

SUBMISSION FORM

Under the Resource Management Act 1991



SUBMITTERS DETAILS

Ray Waite

Contact Name:

2raysofsunshine@gmail.com

49 Totara Drive. twizel 7901

Tick if postal address is preferred method of correspondence*:

221005770

* Our default method of corresponding with you is by email and phone. Alternatively, if you wish to receive correspondence by post (including any decision) please provide a postal address and tick the relevant box above.

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE (if different from the submitter's details)

Company:

Contact Name:

Email address*:

Postal Address*:

Tick if postal address is preferred method of correspondence*:

Phone numbers:

Day

Mobile

* Our default method of corresponding with you is by email and phone. Alternatively, if you wish to receive correspondence by post (including any decision) please provide a postal address and tick the relevant box above.

DETAILS OF APPLICATION BEING SUBMITTED ON

APPLICANT'S NAME: Payne Developments Limited

RM REFERENCE: 190181

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY: Subdivision consent to subdivide Lots 1 to 4 of RM160209 into 14 residential allotments and land use consent to reduce the road and internal boundary setbacks and to increase the building and hard surface coverage in the Residential 4 Zone.

MY SUBMISSION

opposed to the further subdivision of lots 1-4 in Four lakes development

I am not a trade competitor

I am directly affected

I wish to be heard at a hearing in support of my submission and if others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
06-03-2020

DECLARATIONS

Please indicate whether or not you are a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991 (tick):

I **am** a trade competitor I am **not** a trade competitor

If you are a trade competitor, please indicate whether or not are 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 (tick):

I **am** directly affected I am **not** directly affected

Please indicate whether or not you wish to be heard at the hearing in support of your submission (note you will only be notified of a hearing if you have indicated you wish to be heard) (tick):

I **wish** to be heard I **do not** wish to be heard

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing (tick):

Yes No

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of the submitter)*

Date

*If signing on behalf of a trust or company, please provide additional written evidence that you have signing authority.

*A signature is not required if you make your submission electronically.

SUBMITTER

If you are making a submission to the Environment Protection Authority, you should use form 16B. The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the

date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

Applicant: Payne Development Limited
Address for Service: C/- Patterson Pitts Group
PO Box 5933
Dunedin 9054
Attn: Andrew Robinson

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at 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.



MACKENZIE

District Council

Mackenzie District Council
PO Box 52
Main Street
Fairlie, 7987

P: 03 685 9010
E: info@mackenzie.govt.nz
www.mackenzie.govt.nz

Friday 6th March
49 Totara drive
Twizel

I, Ray Waite am opposed to the further subdivision to lots 1-4 in Four lakes development in Twizel for the following reasons-

1- On the original application back in 2017, the developers stated, in their conclusion near the end of the application - Quote "Special consideration has been given to the owners & occupiers of the Totara Drive properties that back onto the development. Providing Residential 4 type allotments where the site abuts the existing properties provides sufficient mitigation as the status quo is essentially retained for those properties."

This reasoning was submitted by the developers for their application to gain approval by Mackenzie council. Now this current pending application is contradicting those points, (for their own financial advantage) which I consider devious and unethical.

2- Twizel already often has in summer months water restrictions applied to residents. Further subdivision of these 4 lots into the proposed 14 lots will put even further strain on water restrictions

3-Already houses being built on stages 1-3 are being advertised on short term websites such as AirBnb. Air Bnb's policies state houses listed for accommodation on their site must have a minimum of 20 metres between the house and the boundary. These houses and virtually all successive houses will not comply to this. The proposed 14 rather than 4 extra houses directly behind our house allows for the strong potential of more noise, parties etc from short term rentals. The developers state in their application that changing the sizes from 4000 Sqm to 1000 Sqm - quote -

"We're aware that there has been occasions when the 4000 Sqm minimum size has led to unused portions of residential properties being used for non-residential purposes, or not being kept in a tidy state. The proposed lot sizes will provide for sites that are easier to maintain, and reduce the scope for the keeping of animals, the accumulation of untidy material, disused vehicles and otherwise problematic activities and land users" - Unquote

The developers son is presently using some of the land in the development for the commercial supply of firewood, where a large pile of firewood logs are stored and being cut up by chainsaw and sold in town. This is disturbing neighbours including ourselves who are in close proximity. This is clearly a NON RESIDENTIAL purpose.

It is a property purchasers choice if they wish to buy a property that is harder to maintain. The proposed extra 14 lots (rather than existing 4) will not reduce the scope for the keeping of animals as they mention, but rather increase the chance of the keeping of animals, with the chance increased of more dogs barking, crapping etc on nearby land.

4- More stress on current infrastructure. This proposed development taps into the existing water supply which council has stated is under pressure during dry years. It is now a lot harder to find a car park in town than it was 5 years ago.

5-This land was sold to the developers for \$500,000, of which the council paid \$200,000 to get the trees removed. Basically we the rate payers paid for the trees to be removed for

the developers. This is absurd ! Why the land was sold for this price when it should have been sold for at least 4 times that amount we are still to know.

6- To the best of my knowledge the resource consent application, approved back in 2017 was not made public, or even to neighbouring properties, which had a large influence on it being approved.

7- The developers are basically wanting to do another non complying subdivision. The 2017 application should have used a plan change process, not a resource consent.

8- The proposal contravenes Primary Subdivision Standard 6.a.i (d) Allotment Size which says "***In Residential 4 Zones where public reticulation is available, no allotments created by subdivision shall have a net area less than 4,000m²***", the application would then become a **Non Complying Activity**. There are further non-compliance issues this RCA would have in terms of building coverage (15% of site area in the Res 4 zone) and building setback (10m from all boundaries in the Res 4 zone) that would mean the proposed newly created lots would be useless for residential development. Presumably to offset this associated land use consents have also been applied for with MDC so as to reduce the setbacks and increase the building coverage areas. These would also have to be considered **NON COMPLYING**.

The Paynes (or their consultants) will say the Four Lakes subdivision has already been acted on so the receiving environment is the same as what they are now wanting to achieve.....this is true.....but only because the Council process before was flawed!

9- We purchased here 9 years ago (49 Totara Drive) knowing we would only ever have one neighbour on that boundary....not potentially 4. I think you also need to look at the potential negative effects from all of the AirBNB and other short term rental websites activities that Four Lakes is promoting by having a **NO** Short Term Let covenant as is the case with other developments in Twizel.

10-Mackenzie Properties took the developers of the Four Lakes subdivision to the Environment Court due to the incorrect process followed in having this subdivision approved by MDC. A private plan change should have been used as the mechanism not a resource consent. The agreement with the Environment Court was for these four large lots to remain as 4,000m² and never be subdivided. So why are the further subdividing of these 4 x 4000m² lots even being considered? Why has this been 'forgotten'? This is absurd. It is also not good enough and very disappointing.

11- This development construction has been going on since August 2018. During this time there has been constant noise and dust from heavy machinery (at times 4 excavators, numerous trucks, scrapers, vibrating rollers etc) working closeby and even closer when the final stage starts) . If 14 lots are approved there will be even more noise from an extra 10 houses being constructed. As it is now builders have been working up until 9pm on numerous nights with rattle guns and other associated noisy equipment, So are we to tolerate this for the future years simply so the developers get some short term financial gain? We informed the Paynes we were not in agreement with this proposal. Basically there unspoken response has been something like - Too bad, we're going to do it anyway.

12- If this proposal is approved, (4 lots into 14) it will mean some short term financial gain in the pocket of the developers, (basically 2 people) whilst there will be the negative effects as stated above, which neighbouring properties and people of Twizel will have to live with for years into the future. This should not be allowed to proceed. It will only further undermine peoples faith in the Mackenzie council