

Please return this form to: info@adc.govt.nz or Ashburton District Council, PO Box 94, Ashburton 7740

Submitter Details

Name:

Postal address:

Home number: Work number:

Mobile number: Email address:

Consent Application

Name of applicant:

Application number:

I/We support this application

I/We oppose this application

The reasons for making my submissions are (please state the nature of your submission and give reasons):

1. Safety
2. Parking
3. Ambience/security
4. Hours of operation
5. Signage
6. Negative affect on our Property Value

See attached submission for details and reasons.

I wish the consent authority to make the following decision (please give details, including the general nature of any conditions sought):

We are happy for Mr Petelo to continue operating as he currently is on only a 5 day / 8 hour a week permit. We are happy for him to use discreet signage and would like him to maintain the building and section in a tidy and clean condition. We do not want a huge building operating 24hr / 7 days a week with multiple physicians!

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Signature and Date 20/12/24

Signature:

Note: The person making this application must send a copy to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable

To Whom it May Concern:

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION LUC24/044 – 2 HARRISON STREET, ASHBURTON

We are writing as an affected person re the above Resource Consent. This proposal is to operate a large medical centre with facilities for up to 5 dental and/or other medical professionals with the option to operate 7 days a week for extended opening hours.

We oppose the above consent on 6 grounds ie:

1. Safety
2. Parking
3. Ambience/Security
4. Hours of Operation
5. Signage
6. Property Value

1. Safety

The site of the proposed medical clinic is situated on a busy corner with a roundabout. This corner is a busy route used by a wide variety of commuters (including high volumes of students of all ages on foot/bike or scooter) during the day as it links 4 busy principal roads in Ashburton.

We believe the proposal put forward would put the safety of commuters and patients of the clinic at risk.

The proposal states that:

'a few transport non-compliances have been identified.'

We consider these non compliance issues to be significant. This proposal does not comply with traffic safety standards of the residential zone rules.

There is not enough queue space (6m) for vehicles turning left into the proposed medical centre on Belt Road from the roundabout at the corner. If both the car parks on the road outside the centre are

full neither is there anywhere for queued vehicles to pull over. There is also a bulbous curved guttering at the corner of Belt Road and Harrison Street which makes pulling to the side of the road difficult.

Our driveway is beside the proposed carparking and when we are turning left into it from the south we have to be very aware of vehicles behind us who don't realise that our left indicator is an indication that we are turning and NOT a matter of our indicator being left on from exiting the roundabout. We have had several close calls with cars behind us having to brake suddenly because of this. We are concerned that users of the carpark (which is closer to the roundabout) would not be conscious of this and accidents could occur.

Likewise when we are turning into our driveway from the north we often have to queue to wait for a gap in the traffic and this can cause a build up of traffic behind us. Patients of the proposed medical clinic would be queued up even closer to the roundabout in this situation.

If vehicles are parked on the west side of Belt Road between the proposed exit from the carpark and the roundabout, vehicles exiting the carpark would need to edge onto the road for an unhindered view of the road which again is a safety concern.

Staff using the staff carpark would need to back out onto Harrison Street in very close(non-compliant) proximity to the roundabout which would be hazardous.

Vehicles entering the roundabout often do so at speed as there is clear vision down past the park as they approach the roundabout so vehicles backing out of the staff carpark or leaving the other carpark would be at risk of being hit or causing an accident.

2. Parking

The proposal put forward by Mr Petelo includes provision for up to 5 medical practioners to operate from the building at any one time plus a receptionist and clinical assistants. There is very limited carparking available on Belt Road and although the proposal offers 9 carparks we believe there would be times when this would be insufficient as up to 5 patients could be waiting while a further 5 are being treated and a further 5 are arriving, and if there is a back log of patients

waiting this number could increase even more. This would put even more pressure on the limited street parking available for residents and their visitors.

There is a large reception and waiting area included in the planning which indicates the expectation that this will become a busy medical clinic.

The proposed 2 car parking for staff on the Harrison side of the property will not be sufficient for 5 medical practitioners, a receptionist, medical assistants etc who may be needed to run the clinic. This would necessitate staff to park either on the road or in the patient carpark area.

3. Ambience/ Security

When we purchased our property in April 2024 we knew there was a dentist operating from the premises next door. However the existing premise is a converted dwelling with minimal signage and it blends in with the residential area it is situated in. We paid what we believe was top dollar to retire in a peaceful, desirable, well established residential area of Ashburton. We believe that the proposed additions will impinge on this.

The proposal states that :

' it is considered that the overall benefit to the wider community will comprehensively outweigh any minor detriment which may be experienced by those residing within the immediately surrounding Residential C Zone'

We find this to be very arrogant and at odds with the statement on page 25 under the assessment of effects which states:

'It is acknowledged that the establishment or expansion of non-residential activities in living environments may result in adverse effects upon residential character and amenity. Such activities may result in loss of visual amenity, incompatible or excessive hours of operation and excessive signage. Some non-residential activities can have adverse effects on existing residential amenity and are not compatible with the existing residential character.'

The proposed additions to the building are not within the 3m of the road boundary requirement. In fact the intrusions are 1.06 m for Belt Road frontage and 0.9m for Harrison Street frontage which make the proposed building very dominant and even with the planting proposed will impinge on the visual environment.

There will also be a great increase in numbers of people around the immediate area which will increase the possibility of unlawful entry to our property and consequently the **security** of our property will be of concern to us.

4. Hours of operation:

Currently Mr Petelo only uses these premises on Thursdays however this proposal now includes an option to open up to 7 days a week with operating hours between 7am and 9pm on weekdays and 9am and 5pm on weekends. It also allows for usage outside these hours for emergency or on call medical practitioners. So in effect this could become a 24hr/7 day a week clinic which would definitely impinge on the residential nature of the area.

Although, as mentioned in the proposal, there is a school and an early learning centre in the area these are 5 day a week premises that do not operate outside normal business hours and neither are close enough to the busy intersection to be considered dangerous and are well within the distance to comply with residential zone traffic safety standards. There is also the hospital but the main entrance to the hospital is approximately 500 metres from the roundabout on a side street, not on the principal road. The maternity ward is slightly closer (but within guidelines), but is a small ward that does not generate a lot of traffic.

The proposal states that the probability of patient numbers will be 'say 60-100 patients a day' yet Mr Petelo told us he alone sees approximately 50 patients a day so if the other 4 practitioners see a similar number that could mean as many as 250 patients using the facility each day which would mean engines starting, doors slamming, people talking and a general increase in noise levels and traffic volume up to 7 days a week!

When talking with Mr Petelo he intimated that he as yet didn't have any definite plans for the rental of the 4 other rooms and that he only uses it one day a week. However he also told us that he plans to spend about \$1.5 million dollars on this project so we don't believe he will leave it sitting empty but will be looking for a return on his investment. His proposal states:

'the intention is to establish a centre for visiting dental professionals and attract other medical professionals who wish to operate from this site.'

He also told us that many of his current patients are college students who walk to their appointments so parking would not be an issue. However we don't believe this would be the case for the patients of other medical practitioners he plans to rent the other rooms to.

5. Signage:

The proposal includes provision for non compliant signage that is considered a restricted discretionary activity and is:-

- a) larger than the maximum allowance
- b) not separated by a minimum of 100 meters on any one site
- c) greater than the maximum area of any sign which shall not exceed 0.5sq m

The large signs will be a distraction to drivers entering the roundabout and in winter the sign on the glass window will have light behind it which will also distract drivers approaching the roundabout.

6. Property Value

We believe that the proposed building and usage will have a negative impact on the value of our property and make it a less desirable property for future purchasers. We are also concerned that if Mr Petelo decides to sell the proposed building that another type of business could be established instead.

Surely there are other premises available in Ashburton that are not in a residential area that would be better suited for this type of use.

In conclusion we would like to reiterate that we oppose this proposal on the above grounds. We are happy for Mr Petelo to continue under the current conditions but only on 5 day a week/8 hours a day. We would like Mr Petelo to maintain the grounds and building in a tidy condition with discreet signage. We do not want a large medical centre dominating the area 24/7 with multiple specialists/physicians resulting in an increase in traffic/ parking/ noise/ and a decrease in security/ambience/safety and property value.

Thank you
John and Pip Cleverley
5A Belt Road
Allenton
Ashburton 7700



Resource Consent Submission Form

RCAP01
VER 1.2
Jan 2016

Please return this form to: info@adc.govt.nz or Ashburton District Council, PO Box 94, Ashburton 7740

Submitter Details

Name:

Postal address:

Home number:

Work number:

Mobile number:

Email address:

Consent Application

Name of applicant:

Application number:

I/We support this application

I/We oppose this application

The reasons for making my submissions are (please state the nature of your submission and give reasons):

I OPPOSE THE ABOVE RESOURCE CONSENT BECAUSE OF
* VEHICLE & PEDESTRIAN SAFETY
* CAR PARKING
* SIGNAGE
* IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES & AMBIANCE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FOR FULL DETAILS

I wish the consent authority to make the following decision (please give details, including the general nature of any conditions sought):

~~NOT TO GRANT APPROVAL FOR LUC24/044 ON THE GROUNDS OF SAFETY, CAR PARKING, SIGNAGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.~~
PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FOR FULL DETAILS.

** please disregard lines thru writing*

I wish to be heard in support of my submission

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

Signature and Date 9 JANUARY, 2025

Signature:

Lynley Hands,
5 Belt Road,
Ashburton
Phone: 0274408022
Email: lghands@xtra.co.nz

9 January, 2025

Lauren Wright,
Processing Officer,
Ashburton District Council,
Baring Square,
Ashburton.

Dear Lauren,

Please Note: With regards to RESOURCE CONSENT DECISION LUC20/006 2 Harrison Street, Ashburton. In a letter dated 16 March, 2020, David Harford Consulting Ltd was formally advised by Laura Connor, Consents Planner for the Ashburton District Council that this consent for Joseph Petelo was granted on 13 March, 2020 subject to conditions. The letter states in part –

General

"4. Prior to the first use of the building, the car parking areas shall be formed and sealed and all car parks shall be marked."

"5. Prior to the first use of the building, the first car park located at the entrance of the site and carpark number 4 on the approved plan shall be marked and reserved for "STAFF ONLY" and made at all times available thereafter."

Landscaping

"6. That prior to the first commercial use of the facility, landscaping plantings as identified on the approved site plan shall be established and thereafter maintained. Should any plants die or be damaged they will be replaced within the next planting season with items of similar species and size."

ADVICE NOTES

"9. The consent holder is requested to notify Council, in writing, once they have completed the works authorised by this resource consent. Such notification should be sent to info@adc.govt.nz including the following details:" A DETAILED PLAN FOR PARKING AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS WAS INCLUDED

I can advise the Council that **none of the carpark has been completed** and **none of landscaping plantings have been completed** and would respectfully ask that a representative from council inspect the building to ensure all internal alterations to the building have been done as per the plan included with the consent approval. I cannot speak to Advice Note 9 but if such letter has been received by the Council it is false.

At the very least Mr Petelo has been operating from these premises as an orthodontist since August, 2022 when I purchased my property with the possibility of longer. He visited me mid 2023 to introduce himself and told me that he was seeing at least 50 patients a day every Thursday.

It could well be that Mr Petelo has acquired an exemption from the Council to operate without fulfilling his resource consent obligations and if that's the case I would be interested to know the reasons.

RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION LUC24/044 – 2 HARRISON STREET, ASHBURTON

I am writing as an affected person to oppose the above Resource Consent for the following reasons

- VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY
- PARKING
- SIGNAGE
- IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES AND AMBIANCE OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

VEHICLE AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

Because the conditions around the carpark for the original resource consent have not been fulfilled there have been no cars parked in the area immediately next to my property except Mr Petelo therefore any difference to traffic flow since the consent was granted has been nil.

The proposal states in 5.4 Assessment of Effects that, *"The key traffic related issues associated with this proposal are parking, vehicle access, traffic generation and the effects of site generated traffic on the adjoining road network."* p.30. I do not believe that anything in the proposal addresses these points adequately.

The proximity of the main carpark for the proposed Big Grin plan is less than 30m to the intersection/round-about at Walnut Avenue/Oak Grove/Harrison Street/Belt Road. The two staff carparks that require vehicles to reverse onto Harrison Street are less than 15m from the corner. This intersection would be one of the most used access points in Ashburton with all four roads generating a high volume of traffic. Therefore placing the property in one of the most dangerous points in Ashburton.

I have done a traffic count of vehicles passing north and south of the entrance to the proposed carpark of The Big Grin on Belt Road and that equated to an average of 1 vehicle passing every 10 seconds. This does not include 3:00pm-3:10pm on a school day when 109 vehicles were counted (an average of 10.9 vehicles every 10 seconds). These vehicles included large semi trailers, SUV's double cabs and utes, cars, vehicles towing trailers, motor bikes, cyclists and in one day an Ambulance went past 3 times (once at speed with sirens operating heading north) which is a regular occurrence. See attached for days, times, vehicle counts and workings to achieve these figures.

On two of the day's I was observing a large group of college students walked south and returned along the footpath on the west side of Belt Road both ways. The number of students in the first group weren't counted but was similar to the second group the following day of 21 students. Added to this the footpath on the west of Belt Road adjoining The Big Grin is used by many people during the day for walking and is very busy from 3:00pm-3:30pm during the week with college, intermediate and primary students either walking or scootering home from school. During this time a number of parents park outside The Big Grin, my property and corresponding parks on the east side of the road waiting to pick up college students.

I have a number of experiences when vehicles driving north along Oak Grove do not slow down at the roundabout at Harrison, Belt and Walnut and continue through to Belt Road at the same speed they were doing along Oak Grove. I believe this is due to being able to see over the green space of the domain to Walnut Avenue when approaching the roundabout and if there is no traffic to give way to, the drivers don't slow down and continue at a much higher speed than is safe. At times I have almost been hit when reversing out of my garage and am concerned that vehicles exiting the proposed Big Grin carpark, which is around 6m closer to the roundabout, would not have a reasonable time to make a safe decision to proceed or give way to oncoming traffic travelling at up to 50km/hour.

Similarly, in my experience, vehicles turning left from Harrison Street onto Belt Road accelerate quickly and because you cannot see them until they're onto Belt Road there is little time to make a decision. If a decision has been made you have to hope the oncoming car will slow down. Again, this would be exacerbated for Big Grin carpark vehicles being 6m closer to the corner than my property.

It is a common occurrence when indicating to turn left into my property, after going through the roundabout, that vehicles immediately behind me are accelerating and when I brake to enter my driveway the vehicle behind comes dangerously close. I believe the following driver thinks I'm still indicating to turn left onto Belt Road. Three neighbours immediately opposite my property on Belt Road and neighbours at 5a Belt Road have all had the same experience. Vehicles turning left into the proposed Big Grin main carpark are at least 6m closer to the roundabout giving them less time to react.

If a vehicle is heading south along Belt Road with the intention of turning right into the proposed Big Grin main carpark and oncoming northbound traffic prevents them from making an immediate turn these vehicles will be sitting stationary in the middle of the single lane on the east side of Belt Road less than 20m from the roundabout. This has the potential to cause an unsafe back up of vehicles and a traffic hazard.

Vehicles turning left when leaving the Big Grin proposed main carpark onto Belt Road will not be able to see if either myself or vehicles from 5a Belt Road are exiting our driveways. The proposal says on p.12 that *"The applicant will retain or re-establish a trellis fence to ensure that the existing fence is no less than 2m in height along the boundary shared with Number 5 Belt Road."* If drivers of these vehicles are focused on the traffic flow on their right and can't see what's on their left will they even look for vehicles existing 5 or 5a Belt Road?

Later in this submission my concerns around parking will, I believe, show that staff and/or client vehicles will be parked on the roadside parks on the west side of Belt Road adjacent to The Big Grin. These will form a visual barrier for vehicles exiting the proposed Big Grin main carpark. Drivers would have a limited view of oncoming north bound traffic and would have to pull out into the stream of traffic to ascertain whether they can exit either south or north safely. I use the Moore Street Medical Centre and find when exiting their carpark the front of my vehicle is well over the safe line of oncoming traffic to my right before I can see whether it's safe to exit left or right because vehicles are parked on the south side of Moore Street and blocking my sight line. Moore Street has a traffic flow that is considerably lighter but I feel very vulnerable. This situation would be a far greater risk when exiting the Big Grin main carpark onto Belt Road and more so if turning right when waiting for traffic from both directions to be clear.

I'm also concerned that if a vehicle turns left into the Big Grin main carpark from Belt Road and find there are no parks remaining they would have to back out into the main stream of traffic with little to no view of oncoming traffic. Alternatively, they realise there are no parks and stop on the road before entering thus creating yet another traffic hazard.

Staff car parking has been delegated to 2 parks that have to reverse onto Harrison Street. Some of these vehicles will presumably enter the parks from the east having come through the roundabout and then having to turn right. If there is oncoming traffic along Harrison Street the staff member would have to wait causing a backlog of vehicles. There would only need to be 3 stationary vehicles to be on the roundabout.

"The main car parking and manoeuvring area will be sited to the east of the Lot to retain the existing crossing position and keep the traffic movements away from the roundabout as much as possible albeit visibility is high in this location." p.26 I disagree with both of these statements in that it will not keep the traffic movements away from the roundabout when it is only metres from the corner. There is not high visibility when existing The Big Grin carpark if there are vehicles parked on the

west side of Belt Road which would more than probably be the case if staff and/or overflow clients have to park in those parks.

CAR PARKING

The proposal is indicating that, *"five orthodontic rooms will be available" p.10* and on the same page says there will be *"a receptionist, three clinical assistants and one dental assistant."* This equates to 9 staff in total if each room is occupied therefore 2 staff parking spaces will be totally inadequate. The proposal states, *"Kerbside carparking is also available" p.9.* It also says of the main carpark off Belt Road, that, *"Whilst the crossing is wide enough and there is ability for an entering vehicle to move off the road whilst allowing an existing vehicle to leave the car park space, it may well be the closest two parking spaces are staff spaces to minimize the daily vehicle movements."*p31. The lack of queue space is non-compliant and presumably making these staff parking would be a way to mitigate that. But the effect of this is to reduce client parking to 7 including a disabled park. It also means that there are only 4 parking spaces for up to 9 staff at any one time. Mr Harford again says on p.31 *"On-street parking will be readily available within the vicinity ..."* The conclusion then is that there will be up to 5 staff vehicles parked on the road. If street parking is used adjacent to the proposed new premises for staff parking and there is an overflow from the proposed main carpark these vehicles will naturally park further north along Belt Road. Presently, outside my property, there is enough parking for 2 small cars (only one if parked in the centre of the park or a large ute/twin cab). This carpark services visitors to 5 properties (5, 5a, 7a, 7b, 9 Belt Road). My concern is the overflow of vehicles from The Big Grin will use these parks leaving the residents of the above 5 properties without on-street parking during the day from Monday-Friday and if the business is busy on a Saturday or Sunday.

The proposal says, *"The probability of the development producing movements throughout the facility of say 60-100 patients a day as a maximum. There will be days when appointments will be less than that number."* p.32 Mr Petelo has told me previously that he sees 50 patients on a Thursday when he is here and there are four more rooms attracting more patients/clients therefore this number would seem reasonable on a daily basis. That would mean between 120 – 200 vehicle movements onto and off Belt Road per day and the associated street parking for such a high volume of vehicles.

Mr Petelo said most of his patients on the Thursday he is presently operating are secondary school students and walk from Ashburton College. This being the case at the moment the parking requirements will be less but a view into the future could well see all 5 rooms being used by other specialists who have clients requiring car parking and the "probability" of 60-100 patients requiring parking could be quite real.

"This proposal will have no more than minor effects on the surrounding environment." "There are little to no adverse effects anticipated as a direct result of the proposed activity." p.35

I think this statement is wrong and personifies the attitude of this proposal in that it is disrespectful to neighbours and the hundreds of people in the wider community using the four major roads culminating in the potentially dangerous traffic situations that could be created at this roundabout.

SIGNAGE

"Signage non-compliances have also been identified. The extent of these minor discrepancies does not seem significant though and an assessment of the effects should demonstrate that the impact of the signage non-compliances will be less than minor." P.24

The proposed signage on the glass windows facing Harrison Street has the potential to cause a hazard with reflection of the sun in the afternoons. A further hazard could be created when internal light is shining from the Staff Room through the window with the Big Grin signage that is only .9m from the boundary and therefore very close to the road.

IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES AND AMBIANCE OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

The visible presence of The Big Grin presently has minimal impact on the residential feel of the neighbourhood because it presents as a domestic bungalow that fits with neighbouring houses. The colour and size of the present sign also has minimal visual impact.

Having spoken to Bruce McPherson (REINZ) he considers having a very visible commercial operation involving a large addition that intrudes into the 3m from the boundary zone and oversize signage next to my property will impact on its resale value and the ambiance of the neighbourhood. His comments were that if he were trying to sell my house and was having an Open Day potential clients would automatically ask about the neighbouring Dental/Medical Operation with thoughts about the commercial impact, traffic safety and increased volume of people onto the property immediately next to mine. The immediate concern of the carpark being next to my property and the noise that would create with cars stopping and starting, car doors opening and shutting, headlights shining onto my property and possibly more importantly the safety aspect of a higher volume of vehicles exiting and entering Belt Road from an immediately neighbouring property. He felt a potential client would have negative thoughts about my property because there was a commercial operation directly next door and may even deter people from taking any further interest after simply driving past.

A large part of the reason I purchased my property at 5 Belt Road a year ago was the attractive neighbourhood, close proximity to the green space of the domain, the beautiful trees on Walnut Avenue and Oak Grove and the added bonus of living in Allenton. I paid appropriately for these things which equated to more than other areas in Ashburton. Whether this be ethically right or wrong it seems it has been the tradition for decades that Allenton house prices are higher in value than other areas of Ashburton. I would feel I'd been duped into paying more than my property was worth if Council allows this Consent to be approved and the corresponding commercial entity is established when the initial terms of reference when purchasing 5 Belt Road had only included a residential bungalow and unassuming sign that blends within the neighbourhood.

The proposal states on numerous occasions that the effects on the environment and neighbouring houses will be minimum or not adverse. It says, *"a key visual and amenity aspect to this proposal is that the building is residential in its design and appearance"* p.25 *"The subject building could be seen as residential in scale and appearance and is therefore compatible with the residential buildings found within the immediate and surrounding area. It is therefore unlikely that this scheme will result in adverse visual effects when observed as part of the wider residential setting."* P.26 *"It is envisaged that non-residential activity of this ilk will remain compatible with the residential location."* p.30 To my knowledge there are no houses within at least a kilometre of this area that are .9m or 1.06m from the boundary line, have car parking for 9 vehicles off two busy roads, have a full glass walls facing a major road, has 17m of what appears to be white board and batten solid wall 1.06m from the street boundary, have the possibility of vehicles coming and going up to 200 times per day, have from 60-100 unknown people visiting daily and being open to the public potentially 24/7. I consider comments stating that this proposed addition will blend in with the surrounding properties to be totally erroneous.

"The actual intrusions are minor as can be seen in the proposed designs." P.27 I believe is an understatement. Three metres reduced to .9m and 1.06m are not minor. *"The roundabout is located to the south of the site on the frontage so provides a high element of open space."*p29 I believe this to have no relevance to the intrusions proposed. Again, *"The proposed plantings along the frontage ... will help mitigate the potential effects of the road setback."* P.29 is considered to be of no value in mitigating the proposed intrusions.

The proposal states a number of times that garden areas and plantings will be created and maintained. In the nearly 18 months that I have lived at 5 Belt Road Mr Petelo has done nothing to the landscape of his business other than have the large hedge along Harrison and Belt Road trimmed. The back area that is visible to the public has been left unattended with a pile of used timber and

plywood lying on the former garage concrete pad. The plywood has disintegrated and large slivers of ply are blown onto my property or the road regularly. Knowing that Mr Petelo has not maintained the landscaping on his property to date, I am dubious about how well he will maintain any new proposed landscaping.

I realise that the hours of operation have been consented with the original council approval but I would like it recorded that had I been a submitter to that consent I would have objected to the hours of operation. Although the current proposal hints that the long hours would not be used there is still that option of operating 24 hours a day 7 days a week by being 'on call' and I don't believe that fits at all well with what the current proposal continually says is a "residential area" ... "that will not be adversely affected".

CONCLUSION

Throughout this proposal words such as, "in general", "more plausible", "it is considered", "the probability", "in our opinion", "is not expected", "is not likely" have been used extensively. These phrases make anything that follows a supposition and therefore only an opinion. I believe a lot of this proposal is based on supposition and opinion therefore must be read as such.

I understand that the existing Big Grin premises and signage are considered a discretionary activity under the Operative Ashburton District Plan and have an approved resource consent. I have no opposition to the existing building and signage but wonder, for the reasons stated above, at the wisdom of still allowing 9 carparks for this consent.

I oppose enlarging of The Big Grin's building and carparking enabling more people to both work and use the services offered creating a severe detrimental effect on the traffic and pedestrian safety on both Belt Road and Harrison Street and the roundabout in general.

I also oppose this consent application because I believe it would have a negative effect on the immediate neighbourhood and ambiance of a residential area so close to the green space of the domain and tree lined Oak Grove and Walnut Avenue.

I have spoken to a number of neighbours, friends and acquaintances who live in the area and use this intersection on a daily basis. None have agreed with the proposed extensions and associated changes that go with this Resource Consent. All have concerns about traffic safety and that the added vehicle movements contributing to an already busy intersection would not be safe. The immediate neighbours are also concerned about the impact of having such a visible commercial enterprise so close to their properties and the impact that would have on the traffic safety and property values.

I would ask you to keep in mind that if the Council approves this Resource Consent and there are multiple accidents as a result, you cannot retract your approval when the building is completed. There will be more possibilities of fatalities occurring simply by the increased traffic volume. I think the many residents in the area that use this intersection, often several times a day, deserve to have their safety taken into consideration and be provided with a safe environment in which they are confident to drive.

LYNLEY HANDS

FOOTNOTE

If this consent is approved there will be months of building that will involve tradesmen's vehicles, large trucks, machinery and people constantly coming on and off site, possible road closures, building supply deliveries, all of which I believe will affect the general safety of traffic and pedestrians. It will not only be disruptive but a real hazard for people that use this roundabout on a daily basis – often multiple times a day.

Added to this there the noise levels will be increased considerably. There will be continuous noise of various types for months. These activities will possibly start at 8:00am and not finish until 5:00pm. There are 9 neighbours on the north and east side of the site that are within 50m and are all retired therefore will be home most or all of the day.

The noise and disruption would have a noticeable detrimental effect on our lifestyle and quality of life, along with people using this part of the road, for the months it would take to build the proposed extension and carparks.

Tuesday 3/9

10:20 - 10:30

IHT	IHT	HTI	HTI
HTI	HTI	HTI	IHT
HTI	HTI	HTI	HTI
III			

School chm walking South?
(College kids) (5 groups) 20.

60 Cars SUVs UTes
3 large trucks
63

TRAFFIC COUNT
DETAILS.

12:05 - 12:15

HTI	HTI	HTI	HTI
	+		
HTI	HTI	HTI	HTI
		+	
II		HTI	HTI
(22)		HTI	HTI
(66) (2 walkers)	IIII	(44)	

Ambulance

3 September

2:05 - 2:15

|||| ||| ||| |||
|||| ||| ||| |||

11
(22) (2 trucks) (21)
(43)

College Kids (16)

2:17 pm.
Walked past - South.

Cold Raining / Cloudy

63
86
43
69 8

241
60 = 60x6

(105)
3-310

Wesly

10 mins.

6 cars / minute

1 car / 10 sec.

~~105~~
~~60x30~~
2

10/min.

1/6 sec.

11:30am 21 College
Kids walked past

2:50 - 3:00

			(A)								
						(40) (29)					

Ambulance (69) (1 truck)

College Kids Walked Back
3:00 - 3:10

|||| ||| ||| |||
|||| (B) ||| ||| ||| 1 trailer
Kids walking "scouting"
home from school

|||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| (105)

Parents packed for kids

|||| (39) ||| ||| ||| (64)
Primary Kids

Ambulance, Siren

3:23pm

Ambulance - No Siren

2:51pm

2:50 - 3:30

College Intermediate
& Primary Kids walking
biking soccering past.

Addition to submission re LUC24/0044 from Pip and John Cleverley, affected neighbours, 5a Belt Road Ashburton

If this consent is granted we have no confidence that Mr Petelo will comply with any conditions set, as he has shown scant regard to compliance issues in the past for the reasons outlined below.

On re-reading the original consent decision for LUC20/0006 it has come to our attention that Mr Petelo has not met the following conditions:

- *Prior to the first use of the building, the car parking areas shall be formed and sealed and all car parks shall be marked.*
- *Prior to the first use of the building, the first car park located at the entrance of the site and carpark number 4 on the approved plan shall be marked and reserved for "Staff Only" and made available at all times thereafter.*

This has not been done at all. In fact the area set out for parking is covered with debris and rubbish which has been there ever since we moved in to our property in April 2024. I attach photos taken on 9th January 2025 as evidence of this. It would appear that Mr Petelo has been practising from the premises without complying with the above conditions.

The original consent also states that:

- *Prior to the first commercial use of the facility, landscaping plantings as identified on the approved site plan shall be established and thereafter maintained.*

This does not appear to have been done either and actually the property looked overgrown and neglected until today 13 January 2025 when contractors have been employed to bring it under control (just one day before submissions close!)

The original consent also states that:

The consent holder is requested to notify council, in writing, once they have completed the works authorised by this resource consent.

Has the council received this or followed up on it at any time since the consent was granted?

It has also come to our attention that Mr Petelo has twice been late paying his registration fees to practice as a dentist, one of these times resulting in him practising illegally. Mr Petelo appeared before the Health Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal where he was censured and fined for seeing patients without a current practising certificate.

Although unrelated to this application this again shows Mr Petelo disregarding compliance issues.