



Resource Management Act 1991

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

(FORM 6)

RECEIVED
17/12/2022
CODC

19/180

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340

Name of person making further submission

Name: J W & D H Walton; J Hay/A Robinson; R/B/S MacFadgen ; A McLean _____

Postal address: _39 Domain Road; 76 Hall Road, Hall Road; 41 Domain Road
Bannockburn _____

(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: ____03 445
1559 _____

Email:
_jwwdhw@gmail.com _____

Contact person: ____Jim Walton _____
(Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan.

I am:

.....; **or**

- 1. A person who has an interest in the proposal that is great than the interest the general public has, the grounds for saying this being:**

**All signatories are resident in Bannockburn and are affected by the plan change 19 proposals; or
(Please state whether you are a person who may make a submission under 1 and/or 2 above a**

3. The local authority for the relevant area.

I support (or oppose) the submission of:

See explanatory note and table appended

..... on Plan Change 19
(Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission point number of the original submission)

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:

See explanatory note and table appended

.....
.....
.....

(Please give reasons and continue on an additional page if necessary)

I seek that the whole (or part [describe part]) of the submission be allowed (or disallowed):

See explanatory note and table appended

.....
(Please give precise details)

I wish to be hearing in support of my further submission.

(Please strike out as applicable)

See explanatory note and table appended

If others make a similar submission , I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

(Please delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

yes

.....**J W Walton**.....

Signature of person making Further Submission

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)

(A signature is not required if you make a submission by electronic means)

Date: ...**16 December 2022**.....

Email:**jwwdhw@gmail.com**.....

Telephone No: **03 445 1559**

Postal Address: **39 Domain Road Bannockburn**

.....

.....

Contact Person: **Jim Walton: resident**
(name & designation, if applicable)

Submissions close at 4pm on Tuesday 20 December 2022

Submissions can be emailed to districtplan@codc.govt.nz

Note to person making submission

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

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.

We support or oppose the submission of:	The reasons for our support or opposition are:	We seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed:	We wish to be heard in support of these further submissions
James and Gillian Watt, james.b.watt53@gmail.com , submission 19, points 1 & 2. We support both these points.	The reason for our support is that this submission is in accord with the aspect of our original submission that seeks to prevent housing construction on	We seek that the whole of this submission be allowed.	We wish to be heard.

	Templars Hill and protecting high quality viticultural land from housing subdivision.		
Gordon and Jen McGregor, gkmcgregor@gmail.com , submission 27, points 1 & 2. We support both these points.	The reason for our support is that this submission opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and proposes an extension to the building line restriction in Domain Road area. This is in accord with our original submission.	We seek that the whole of this submission be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Ralph Allen and Jostina Riedstra, ralphallen@orcon.net.nz , submission 29, points 1 & 2. We support both points.	The reason for our support is that this submission opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and proposes a recognition of the existing QEII covenant over the submitters' property in Domain Road.	We seek that the whole of this submission be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Gordon Stewart, bannockburn452@gmail.com , submission 34, points 1 & 2. We support point 1 and oppose point 2.	The reason for our support for point 1 is that this submission is in accord with the aspect of our original submission that seeks to prevent housing construction on Templars Hill. We oppose point 2, that minimum lot sizes be	We seek that the point 1 be allowed and point 2 be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.

	<p>reduced from 2000m² to 1000m² because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Anthony Lingard, 26 Domain Road, Bannockburn stuling68@gmail.com, submission 45, point 1.</p> <p>We support point 1.</p>	<p>The reason for our support is that this submission opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard as outlined in our original submission.</p>	<p>We seek that point 1 be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Charles and Nicola Hughes, charliehugs76@gmail.com, submission 46, point 1.</p>	<p>The reason for opposing this submission is that it supports the rezoning of the Domain Road Vineyard which we oppose.</p>	<p>We seek that this point be disallowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Roger Evans Family Trust, roger.evans@stafford.co.nz, submission 47, point 3.</p> <p>We support point 3.</p>	<p>The reason for our support is that this submission is in accord with the aspect of our original submission that seeks to prevent housing construction on Templars Hill.</p>	<p>We seek that point 3 be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

<p>Merion (Mike) and Celia Davies, mikecelia@yahoo.com, submission 56, point 1.</p> <p>We support point 1.</p>	<p>The reason we support this submission is because it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>We seek that point 1 be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>James Dicey, james@dicey.nz, submission 70, points relating the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, the protection of productive soils and the provision by developers of greenways.</p> <p>We support these points.</p>	<p>The reason we support these points is because they oppose the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and promote the protection of productive land consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. We support developers providing greenways.</p>	<p>We seek that these points be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Brigid Anne and Jason David Short, shortsff@xtra.co.nz, submission 71, all points.</p> <p>We support all points.</p>	<p>The reason we support all of these points is that they are entirely consistent with our submission and give multiple reasons why Domain Road Vineyard should not be rezoned.</p>	<p>We seek that all points be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Residents for Responsible Development of Cromwell (R4RDC), t.tinworth@xtra.co.nz, submission 75, points relating the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, the protection of productive soils and the provision by developers of greenways.</p> <p>We support these points.</p>	<p>The reason we support these points is because they oppose the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and promote the protection of productive land consistent with the National</p>	<p>We seek that these points be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022. We support developers providing greenways.</p>		
<p>Astrid Geneblaza, astrid.geneblaza@gmail.com, submission 78, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lots sizes in</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	Bannockburn.		
<p>Jones Family Trust and Searell Family Trust, craig@townplanning.co.nz, submission 82, points 1 & 3.</p> <p>We oppose these points.</p>	<p>The reason we oppose these points is that changes in minimum lot sizes should not proceed when there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	<p>We seek that points 1 & 3 be disallowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Dr Wendy Bamford and Mr Graham Bamford, wbamford@xtra.co.nz, submission 84, point 'a'.</p> <p>We support point a.</p>	<p>The reason we support point a is that it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and Templars Hill.</p> <p>The reason we now oppose rezoning and subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant</p>	<p>We seek that point 'a' be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Niall and Julie Watson, nwatsonnz@gmail.com, submission 85, all points.</p> <p>We support this submission in its entirety.</p>	<p>The reason we support all of this submission is that it is entirely consistent with ours and in particular its opposition to the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>We seek that all of this submission be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>David Olds. david.olds@aderant.com, submission 86, point 2.</p> <p>We support point 2.</p>	<p>The reason we support point 2 is that it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>We seek that this point be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Peter and Ngaire Grellet, grellet@extra.co.nz, submission 92, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation subdivision</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

<p>of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lots sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	<p>Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	
<p>Jim and Diane Walton et al., jwwhdw@gmail.com, submission 97, points regarding Domain Road Vineyard, Templars Hill.</p> <p>We support these points.</p>	<p>The reason we support these points is because they oppose the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and support the protection of Templars Hill from development.</p>	<p>We seek that these points be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

<p>Nita Smith and Keiran Parsons, nita.j.smith@gmail.com; kieranparsons6@gmail.com, submission 100, entire submission.</p> <p>Neither support nor oppose.</p>	<p>The reason for our position is that while we support LLRZ residential development to the south of Bannockburn we are aware that there has been no notification of this proposal which offers Bannockburn residents a chance to be consulted.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation about extension of the residential zoning and the configuration of new residential areas in Bannockburn.</p>		<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Geoffrey Owen and Ingrid Janice Poole, poolefam@xtra.co.nz, submission 101, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Suz Allison, suznlloyd@xtra.co.nz, submission 103, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Britta Sonntag, britta_huwald@hotmail.com, submission 104, point opposing the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.</p> <p>We support this point.</p>	<p>The reason we support this point is that it is consistent with our original submission.</p>	<p>We seek that this point be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Jill Marshall, landjmarshall72@gmail.com, submission 105, we support all points except permitting a sa form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Robyn Jane Fluksova and Jindrich Fluksa, jrfluksa@yahoo.co.nz, submission 120, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Donna Hall, donna@donnahall.nz, submission 115, we support all points except permitting as mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Graeme Crosbie, info@domainroad.co.nz, submission 117, points 1 & 2.</p> <p>We oppose both points.</p>	<p>The reason we oppose both of these points relating to the inclusion of Domain Road Vineyard in the LLRZ and reducing lot sizes to 1000m² is because the first point is contrary to our and many other submissions and the second requires further community consultation.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lots sizes in</p>	<p>We seek that points 1 & 2 be disallowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	Bannockburn.		
Jack Longton and Karen Lillian Searle, jack@tiqvah.co.nz , submission 119, we support all points except permitting as a mitigating factor, subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m ² lots.	<p>The reason we support all points except subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Harold Kruse Davidson, matt@ladpro.co.nz , submission 127, entire submission. Neither support nor oppose.	The reason for our position is that we are aware that there has been no notification of this proposal which		We wish to be heard.

	<p>offers Bannockburn residents a chance to be consulted.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation about extension of the residential zoning and the configuration of new and existing residential areas in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>Ros and Peter Herbison, rospete@xtra.co.nz, submission 134, the point opposing the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.</p> <p>We support this point.</p>	<p>The reason we support this point is that it is entirely consistent with our submission.</p>	<p>We seek that this point be allowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>
<p>Cairine Heather McLeod, campbell@chasurveyors.co.nz, submission 135, entire submission.</p> <p>Neither support nor oppose.</p>	<p>The reason for our position is that while we support LLRZ residential development to the south of Bannockburn we are aware that there has been no notification of this proposal which offers Bannockburn residents a chance to be consulted.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential</p>		<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation about extension of the residential zoning and the configuration of new and existing residential areas in Bannockburn.		
Bannockburn Responsible Development Inc., james@dicey.nz , submission 140, points opposing the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and retention of the current no-build restrictions. We support these points.	The reason we support these points is that they are consistent with our submission.	We seek that these points be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Koraki Ltd and Scott Scott Ltd, kiscott@outlook.co.nz , submission 143, entire submission. Neither support nor oppose.	The reason for our position is that we are aware that there has been no notification of this proposal which offers Bannockburn residents a chance to be consulted. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation about extension of the residential zoning and the configuration of new and existing residential areas in Bannockburn.		We wish to be heard
Professor Jennifer Dixon, jennydixon017@gmail.com , submission 154, we support all	The reason we support all points except subdivision	We seek that all points, barring the reference to	We wish to be heard.

<p>points except permitting as a mitigating factor, subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m² lots.</p>	<p>of Domain Road Vineyard (to 3000m² lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and there is abundant opportunity for extension of the residential zone to the south of the village.</p> <p>Changing of current lot sizes should not proceed because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	<p>subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	
<p>Werner Murray, carolynwerner@mac.com, submission 156, point one.</p> <p>We oppose this point.</p>	<p>The reason we oppose reducing the minimum lot size to 1400m² is because there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about such a</p>	<p>We seek that this point be disallowed.</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

	<p>change. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>		
<p>John and Rowan Klevstul and Rubicon Hall Road Ltd, office@townplanning.co.nz, submission 163, entire submission.</p> <p>Neither support nor oppose.</p>	<p>The reason for our position is that while we support LLRZ residential development to the south of Bannockburn we are aware that there has been no notification of this proposal which offers Bannockburn residents a chance to be consulted.</p> <p>We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation about extension of the residential zoning and the configuration of new residential areas in Bannockburn.</p>		<p>We wish to be heard.</p>