

Plan Change 15 - Buxton Gore Bay Ltd
Submissions by Submitter

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
1 Mr K McManus	1.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the proposed plan change no. 15."
	1.02	Number of lots	Oppose	83 new lots will double the number of dwellings in Gore Bay.
	1.03	Size of lots	Oppose	The minimum lot size of 450 sq m is essentially high density suburban environment that is out of keeping with the local landscape and environment.
	1.04	Landscape values	Oppose	The character of Gore Bay will be overwhelmed by the scale of the development.
	1.05	Visual amenity	Oppose	The East terraces development will be visible from the beach and will change forever the present rural/natural view.
	1.06	Traffic volume	Oppose	The proposal will double the traffic on Gore Bay Rd.
	1.07	Road access	Oppose	The intersection with Gore Bay Rd is inadequate and is at an unsuitable location that cannot be improved without significant landscape changes.
	1.08	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	The proposal will cause parking problems within Gore Bay for beach access.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
2 Mr M Singleton	2.01	Support with amendments	Support	"Require that: 1. Reference to road widths be replaced with statement for accordance with District Plan requirements and good engineering practice; 2. The policy section clearly indicates that the maintenance of vested assests be funded district-wide; 3. Grazed areas be stock proof; 4.&5. Practicable water treatment and rubbish collection be resolved; 6. Detailed design of Gore Bay Rd/Buxton Rd intersection acknowledging operational speed is required as further information."
	2.02	Road access	Oppose	Concerns that road widths of 10 to 12m are inadequate to contain cut and fill batters.
	2.03	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	Needs assurance that funding for vested public walkways, cycleways and a tennis court will be district-wide.
	2.04	Boundary fencing for stock	Oppose	Some boundaries are halfway down the cliff, the site needs to be stock proof to its neighbours.
	2.05	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	UV treatment has been suggested for the Gore Bay water supply before and discarded.
	2.06	Rubbish removal	Oppose	A similar rubbish system to Gore Bay would be aggravating a system that is already inefficient and unduly costly to users.
	2.07	Road access	Oppose	The traffic report glosses over the potential adverse effects of the intersection of Gore Bay Rd and the new Buxton access.
3 Mr N G Dench	3.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject Plan Change 15 to rezone the land in the Buxton Valley Catchment."
	3.02	Land stability	Oppose	The Buxton Valley catchment is susceptible to slips.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
3 Mr N G Dench	3.03	Flooding in Gore Bay	Oppose	Run off will endanger property at the bottom of the Buxton River catchment through the possibility of the river becoming blocked and flooding to lower property adjacent to the Buxton River.
4 Ms K Bestic	4.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject proposed private plan change,"
	4.02	Number of lots	Oppose	The housing density proposed is excessive.
	4.03	Development controls	Oppose	There is no guarantee that housing will be limited to the maximum suggested or to indicated sites.
	4.04	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns over stormwater discharge and sewage treatment.
	4.05	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Concerns over potable water supply.
	4.06	Unspecified flooding.	Oppose	Concerns over lack of consideration of flood risk.
	4.07	Land stability	Oppose	The natural character of this site is unsuited to sustain a development of this magnitude as the substrate is highly erosive.
	4.08	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Concerns over sedimentation of Buxton creek during development.
	4.09	Road access	Oppose	Location of access point on Gore Bay Rd could endanger preservation of the limestone knoll in its current form.
	4.10	Landscape values	Oppose	Inconsistent to be proposing this kind of development in an Outstanding Landscape.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
4 Ms K Bestic	4.11	Visual amenity	Oppose	Concerns over visual impact of housing from beach and/or existing settlement detracting from rural backdrop. Inconsistent with regenerating bush on coastal side of cliff.
	4.12	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	No guarantee of public access or maintenance.
	4.13	Development controls	Oppose	No guarantee of retention of terms and conditions in the event of the development being on-sold.
5 Mrs J A Grigor	5.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the proposal for a private plan change for the Buxton Valley as the area has a fragile ecology and difficult access from either Cheviot or Port Robinson ends of Gore Bay."
	5.02	Road access	Oppose	Cheviot/Gore bay Rd has areas of instability: sections are continually slumping and frequently affected by slips and rock falls. The geological formation is unstable and has difficulty coping with existing traffic. Floods have washed out bridge approaches 3 times in last 2 years closing the road at the access point. Questions Item 73 in Traffic Impact Assessment.
	5.03	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Current water scheme is incapable of maintaining supply to parts of Gore Bay and Port Robinson. Increased density would cause further deterioration of supply. Quality of water supply is unsatisfactory.
	5.04	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Stormwater discharge would increase erosion and siltation of creek and swimming hole.
	5.05	Land stability	Oppose	Long history of slumping, slips and under runners (not specified whether Buxton Valley or Gore Bay). "Limestone" cliffs are largely easily erodible silt and sandstone conglomerations. Buxton Valley should be lightly grazed not developed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
6 Port Robinson Informed Citizens Inc.	6.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the proposed plan change."
	6.02	Number of lots	Oppose	The proposed density is excessive and does not include any maximum limitation.
	6.03	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns regarding stormwater and discharge, sewerage and sewerage treatment.
	6.04	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Concerns regarding supply and treatment of potable water.
	6.05	Unspecified flooding.	Oppose	Concerns regarding flood risk.
	6.06	Land stability	Oppose	The natural characteristics of the site are unsuitable for sustaining a development of this scale. Soils are highly erosive.
	6.07	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Concerns about sedimentation of Buxton Creek during development and construction phases.
	6.08	Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety	Oppose	Concerns about safety issues at access point and for pedestrians and cyclists.
	6.09	Traffic volume	Oppose	Gore Bay Rd from start at Cheviot is unable to cope with increased traffic without accelerated deterioration, and does not easily accommodate heavy traffic movements. Concerns with increased traffic on beach.
	6.10	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Concerns with increased loading on beach parking.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
6 Port Robinson Informed Citizens Inc.	6.11	Visual amenity	Oppose	Visual impact of ridge housing from existing settlement is inconsistent with regenerating native bush, and "bach housing" detracts from rural backdrop.
	6.12	Landscape values	Oppose	Inappropriate to be proposing this type of development in an Outstanding Landscape area.
	6.13	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	No guarantee of public access or maintenance.
	6.14	Development controls	Oppose	If onsold, buyers should agree to all terms and conditions set out.
7 Ms F J Cottrell	7.01	Relief sought is unclear	Neutral	"That the application to rezone the particular area called the Buxton Valley Management Area from rural to an Environment of Special Concern."
	7.02	Number of lots	Oppose	The area does not have the capacity physically and environmentally to cope with the demands. The public meetings did not provide engineering justification for the proposed "volume" of housing.
	7.03	Reserves	Oppose	The Buxton Stream and adjoining land was designated as reserve by agreement between a former landowner and the local authority, and this is not acknowledged in the submissions (sic).
8 Mr T H & Mrs D H Ensor	8.01	Other relief sought	Oppose	"That the HDC engage a suitably qualified person or company to peer review the proposal with due regard to the unique outstanding landscapes of Gore Bay and make the results of the review available before making a decision."

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
8 Mr T H & Mrs D H Ensor	8.02	Development controls	Oppose	Don't agree that: level of detail sufficient for exemptions from earthworks and vegetation clearance rules; and location of roads and buildable areas take into account localised geological/ground conditions.
	8.03	Landscape values	Oppose	Incorrect references to limestone cliffs in landscape descriptions in Issues text.
	8.04	Land stability	Oppose	Incorrect Issues statement that "sedimentary rock base is expected to remain stable" as silica sand base soils very prone to scouring and 1951 earthquake severe in Gore Bay. Soil surrounding water supply line to Gore Bay is unstable.
	8.05	Flooding in Gore Bay	Oppose	Major floods occurred in February and August 2008.
	8.06	Road access	Oppose	Poor visibility at intersection with Gore Bay Rd.
	8.07	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Inadequate parking within the Buxton Valley Management Area.
	8.08	Development controls	Oppose	Discretionary activities anticipate that the Outline Management Plan will not be followed.
	8.09	Scale of development and population increase	Oppose	Gore Bay is a special place because of low impact, non-commercial development. Multiplying effect of increased people on demand for facilities in Gore Bay.
	8.10	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Multiplying effect of increased people and car parking demand in Gore Bay.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
8 Mr T H & Mrs D H Ensor	8.11	Road access	Oppose	Current roading infrastructure is inadequate for potential doubling of population. The road around 'The Brothers' would have to be widened causing massive slips and slumping from the steep land above.
	8.12	Landscape values	Oppose	Would reverse Outstanding Landscape position "advocated so strongly" by HDC in District Plan consultation. Much of the special attributes of the Gore Bay coastline would be "permanently lost for ever".
9 Ms M J Ackley	9.01	Support with amendments	Support	"1. A cap on the density of housing at a figure well below 83. 2. A guarantee that the residents of Gore Bay and Cathedral Rd will not be adversely affected by: inadequate water supply; deterioration in roading coping with increased volumes and heavy vehicles."
	9.02	Number of lots	Oppose	83 residential lots is excessive (a figure well below that would be acceptable). No indication of maximum density that could be permitted.
	9.03	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Water to residents of Gore Bay and Cathedral Rd must not be reduced because of Buxton development. Historically there can be a shortfall at times of peak holiday and even 40 more houses would increase this problem.
	9.04	Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety	Oppose	Safety issues with Gore Bay Rd access due to increased traffic and poor visibility.
	9.05	Traffic volume	Oppose	Capacity of Gore Bay and Cathedral Rds to support increased traffic, and heavy vehicles during construction phase.
10 Ms M Noering & Mr H Wiesen	10.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the above mentioned applications for a Plan Change by Buxton Gore Bay Ltd for the above mentioned reasons."

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
10 Ms M Noering & Mr H Wiesen	10.02	Number of lots	Oppose	83 houses is excessive and will have a major impact on the environment. There is no maximum limitation.
	10.03	Visual amenity	Oppose	Gore Bay will lose its semi-rural backdrop. The visual impact of ridge housing and bach settlement is inconsistent with regenerating native bush.
	10.04	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Concerns regarding potable water supply and available volume.
	10.05	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns regarding sewerage and treatment, and stormwater and domestic wastewater discharge.
	10.06	Flooding in Gore Bay	Oppose	Concerns regarding flooding risks.
	10.07	Land stability	Oppose	Prevalent soils are unstable, highly erosive and prone to disintegration.
	10.08	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Concerns regarding impact on the Buxton Stream through silting, sedimentation and pollution.
	10.09	Effects on vegetation and wildlife	Oppose	Will have a significant impact on native bush/vegetation/birdlife.
	10.10	Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety	Oppose	Severe safety issues regarding: reduced visibility and increased traffic at the access point; increased truck movements on a narrow road during construction; risk to pedestrians, joggers and cyclists from increased traffic and narrow road.
	10.11	Road access	Oppose	Concerns regarding preservation of limestone knob in its current form. Gore Bay Rd is slumping and prone to slips.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
10 Ms M Noering & Mr H Wiesen	10.12	Traffic volume	Oppose	Concerns regarding accelerated deterioration of the road with increased traffic volume.
	10.13	Development controls	Oppose	No guarantee has been given that houses will be built in indicated areas on the plan, or that if on sold the new owners will agree to terms and conditions.
	10.14	Landscape values	Oppose	Development is inconsistent with Outstanding Landscape.
	10.15	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	No guarantee of public access or maintenance of walkways.
	10.16	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Carparking in Gore Bay could become an issue.
11 Port Robinson Reserve Committee	11.01	Relief sought is unclear	Neutral	"That the HDC take all reasonable steps to require the Buxton Stream to be a recreational quality waterway, not compromised by pollution, sedimentation or abstraction."
	11.02	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns regarding effect of proposed sewerage treatment and dispersal on recreational water quality in the Buxton Stream, and effects on treatment plant under flood conditions.
	11.03	Reserves	Oppose	It would be appropriate for reserve access by way of legal easement from the new road.
	11.04	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	The stormwater pond immediately to the NW of the Buxton bridge is not appropriate for practical or amenity value reasons.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
12 Mr B A and Mrs G J Palmer	12.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"The proposed Plan Change Number 15 - Buxton Gore Bay Limited should be refused in its entirety, and consequentially (sic) dismissed. Furthermore - and for the avoidance of doubt - the District Plan for the Hurunui District should remain unchanged and a Declaration accordingly is made."
	12.03	Adequacy of s32 analysis	Oppose	The s32 analysis is unpersuasive.
	12.04	Landscape values	Oppose	Gore Bay is an environmentally beautiful coastal area that is enhanced by native and exotic bush which must be appropriately protected and not spoiled by inappropriate development.
	12.05	Scale of development and population increase	Oppose	Gore Bay is isolated and tranquil and will be adversely impacted by the potential population "explosion" of 83 additional properties.
	12.06	Commercial interest	Oppose	Properties at Gore Bay have become very valuable and there are very cogent commercial reasons for any property developer to seek to undertake and to maximise the commercial opportunity.
	12.07	Effects on vegetation and wildlife	Oppose	The development would significantly impact on the abundance of birdlife in Gore Bay.
	12.08	Road access	Oppose	Appropriate roading is not provided in the plan change.
	12.09	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Appropriate parking is not provided in the plan change.
	12.10	Traffic volume	Oppose	A traffic bottleneck would be created in Gore Bay.
	12.11	Benefits and advantages	Oppose	The advantages of swimming hole enhancement, and access to walkways and native forest are "gossamer thin" items of substance.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
12 Mr B A and Mrs G J Palmer	12.12	Land stability	Oppose	The land near the cliff edges may be de-stabilised by the development with the risk of subsidence to properties in Gore Bay.
	12.13	Number of lots	Oppose	The status quo of the District Plan is preferred to the intensive residential subdivision of the proposed housing clusters.
	12.2	Unspecified environmental effects	Oppose	For cogent environmental reasons the status quo in the District Plan should be retained. This is a major development which is incompatible with appropriate environmental protection.
13 Ms R A Barnes	13.01	Support with amendments	Oppose	"The proposal should not be approved until road access is considered in more detail."
	13.02	Traffic volume	Oppose	No serious assessment of the capacity of the Gore Bay Rd to carry the increase in traffic is included in the proposal. The calculation of summer traffic is light weight.
	13.03	Road access	Oppose	Gore Bay Rd has a long narrow section that is not easily widened and is vulnerable to edge collapse. Heavy traffic during building would put this road at risk.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
14 New Zealand Fire Service Commission	14.01	Support with amendments	Support	"Add the following to B6.2 Conditions for Permitted Activities - "B6.2.15 Fire Fighting Water Supply (a) Any new residential allotment created within the Buxton Valley Management Area shall comply with the requirements New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of practice SNZ PAS 4509:2203. ADVICE NOTES: For more information on how to comply with the above or on how to provide for NZFS operational requirements refer to the New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2203 (http://www.fire.org.nz/building/water.htm). In particular the following should be noted: - For more information on suction sources see Appendix A, SNZ PAS 4509:2003, Section B3; - For more information on flooded sources see Appendix B, SNZ PAS 4509:2003, Section B3; - The reserve capacities and flow rates stipulated in the above conditions are relevant only for single-family dwellings. In the event that any proposed dwelling provides for more than single-family occupation then the consent holder should consult with the NZFS as larger capacities and flow rates may be required". Or alternatively insert the above in the Section A3 Subdivision District Wide Rules.
	14.02	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	The proposal does not provide for an adequate reticulated water supply for fire-fighting purposes that meets the provisions of SNZ PAS 4509:2003. This is also not provided for in the subdivision standards in the District Plan.
15 Mr T W Lucas	15.01	Accept the plan change	Support	"I support the proposal."
	15.02	Road access	Oppose	The road from Cheviot to the site will require improvements at various points due to the increased traffic flow.
	15.03	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	There will be a need for an increase in parking near the beach due to eventual population growth.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
15 Mr T W Lucas	15.04	Development contributions	Oppose	Assume that development 'levies' could be utilised for road and parking improvements.
	15.5	Public walkways and cycleways	Support	The proposed walking tracks would be a 'popular amenity' for the district.
16 Mr M B Watson	16.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject proposed private plan change."
	16.02	Number of lots	Oppose	The housing density proposed is excessive.
	16.03	Development controls	Oppose	There is no guarantee that housing will be limited to the maximum suggested or to indicated sites.
	16.04	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns over stormwater discharge and sewage treatment.
	16.05	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Concerns over potable water supply.
	16.06	Unspecified flooding.	Oppose	Concerns over lack of consideration of flood risk.
	16.07	Land stability	Oppose	The natural character of this site is unsuited to sustain a development of this magnitude as the substrate is highly erosive.
	16.08	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Concerns over sedimentation of Buxton Creek during development.
	16.09	Road access	Oppose	Location of access point on Gore Bay Rd could endanger preservation of the limestone knoll in its current form.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
16 Mr M B Watson	16.10	Landscape values	Oppose	Inconsistent to be proposing this kind of development in an Outstanding Landscape.
	16.11	Visual amenity	Oppose	Concerns over visual impact of housing from beach and/or existing settlement detracting from rural backdrop. Inconsistent with regenerating bush on coastal side of cliff.
	16.12	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	No guarantee of public access or maintenance.
	16.13	Development controls	Oppose	No guarantee of retention of terms and conditions in the event of the development being on-sold.
17 Ms G Smith	17.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the plan change."
	17.02	Scale of development and population increase	Oppose	83 houses is too large a development and will have detrimental impacts on erosion, traffic and pollution.
	17.03	Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety	Oppose	Increased traffic flows will cause safety issues for residents and tourists.
	17.04	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Sedimentation of the Buxton Stream will be increased by excavation.
	17.05	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Stormwater and sewerage may pollute Buxton Stream.
	17.06	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	Existing residents periodically run out of water and there will be increased pressure on HDC to supply household water.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
17 Ms G Smith	17.07	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	It is unclear how the public will have access to the proposed walkways and covenanted areas and how these areas are to be maintained.
18 Mr A W Smith	18.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject private plan change."
	18.02	Land stability	Oppose	It has been privately acknowledged that the number of proposed residences (83) is based on the financial backers' desired return rather than the geologists tally of stable sites. This priority should be reversed. Four clusters of 6 houses as currently allowed may in fact be optimum for the site.
	18.03	Commercial interest	Oppose	The character of the clusters will range between bach style/family affordable to 'dress circle'. Could the 'family' cluster be marketed first to help rejuvenate the local population?
	18.04	Road access	Oppose	Needs careful planning to avoid being hazardous.
	18.05	Landscape values	Oppose	Limestone bluffs must be kept intact.
	18.06	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	Public access was to be a major mitigating gesture yet now seems dependent on compliance by the development's residents.
20 Mr I C Page	20.01	Support with amendments	Support	"1. I suggest that no development be undertaken until the covenanted areas as proposed are protected and the terms of public access established. 2. That an amended Traffic Impact Report be prepared covering the effect of doubling the traffic volume on the narrow cliff edge area of Gore Bay Rd. That an amended Traffic Impact Report be prepared covering the effect of the increased traffic on vehicle parking at the southern end of the beach and a plan be implemented to mitigate this effect."

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
20 Mr I C Page	20.02	Protective covenants	Oppose	Protection of indigenous vegetation is supported but "covenanted area" is open to interpretation without further details, particularly regarding public access provisions and enforcement. While building is delayed pending protection, the roading network would already be in place and the development possibly on-sold.
	20.03	Traffic volume	Oppose	Doubling of existing traffic is minimum. Estimate over 200 additional traffic movements plus 4WD motorbikes and recreational vehicles which will cause a bottleneck at the Buxton Bridge.
	20.04	Road access	Oppose	Gore Bay Rd is narrow and at risk from rockfalls, slips and flooding events which can easily isolate the inhabitants. Would like to see professional opinion of impact to Gore Bay Rd in Traffic Impact Report.
	20.05	Vehicle, pedestrian and cyclist safety	Oppose	Traffic bottleneck at Buxton Bridge would be dangerous for pedestrians due to lack of footpath and proximity to motorcamp.
	20.06	Visitor and beach parking	Oppose	Southern end of beach is heavily used and distance from Buxton Valley will compound current parking problems there. Parking mitigation is not covered in Traffic Impact Report.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
21 Mr M W Wybourn and Ms S T Ross	21.01	Support with amendments	Support	"I am generally in support of the proposal, provided it is in accordance with the outline development plan as Buxton Stream & environs will benefit greatly from the planned protection fencing and stock exclusion. I am concerned about the number of potential extra inhabitants of Gore Bay area placing undue pressure on the marine resources of the area. Therefore I would like the maximum number of lots reduced to 50. As a neighbouring landowner I will have wastewater treatment area, extra housing and associated activities within close proximity to my property. In consideration for this inconvenience I believe myself and other adjacent landowners should be granted easement to the planned road, and thereby to Gore Bay Rd, which would enhance the enjoyment and convenience of our property."
	21.02	Development controls	Support	B6.2.1 Strongly support that all and any activity must be strictly in line with the outline development plan.
	21.03	Number of lots	Oppose	B6.2.2 Reduce the maximum number of dwellings to 50.
	21.04	Boundary fencing for stock	Oppose	B6.2.13 Fencing to protect indigenous vegetation should meet QEII Trust standards or minimum 7 wire post & batten permanent standard.
	21.05	Effects on vegetation and wildlife	Support	B6.2.12 Support indigenous planting provisions.
	21.06	Development controls	Oppose	B6.5 Exotic trees likely to exceed 5m in height should be a non-complying activity within 10m of boundary in separate title.
	21.07	Road access	Oppose	B6.1.2(b) Neighbouring landowners should be granted easement to any roads vested in Council.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
22 Mr T and Mrs S Ashley	22.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"We seek that the HDC declines this privately initiated plan change request."
	22.02	Landscape values	Oppose	The development is not appropriate to the coastal hills of Gore Bay. Adverse effects of the development on the existing character and amenity of Gore Bay cannot be prevented. Outstanding landscape areas should be excluded from residential development.
	22.03	Benefits and advantages	Oppose	The development will not contribute to achieving a wider settlement strategy for the district as will primarily provide holiday accommodation for people residing outside of the district, and is not otherwise required for those living and working in the district.
	22.04	Traffic volume	Oppose	Additional traffic effects have been downplayed in the Traffic Impact Report. The data used is not representative enough to base a decision on.
	22.05	Road access	Oppose	Cathedral Rd cannot physically accommodate the increase in traffic without require major upgrading (if even possible). The level of traffic would be beyond the safe and efficient carrying capacity of the existing road network and would have significant adverse effects on the amenity of Gore Bay Village.
	22.06	General amenity values	Oppose	The present land zoning is the most efficient and appropriate to maintain the current amenity values of the area.
23 Medical Officer of Health Community & Public Health Ltd	23.01	Support with amendments	Oppose	"If further information sufficient to allow a proper assessment to be made is not provided, then the application should be refused. A formalised agreement on the management of water services throughout the process and future management should be required."

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
23 Medical Officer of Health Community & Public Health Ltd	23.02	Water supply and treatment	Oppose	There is insufficient formalised commitment for the future management and maintenance of the treatment and supply of water services, which does not enable a proper assessment of the effects on public health. The Council may not relinquish management of water services for a population greater than 200, and confirmation that the HDC will manage and maintain the water supply service is required.
	23.03	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	There is insufficient formalised commitment for the future management and maintenance of the treatment and supply of sewage services, which does not enable a proper assessment of the effects on public health. The Council may not relinquish management of sewage services for a population greater than 200, and confirmation that the HDC will manage and maintain the sewage services is required.
24 Mr A W and Mrs L M Bestic	24.01	Reject the plan change	Oppose	"Reject the Private Plan Change because of serious concerns regarding housing density, water/erosion, soil types and land stability, Buxton Stream sedimentation, loss of amenity values, access to walkways, onselling."
	24.02	Land stability	Oppose	The character of this area is not suitable to a development of this size as areas of substrate and soil are prone to water runners and erosion.
	24.03	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Concerns re discharge of stormwater, sewage treatment and discharge.
	24.04	Sedimentation of Buxton Creek	Oppose	Concerns re sedimentation of Buxton Creek.
	24.05	Number of lots	Oppose	The plan does not show any maximum limit to houses or that housing will be restricted to indicated sites.

Submitter	Sub No.	Issue	Type	Submission
24 Mr A W and Mrs L M Bestic	24.06	Visual amenity	Oppose	Cliff-top housing will detract from the backdrop of the beach and existing settlement.
	24.07	Landscape values	Oppose	This kind of development is inconsistent with an Outstanding Landscape.
	24.08	Public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	There is no guarantee of public access to walking tracks or comment on maintenance of tracks.
	24.09	Road access	Oppose	The Gore Bay Rd access point has very limited visibility. The limestone knoll is a feature of Gore Bay and should be preserved in its present form.
	24.10	Development controls	Oppose	There is no comment or guarantee of retention of terms and conditions if the Buxton development is on-sold.
25 Mr S P Barnett LATE	25.01	Relief sought is unclear	Neutral	No decision is stated.
	25.02	Public walkways and cycleways	Support	Support public access from development to Moody St.
	25.03	Wastewater treatment and discharge	Oppose	Will the present drainage system in Moody St cope with a massive run off from the access track?