

## 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)

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

RECEIVED  
20/12/2022  
CODC

19/193

#### Name of person making further submission

Name: Niall and Julie Watson  
Postal address: 440 Bannockburn Road  
Phone: 0274394757

Email: [njwatsonnz@gmail.com](mailto:njwatsonnz@gmail.com) (address for service)

Contact person: Niall Watson

- This is a further submission in support of and in opposition to submissions on Proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan.
- **We have an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has in the plan change, the grounds for saying this being:**
- **We own a house in Bannockburn Road, Bannockburn and have done so for over 20 years which been both a holiday home and a rental property.**
- Our further submissions in support and in opposition to submissions made on the Central Otago District Plan Change 19 are included in the attached table and introductory explanatory note
- The reasons for our support and opposition are included in the attachment along with those submissions we seek to be allowed and those we seek to be disallowed.
- We wish to be heard in support of our further submission.
- If others make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Niall and Julie Watson  
Signature of person making Further Submission

Date: 14 December 2022

**Explanatory note**

Our purpose here is to highlight the main themes in our ‘further submissions’ of which this explanatory note is a part. These themes are:

1. We support all those submissions opposing the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, including Templars Hill as a LLRZ. Our reasons are elaborated in our primary submission but in addition now include the need to protect the productive soils upon which this high-quality vineyard grows. This is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022.
2. A number of submitters have proposed that minimum lot sizes be reduced from 2000m<sup>2</sup> in the Bannockburn LLRZ. Others have submitted, including ourselves, that if the proposal to rezone Domain Road Vineyard as LLR is accepted, then a larger (3000m<sup>2</sup>) lot size should be instituted in mitigation of the impacts of the rezoning. We now oppose this in the first instance because, apart from our complete opposition to any rezoning of the vineyard, there has been no community consultation in Bannockburn about changes to LLRZ lot sizes. We strongly recommend that the CODC embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise based on local consultation which would include, among other things, questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.
3. We support requiring developers to provide greenways, reserves and/or open spaces in new residential developments.
4. We have neither supported nor opposed the LLRZ rezoning proposals, including variance from the standard 2000m<sup>2</sup> LLRZ lot size, outlined in submissions 100, 127, 135, 143, 163. The reason for our position is that we support LLRZ residential development to the south of Bannockburn on soils not developed for horticultural use and/or less productive than those in the Domain Road Vineyard. Any such residential development should be located in a way that protects the rural heritage village character of Bannockburn and the expansive rural views it offers. We are aware that there has been no notification of these proposals which allow local residents to be informed of potential changes. Such notification is surely warranted given the scale and effects of the proposals. This, again, is why we believe the CODC should embark on a residential development strategic planning exercise for Bannockburn based on local consultation to consider these and any other proposals that may arise.

**Further submissions**

<b>We support or oppose the submission of:</b>	<b>The reasons for our support or opposition are:</b>	<b>We seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed:</b>	<b>We wish to be heard in support of these further submissions</b>
James and Gillian Watt, <a href="mailto:james.b.watt53@gmail.com">james.b.watt53@gmail.com</a> , 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 Templars	We seek that the whole of this	We wish to be heard.

	Hill and protecting high quality viticultural land from housing subdivision.	submission be allowed.	
Gordon and Jen McGregor, <a href="mailto:gkmcgregor@gmail.com">gkmcgregor@gmail.com</a> , 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, <a href="mailto:ralphallen@orcon.net.nz">ralphallen@orcon.net.nz</a> , 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, <a href="mailto:bannockburn452@gmail.com">bannockburn452@gmail.com</a> , 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 reduced from 2000m <sup>2</sup> to 1000m <sup>2</sup> , 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, among other things, questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.	We seek that the point 1 be allowed and point 2 be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.
Anthony Lingard, 26 Domain Road, Bannockburn <a href="mailto:stuling68@gmail.com">stuling68@gmail.com</a> , submission 45, point 1.  We support point 1.	The reason for our support is that this submission opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard as outlined in our original submission.	We seek that point 1 be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Charles and Nicola Hughes, <a href="mailto:charliehugs76@gmail.com">charliehugs76@gmail.com</a> , submission 46, point 1.  We oppose point 1.	The reason for opposing this submission is that it supports the rezoning of the Domain Road Vineyard which we oppose.	We seek that this point be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.

Roger Evans Family Trust, <a href="mailto:roger.evans@stafford.co.nz">roger.evans@stafford.co.nz</a> , submission 47, point 3.  We support point 3.	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.	We seek that point 3 be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Merion (Mike) and Celia Davies, <a href="mailto:mikecelia@yahoo.com">mikecelia@yahoo.com</a> , submission 56, point 1.  We support point 1.	The reason we support this submission is because it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.	We seek that point 1 be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
James Dicey, <a href="mailto:james@dicey.nz">james@dicey.nz</a> , submission 70, points relating the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, the protection of productive soils and the provision by developers of greenways.  We support these points.	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.	We seek that these points be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Brigid Anne and Jason David Short, <a href="mailto:shortsff@xtra.co.nz">shortsff@xtra.co.nz</a> , submission 71, all points.  We support all points.	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.	We seek that all points be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Residents for Responsible Development of Cromwell (R4RDC), <a href="mailto:t.tinworth@xtra.co.nz">t.tinworth@xtra.co.nz</a> , submission 75, points relating the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, the protection of productive soils and the provision by developers of greenways.  We support these points.	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.	We seek that these points be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Astrid Geneblaza, <a href="mailto:astrid.geneblaza@gmail.com">astrid.geneblaza@gmail.com</a> , submission 78, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots.	The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m <sup>2</sup> 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.	We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.	We wish to be heard.

	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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.		
Jones Family Trust and Searell Family Trust, <a href="mailto:craig@townplanning.co.nz">craig@townplanning.co.nz</a> , submission 82, points 1 & 3.  We oppose these points.	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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.	We seek that points 1 & 3 be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.
Dr Wendy Bamford and Mr Graham Bamford, <a href="mailto:wbamford@xtra.co.nz">wbamford@xtra.co.nz</a> , submission 84, point 'a'.  We support point 'a'.	The reason we support point 'a' is that it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard, including Templars Hill.	We seek that point 'a' be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Perkins Miller Family Trust, <a href="mailto:harvey@peopleandplaces.co.nz">harvey@peopleandplaces.co.nz</a> , submission 52, all points.  We support all this submission except for the proposal to permit, as a form of mitigation residential zoning of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots.	The reason we support this submission, (apart from the proposal to permit, as a form of mitigation residential zoning of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots.) is that it is otherwise entirely consistent with ours and in particular its opposition to the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.	We seek that all of this submission be allowed except for the proposal for 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots on the Domain Road Vineyard area which should be disallowed	We wish to be heard.
David Olds. <a href="mailto:david.olds@aderant.com">david.olds@aderant.com</a> , submission 86, point 2.	The reason we support point 2 is that it opposes the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.	We seek that this point be allowed.	We wish to be heard.

We support point 2.			
Peter and Ngaire Grellet, <a href="mailto:grellet@extra.co.nz">grellet@extra.co.nz</a> , submission 92, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots.	The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m <sup>2</sup> 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.  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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.	We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots, be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Jim and Diane Walton et al., <a href="mailto:jwwdhew@gmail.com">jwwdhew@gmail.com</a> , submission 97, points regarding Domain Road Vineyard, Templars Hill.  We support these points.	The reason we support these points is because they oppose the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and support the protection of Templars Hill from housing development.	We seek that these points be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Nita Smith and Keiran Parsons, <a href="mailto:nita.i.smith@gmail.com">nita.i.smith@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:kieranparsons6@gmail.com">kieranparsons6@gmail.com</a> , submission 100, entire submission.  Neither support nor oppose.	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 allows local residents 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 residential areas in Bannockburn.		We wish to be heard.
Geoffrey Owen and Ingrid Janice Poole, <a href="mailto:poolefam@xtra.co.nz">poolefam@xtra.co.nz</a> , submission 101, we support all	The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots) is because having	We seek that all points, barring the	We wish to be heard.

Field Code Changed

<p>points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	<p>reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots, be allowed.</p>	
<p>Suz Allison, <a href="mailto:suznloyd@xtra.co.nz">suznloyd@xtra.co.nz</a>, submission 103, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m<sup>2</sup> 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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</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>Britta Sonntag, <a href="mailto:britta_huwald@hotmail.com">britta_huwald@hotmail.com</a>, 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, <a href="mailto:landjmarshall72@gmail.com">landjmarshall72@gmail.com</a>,</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision</p>	<p>We seek that all</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>

<p>submission 105, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m<sup>2</sup> 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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	<p>points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.</p>	
<p>Robyn Jane Fluksova and Jindrich Fluksa, <a href="mailto:jrfluksa@yahoo.co.nz">jrfluksa@yahoo.co.nz</a>, submission 120, we support all points except permitting as a form of mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m<sup>2</sup> 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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</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>Donna Hall, <a href="mailto:donna@dannahall.nz">donna@dannahall.nz</a>, submission 115, we support all points except permitting as mitigation any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except permitting any subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots) is because having reviewed the submissions there is substantial support for the status quo in the Domain Road area and</p>	<p>We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision</p>	<p>We wish to be heard.</p>



	<p>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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.	
<p>Graeme Crosbie, <a href="mailto:info@domainroad.co.nz">info@domainroad.co.nz</a>, submission 117, points 1 &amp; 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 1000m<sup>2</sup> 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, among other things, include questions about lots sizes in Bannockburn.</p>	We seek that points 1 & 2 be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.
<p>Jack Longton and Karen Lillian Searle, <a href="mailto:jack@tiqvah.co.nz">jack@tiqvah.co.nz</a>, submission 119, we support all points except permitting as a mitigating factor, subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m<sup>2</sup> lots.</p>	<p>The reason we support all points except subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m<sup>2</sup> 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</p>	We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.	We wish to be heard.

	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, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.		
Harold Kruse Davidson, <a href="mailto:matt@ladpro.co.nz">matt@ladpro.co.nz</a> , 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 allows local residents 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.
Ros and Peter Herbison, <a href="mailto:rospete@xtra.co.nz">rospete@xtra.co.nz</a> , submission 134, the point opposing the rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard.  We support this point.	The reason we support this point is that it is entirely consistent with our submission.	We seek that this point be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Cairine Heather McLeod, <a href="mailto:campbell@chasurveyors.co.nz">campbell@chasurveyors.co.nz</a> , submission 135, entire submission.  Neither support nor oppose.	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 that allows local residents 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.
Bannockburn Responsible Development Inc., <a href="mailto:james@dicey.nz">james@dicey.nz</a> , submission 140, points opposing the	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.

rezoning of Domain Road Vineyard and retention of the current no-build restrictions.  We support these points.			
Koraki Ltd and Scott Scott Ltd, <a href="mailto:kiscott@outlook.co.nz">kiscott@outlook.co.nz</a> , 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 allows local residents 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, <a href="mailto:jennydixon017@gmail.com">jennydixon017@gmail.com</a> , submission 154, we support all points except permitting as a mitigating factor, subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard into 3000m <sup>2</sup> lots.	The reason we support all points except subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard (into 3000m <sup>2</sup> 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.  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, among other things, questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.	We seek that all points, barring the reference to subdivision of Domain Road Vineyard, be allowed.	We wish to be heard.
Werner Murray, <a href="mailto:carolynwerner@mac.com">carolynwerner@mac.com</a> , submission 156, point one.  We oppose this point.	The reason we oppose reducing the LLRZ minimum lot size to 1400m <sup>2</sup> is 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	We seek that this point be disallowed.	We wish to be heard.

	planning exercise based on local consultation which would, among other things, include questions about lot sizes in Bannockburn.		
<p>John and Rowan Klevstul and Rubicon Hall Road Ltd, <a href="mailto:office@townplanning.co.nz">office@townplanning.co.nz</a>, 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 allows local residents 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>		We wish to be heard.