

# District Plan Submission Form

(for plan changes, variations and notices of requirement)

<small>Please print clearly</small>	<small>For office use only</small>
Full name: <b>TIMOTHY JOHN NUNWEEK KEEGAN</b>	Submission No. <b>668</b>
Organisation: (if the submission is on behalf of an organisation)	<b>668</b>
Agent: (if applicable)	<b>668</b>
Address for correspondence: <b>90 Aroha Ave, Sandringham 1025</b>	<b>668</b>
Phone: (business) (home) <b>(09) 8495290</b> (fax)	<b>668</b>
e-mail address: <b>tkee 011@cucklanduni.ac.nz</b>	<b>668</b>
This is a submission on the following plan modification (state plan modification name and number): <b>Plan modification 8 - Westfield St. Lukes</b>	
Please tick the section of the district plan your submission relates to: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1999 Operative Isthmus Section <input type="checkbox"/> Transitional Operative District Plan (former Auckland District Scheme) <input type="checkbox"/> 1996 Operative Hauraki Gulf Islands Section <input type="checkbox"/> 1997 Proposed Central Area Section <input type="checkbox"/> 2004 Operative Central Area Section	
Please use a separate form for each separate matter for submission	
The specific provision of the plan modification that my submission relates to is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I believe it will increase the crime rate in the area by provoking more car break-ins.</li><li>• The increase in size will block sunlight from surrounding homes.</li><li>• Expansion of St. Lukes is unnecessary, there are enough shops in the Auckland region to satisfy the population.</li><li>• There is already so much traffic that my family can not park our cars outside our home if the driveway is often blocked, the increase in traffic will be an issue on all surrounding streets.</li><li>• Also, a traffic increase cannot be accommodated by the small &amp; narrow streets.</li><li>• Westfield St Lukes is already causing the above issues to the surrounding area without providing any significant benefits and the size expansion will worsen the issues with no attempts being made to ease them.</li></ul>	
<small>continued on reverse</small>	

I / We support  / oppose  / seek amendments  to the plan modification. The reasons for my / our views are;

Note: if you generally support the plan modification but seek some amendments to it you should tick both the "support" and the "seek amendments" box. If you oppose the modification but seek amendments as an alternative to its decline, you should tick both the "oppose" and the "seek amendments" box.

- It will put all local pedestrians at risk on the narrow & windy roads. This is especially pertinent for the children of many young families living in the community, who need a safe home environment to learn the road crossing skills they need.
- It impacts on the community negatively without offering any benefits.
- The local business need as much support as we can offer them, & St. Luke's expansion will draw attention further from our local shops.
- ~~Conspicuous~~ The higher density of cars parked in the local streets will increase their profile as a target for theft.

I / We seek the following decision from the council (give precise details):

Note: the decision requested from council should only relate to the content of the plan modification. Any matters raised which do not directly relate to the plan modification will be treated as being not "on" the plan modification or "outside the scope" of the plan modification and will not be considered.

decline  / accept  / accept with amendments

I believe that in this matter it is unethical to put the needs of a private business before the needs of the community surrounding it. If a plan is going to impact negatively on its local community it should offer compensation of some sort to them in order to reconcile the detrimental impact it has on them. This plan does not do such things and it ignores the complaints of residents as well as the <sup>issues</sup> surrounding installation of the environmental effects of storm water runoff in an area with no reticulated drainage, which would have to be upgraded with council funds in order to benefit not the public but a private entity. ~~and~~ I believe that the public aren't being considered in this matter but the interests of big business, who ought to be secondary to the population they service.

I have attached additional information Yes No

I / We wish to be heard at the council planning hearing Yes No

I / We would be prepared to present a joint case at the hearing with any others making a similar submission Yes No

Signed  Date 25/5/2009.

Note: If your submission is to a notice of requirement the RMA requires you to serve a copy on the person who lodged the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable