

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to our councilors and the wider community regarding the application for subdivision made by the Clutha Plains Trust.

My name is Linda Hamilton, I am here with my husband Jakub Kaminski and we are adjoining neighbors to the proposed subdivision. We have made a written submission to the council stating our objections to the subdivision.

As the proposed subdivision does not comply with the District Plan we understand that it must meet the requirements of Section 95A Resource Management Act 1991. The act states that one must consider the “**effects of the activity**, rather than just the activity itself”.

As per our written submission there are three main reasons why we do not support the subdivision.

1. The proposed subdivision is manifestly out of character with Tarras; there being no similarly sized subdivisions in the area. Additionally, the proposed subdivision clearly does not **maintain and enhance** the amenity values of the area as it seriously interrupts the open form development of the area.

This fact is identified in our own submission and by several other submissions. It is also openly recognized by the Clutha Plains Trust, in that, a major part of their application is devoted to mitigating the negative impact of the development by concealing it with native plantings which in themselves (even if successful) will still **not maintain and enhance** the amenity value of the open landscape. It will in fact create another hindrance to the open form development of the area.

(Note that this area is not a reliable environment to establish native vegetation, we started revegetating areas of our property three years ago and it is very demanding and expensive, it requires constant weeding, spraying, irrigation, and plant replacements. Over the last three years we have spent more than \$50,000 on revegetation tube stock alone, (excludes irrigation and maintenance costs) it is nowhere near the

height or density to screen any buildings. And we doubt that this would be any different in another three years.)

If council decides to approve this development based in part, or wholly on the basis that the buildings will be adequately screened it would seem logical that conditions should apply that would ensure that this would happen, conditions could include meeting planting and maintenance milestones and having adequate funds set aside by the applicant to meet these conditions.

We understand that the applicant has carried out native revegetative plantings over the past few years, but they are not visible.



2. The proposed development is essentially medium density housing situated either in a remote location or across the road from an international airport and under the flight path.

It's a concern that there are no footpaths, playgrounds, or bicycle tracks in a proposal for such a development. And with this proposed housing being more than 6 km away from the village and school and almost 8 km from the Tarras Community Hall the residents would be unsupported by amenities that one would expect from modern medium density housing developments.

If it were not for the possibility that there could be an airport situated on the land owned by CIAL we would happily welcome the subdivision of the land into two lifestyle blocks as we believe this could be done without affecting the open rural landscape.

However, because this possibility is still likely we cannot support it. We are involved with community groups who's meetings have witnessed the angst and worry experienced by people building their houses when the plans for the airport became public. I would not wish this situation on anyone. And its a concern that people might buy one of these sections not knowing that they could be living directly under an international airport runway.

3. Additionally, as adjoining neighbors we would undoubtedly be affected by the additional dust and road use that would be created; both in the construction of the subdivision and when built on and occupied. With the drier warmer summers being on the increase we would think that any additional roading to handle this traffic should be a "sealed road" and not a gravel road.
4. Finally, approving this development would set a precedent which could lead to further non complying developments and may weaken the overall integrity of the rural zoning provisions.