing urban area of Clyde is clearly apparent and any urban development on the site will appear as a natural extension of and integral with the existing urban form. There is little remaining "naturalness" within the site, which has the capacity to absorb change without adverse effects. Change from semi-rural to urban is an inevitable consequence of growth into Greenfield areas, close to the urban-rural interface (c.f. District Plan objective 7.1.3 and policy 7.2.8 "Management of Change").

The Request provides for a landscaped buffer along SH8 to soften views of built development from the highway.

11.0 Effects on Adjoining Properties

Two of the adjoining property owners along Mutton Town Road consulted indicated that they opposed any further growth in Clyde and wished to retain their quiet rural environment, although both owners were not opposed to a retirement village on the site.

The Requestors consider that if it is an unreasonable expectation that persons living on the fringes of an existing urban area can have any long term expectation that the area will remain semi-rural for ever.

Given the established future demand for housing in Clyde, the Requestors believe it unreasonable not to re-zone further greenfields land for urban use, given the contribution that a lack of land for houses makes to the increased unaffordability of the District's housing. The Requestors could also subdivide their land into 6 allotments (more if subdivision were staged) with no minimum lot size, under the site's current zoning. Further housing development within the site is therefore a "given".

Although it has no clear plan of the future of Dunstan Hospital, the Southern District Health Board (SDHB) has advised that it is critical that it maintains its existing rights to operate its facilities and the flexibility to expand/change to meet the needs of the community. The SDHB is concerned about the possibility of residents within the site complaining about its existing legal rights and conditions of the hospital – i.e. "reverse sensitivity" in particular the operation of the air ambulance activity at the hospital.

The Requestors consider that any such complaints by residents is unlikely, given that a large proportion of new residents are expected to be retirees for which the proximity of Dunstan Hospital is likely to be a significant attraction. Indeed, if a retirement village ever went ahead on the site, the proximity of Dunstan Hospital would almost certainly feature heavily in the village's marketing.

Enquiries with the current operators of the Air Ambulance Service have ascertained that the service has never had a complaint about its operations at Dunstan Hospital and that public complaints over the last 25 years of its total operation throughout Otago are "extremely rare".

The air ambulance service advises that its standard flight path is not over the subject site. The helicopter pad is some 230m from the site at its closest and the majority of the site is no closer to the helipad than much of the adjoining Sunderland Estate subdivision, from which no complaints have ever emanated.

The Requestors are of the opinion that people simply do not complain about a service that "there for the grace of god go I".

It is also noted that small rural hospitals (and large public hospitals in major cities) adjacent to residential areas are a common feature (e.g. Frankton Hospital) and do not appear to be generating significant reverse sensitivity effects. Overall, it is considered that the risk of reverse sensitivity effects on the SDHB caused by the Request are very low and are acceptable.

12.0 Conclusion

In summary, the Request will have no significant adverse effects on the environment. Any adverse effects are less than minor, have been recognised and their avoidance or mitigation has been provided for in the Request.

The net effects of the Request are, on balance, overwhelmingly positive.

Appendix 'A'
Response to Consultation

Peter Dymock

From: Julie Rickman <Julie.Rickman@southerndhb.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 20 December 2019 12:07 p.m.
To: Peter Dymock
Cc: Paul Pugh
Subject: Application for Private Plan Change - Dunstan

Hi Peter

We acknowledge your letter dated 12 November 2019 regarding the Application for Private Plan Change by Clyde Claim Limited and Houlahan Enterprises Limited. Your clients intend applying to Central Otago District Council for a private plan re-zone of the land from "Rural-Residential Resource Area" to "Residential Resource Area". Currently Central Otago Health Services Limited and Southern District Health Board provide health care services from a property adjacent to the land which is proposed to be re-zoned. Dunstan Hospital (operated by Central Otago Health Services Limited) is a rural hospital within the Southern District Health Board network of hospitals. As you will appreciate the Dunstan Hospital operates 24 hours a day seven days a week, and has operated since 1863. We frequently have air ambulance (helicopter) activity in addition to road ambulance for the transportation of our patients. With the growth in the Central Otago region, the health care services are evolving and at this time we do not have a clear plan of our future state.

However, it is critical that we maintain our existing rights to operate our facilities and the flexibility to expand/change to meet the needs of our community.

Therefore, any re-zoning which may place limits on operations or which anticipates a scenario where future residents could complain about our existing legal rights and conditions at the hospital, would be a concern.

We would appreciate remaining connected to the re-zone process that we can understand fully the plans and work effectively with you.

Apologies for the delay in response.

Enjoy your Xmas and break.

Kind regards

Julie Rickman

Julie Rickman, Executive Director Finance, Procurement and Facilities
Cellphone: 027 581 5313 | Email: julie.rickman@southerndhb.govt.nz

Southern District Health Board

Kind – Manaakitanga | Open – Pono | Positive – Whaiwhakaaro | Community – Whanaungatanga

This email or attachments may contain confidential or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the addressee(s). Any use, redistribution, disclosure, or reproduction of this message, except as intended, is prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender and remove all copies of the message, including any attachments. Please note, the views expressed in this communication are not necessarily those of the Southern DHB, unless expressly so stated or apparent from the context.

11 December 2019

K Kennedy
c/- Peter Dymock
Paterson Pitts Group
PO Box 84
CROMWELL 93429058

via email: cromwell@ppgroup.co.nz

Level 2, AA Centre
450 Moray Place
PO Box 5245
Moray Place
Dunedin 9058
New Zealand
T 64 3 951 3009
F 64 3 951 3013
www.nzta.govt.nz

Dear Peter

**PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE -CLYDE CLAIM LTD & HOULAHAN ENTERPRISES LTD -NZ TRANSPORT
AGENCY PRELIMINARY COMMENTS**

Thank you for forwarding information on the proposal for a private Plan Change to rezone an area of land partially bounded by State Highway 8 (SH8), Sunderland Road and Mutton Town Road, Clyde from rural residential to residential resource area.

We understand the proposed residential development could potentially create 150 new residential lots adjoining both Mutton Town Road and SH8. No direct access from SH8 is proposed. The timing of the proposal is to coincide with the completion of the Clyde Wastewater reticulation project.

The information has been received and assessed. We note that SH8 is a Limited Access Road in this location. As a result, if the Plan Change was to go ahead the NZ Transport Agency would support the proposal for no direct access from the highway. The NZ Transport Agency would also support potential rules around preventing reverse sensitivity issues around highway noise for properties located adjacent to the highway.

However, for a change of this size we would require a comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment to be undertaken to fully assess the potential effects of the development on SH8. As part of the Traffic Impact Assessment the NZ Transport Agency would like to see the effects of the proposal assessed particularly on the Mutton Town Road intersection with SH8 and also the Sunderland Road intersection SH8 intersection.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this proposal further, please do not hesitate to contact the NZ Transport Agency.

Yours sincerely



Julie McMinn
Consultant Planner to the New Zealand Transport Agency

10 December 2019

Paterson Pitts Group
P O Box 84
Cromwell 9342

Attention: Peter Dymock

**Preliminary Statement – Clyde Claim Ltd & Houlahan Enterprises Ltd
Proposed Private Plan Change – Mutton Town Road, Clyde**

In regards to information received 12 November 2019. We have reviewed the information supplied to date, which at this stage of the project is limited. Our preliminary comments are as follows:

At this stage of the proposed Plan Change, Ngā Rūnanga have no concerns regarding the site specific provision of a 20 metre buffer zone along State Highway 8 and an 80 metre reverse sensitivity provision and prevention of direct access onto State Highway 8.

Ngā Rūnanga would request that the following be a condition of the Private Plan Change:

- That the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol (attached) should be adhered to in undertaking earthworks.

Ngā Rūnanga would like it noted that although there are no recorded Māori archaeological sites within the boundary of the proposed subdivision. The Clutha River/Mata-au was an important river as an ara tawhito (pathway) and source of mahika kai (food and resource gathering) and there is the potential to disturb unrecorded sites during any earthworks for any future development. Therefore, any earthworks undertaken should be carried out in a way that allows contractors to monitor for artefacts or archaeological material.

Please note that this reply is made without prejudice. The Rūnanga reserves the right to reconsider its position in light of additional information and/or research.

Thank you for seeking our feedback at this early stage and encourage consultation throughout the development of the above proposal.

Nāku noa, nā



Tania Richardson
Consents Officer

cc Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki
Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou
Hokonui Rūnanga



HERITAGE NEW ZEALAND
POUHERE TAONGA

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol

Under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act (2014) an archaeological site is defined as any place in New Zealand that was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900 and provides or may provide, through investigation by archaeological methods, evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. For pre-contact Maori sites this evidence may be in the form of bones, shells, charcoal, stones etc. In later sites of European/Chinese origin, artefacts such as bottle glass, crockery etc. may be found, or evidence of old foundations, wells, drains or similar structures. Burials/koiwi tangata may be found from any historic period.

In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works, the following applies;

1. Work shall cease immediately at that place and within 20m around the site.
2. The contractor must shut down all machinery, secure the area, and advise the Site Manager.
3. The Site Manager shall secure the site and notify the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist. Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
4. If the site is of Maori origin, the Site Manager shall notify the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative of the discovery and ensure site access to enable appropriate cultural procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, as long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (*Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, Protected Objects Act*).
5. If human remains (koiwi tangata) are uncovered the Site Manager shall advise the Heritage New Zealand Regional Archaeologist, NZ Police and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative and the above process under 4 shall apply. Remains are not to be moved until such time as iwi and Heritage New Zealand have responded.
6. Works affecting the archaeological site and any human remains (koiwi tangata) shall not resume until Heritage New Zealand gives written approval for work to continue. Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
7. Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find such as a description of location and content, is to be provided for their records.
8. Heritage New Zealand will determine if an archaeological authority under the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* is required for works to continue.

It is an offence under S87 of the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014* to modify or destroy an archaeological site without an authority from Heritage New Zealand irrespective of

Peter Dymock

From: Peter Dymock
Sent: Friday, 6 December 2019 8:32 a.m.
To: Kim Whipp
Subject: RE: Private plan change mutton town road

Dear Kim

Receipt of your email is acknowledged

Peter Dymock
Senior Planner
M 027 437 7910
T 03 445 1826

PATERSONPITTSGROUP
Surveying • Planning • Engineering
Your Land Professionals

From: Kim Whipp <kwhipp@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, 6 December 2019 6:56 a.m.
To: Peter Dymock <Peter.Dymock@ppgroup.co.nz>
Subject: Private plan change mutton town road

Good morning Peter please see attached preliminary opposition notes. Mark and his mother Esther Weatherall will strongly formally oppose the majority of what is being proposed in due course.

Kindly acknowledge receipt.

Sent from my iPad

In response to the application to rezone the Lots of Muttontown Road, Alexandra I OPPOSE the said Application.

I strongly oppose and will strongly oppose the subdivision of proposed split of 74 Muttontown Road. I would like to point out that the Council approximately 1 year ago turned down an application to split this block into two Titles. This would have allowed one extra residential property to be built which would have been with the keeping of the area. A number of small sections would be broken away from the actual town would be an eye sore and detract from rural vibe that makes Muttontown Road such a unique place. This would be outrageous for the neighbouring properties who live where they live for the rural lifestyle.

The current operation of the commercial entity at the end of Muttontown Road has already added extra traffic and noise to the area. This entity has become an absolute eye sore to the neighbouring properties. A proposed extra 151 sections would put stress on the roading system and in my view is simply a money making venture to the developers who are not giving mindful consideration to area and the people that live there.

Is this development to encourage affordable housing? If so this will attract more families to Clyde which will have an impact on the 1 primary school and 1 early childhood centre. This could also have a large effect on buses commuting kids to the local High School in Alexandra. The High School and close residents to the High School are already impacted by a large number of students travelling by car to school and lack of parking space, this could make an increasing problem only worse.

If you are going to encourage more people to live in Clyde and travel to Alexandra and surrounding districts for work this could put a possible increase of 200 plus vehicles on the already stretched roading out of Clyde, peak hours morning and night. The increase of vehicles trying to get out of Clyde onto a 100km main highway is an accident waiting to happen. This would no doubt put more pressure on rate payers to look at redeveloping the roading structure. Yet another increase in rates could a small community take that or put up with that, I don't think so!. Extra people would need extra amenities. Let's not overcrowd a beautiful town.

I will be strongly pointing out to the Council and ensuring the Community is aware of my view that the Central Otago District Council has a responsibility to the Alexandra Hub to encourage more development within the township of Alexandra to encourage families/prospective business owners to the area. The Alexandra business centre needs urgent attention given the number of empty shops/commercial spaces. A large subdivision is already underway on Dunstan Road with more room for development. The Council should be encouraging more developments within the town boundaries. Especially with families as Alexandra is where all the facilities are for people, swimming pool, bike park, sporting arenas and schooling. The town centre has the space for developing without the need to ruin the uniqueness of the Clyde town centre.

Part of the land in the Application is directly opposite the Hospital. If this was going to be developed at all I believe the block directly on the entrance to Clyde only should be looked at for the development of a Retirement Village. This would be

reasonably stand alone if done correctly and wouldn't involve the heavy traffic during peak hours.

Very careful consideration needs to be given to ensure that any development of Clyde does not unnecessarily allow it to become over populated and have the outcome of looking more like Lake Hayes (Nappy Valley) with undue stress being put on current resources which detracts from the natural beauty and attraction of visitors to the area.

As I said Clyde is a unique and beautiful town that needs to be looked after not have it's integrity destroyed. In particular the residents of Muttontown Road live there for a reason, for the quiet rural environment. If we wanted to have close neighbours we would move to town.

As I said any application for such a large number of residential sections within this subdivision will be strongly opposed.

Peter Dymock

From: twohuttons <twohuttons@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 5 December 2019 11:29 a.m.
To: Peter Dymock
Subject: Application for Private Plan Change on Muttontown Road

Dear Peter

I have several concerns regarding this matter.

We brought our property as a retirement property. Space, quietness and privacy are among our top desires for retirement. Hence the purchase of the ground and location. This would be totally reversed if your clients proposal was to go ahead.

The number of proposed sections makes the opportunity of privacy and peace non existent . As older residents quietness is important. It is only natural young families are going to create noise. Especially if we have homes on two boundaries.

At night we are used to darkness without street lights. If this development was to go ahead it will be a well lite area. The traffic along Muttontown Road is increasing all the time. The entry to SH8 is a dangerous entry as it is. Increased traffic will only enhance the chance of a serious accident. Especially when you are entering a 100k area.

It had been mentioned a retirement village be built opposite the hospital. This would have more appeal regarding traffic problems

Dust, as the result of any excavation would be horrendous. Not at all desirable for ones health or home.

These are my main concerns for any rezoning to go ahead


Yours faithfully
James Hutton

Sent from Samsung tablet

Proposed Rezoning of Land Mutton Town Road, Clyde Information & Consulting Evening

Name	Address	Comment
Helen McCormick	39 Hazlett St Clyde	
Dennis & Flour MARRIS	16 Chandler Cres -	lots of 550-600 and you have our full support.
Tony WILLEM	106 SHIELDS ST.	WE WANT A RETIRED VILLAGE Now.
Gordon Miller		Get it going soon
Callum Lawrie	112 Hazlett Street	All for it.
Sarah-Jane Thompson	112 Hazlett St.	Excited, want it started!

Proposed Rezoning of Land Mutton Town Road, Clyde Information & Consulting Evening

Name	Address	Comment
Garry-Sandra Sutherland	34 Hazlett St Clyde.	Fully Support.
Mary Allen	63 Newcastle St Clyde	"
Bob Allen	63 Newcastle St Clyde 9330	Much needed. 
Paul R. Wright	17 Chandler Cres Clyde	Bring it on
Pro D Smythe	Mutton Town Rd Clyde	Rezone the whole road.
Denis Alexander	Vincent Place. Clyde	yes.

Proposed Rezoning of Land Mutton Town Road, Clyde Information & Consulting Evening

Name	Address	Comment
Len Horner	129 FACHE ST Clyde	
Rag Hogganthe HOUSE STEWART	39 Chandler Cres 39 CHANDLER CRES	WE ARE TARGETING SECTION SIZES 600. RETIREMENT VILLAGE WOULD BE GREAT
Erin Tumbly	30 Chandler Cres	
Ruth Wells	125 Fache st	Build a retirement village & free up lots of houses.
Karen Beir	41 whitby st clyde	
leanne Downie	25 Sunderland	
		Concerned that rezoning allows for 250sqm sections with no protection once zoning happens
Sue + Brian Williamson	7 Annan Street Clyde	

Proposed Rezoning of Land Mutton Town Road, Clyde Information & Consulting Evening

Name	Address	Comment
James Rabbette	48 Hazlett st Clyde	Have our full support. Look forward to seeing this start <u>ASAP</u>
Jeff Bell	10 Naylor St Clyde	Has to happen soon
Bob Syrell.	6 Vincent Place Clyde.	Access should be via Mutton Town Rd. not Sunderland St.
Phil Bradley	Clyde	yes all good.
MARK WEATHERALL	CLYDE.	Against Residential surrounded by Rural blocks
Pot Christie	23 Chandler Cres. Clyde	Progress

Proposed Rezoning of Land Mutton Town Road, Clyde Information & Consulting Evening

Name	Address	Comment
Esther Weatherall	Muttontown Rd 1 RD Alexandra.	not in favour of Residential zoning in Rural blocks.
Carver Muir	Albert Drive	Good to see progress for the town.
Leon Van Roxtel	136 Fache St CLYDE	Good to see Progress in Clyde