

Resource Management Act 1991

Submission on Notified Proposed Plan Change to Central Otago District Plan

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

(FORM 5)

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

Details of submitter

Name: Paul and Angela Jacobson. Judge Rock.

Postal address: _36 Hillview Road Alexandra
(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: 034485059 or 0274384062

Email: wines@judgerock.co.nz

Contact person: _Paul Jacobson owner Judge Rock Wines, owners of 36 and 38 Hillview Road (Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 19 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).

We are not a trade competitor for the purposes of [section 308B](#) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (*select one)

The specific provisions of our submission relates to are:

(Give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

36 and 38 Hillview Road -Judge Rock Vineyard.

This submission is:

(Attach on separate page if necessary) Include:

- *We oppose the LLRZ on our property.*
- *Request PC19 amended to better define this Plan Change 19 as Large Lot Urban Zone LLUZ*
- *Request that our property is zoned as Viticultural Zone Rural*
- *We oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and*

- *the reasons for your views.*

Background

- Plan Change 19 purports to be a modification of the existing Rural Land around Alexandra including our vineyard, refer attached downloaded Maps of Plan Change 19 (PC19). Our property under this PC 19 proposal would change our land from “Rural Residential” to “Large Lot Rural Zone” (LLRZ) and allow subdivision down to 2,000m² subject to connection to the Alexandra Wastewater reticulation and treatment plant.
- In effect this change of Zoning is therefore from Rural to Urban as it requires connection to the Alexandra wastewater system
- Also a 2,000m² lot minimum is a large lot for an Urban setting but only a small lot from a Rural perspective.
- Therefore the above description of PC 19 zone change for our property would be better defined as Large Lot Urban Zone (LLUZ) and not LLRZ.
- There is little logic given for the size of the lots under this Plan Change. From a planning and sustainability perspective the density of lots and people should be highest near the centre of Alexandra to allow walking rather than car access to schools, businesses and services. The proposed PC19 has a uniform density of 2000m² all the way to Waldron Road rather than a gradation of density. This is not considered in the Section 32 analysis.
- This extension of the urban area in the Section 32 analysis should including consideration of existing agricultural and viticultural implications on our land which it does not. There are very few areas of New Zealand (or for that matter cool climate areas worldwide) that can grow and produce world class Pinot Noir as evidenced by our multiple Gold Medals and trophies. As climate change warms the existing grape regions of Central Otago many areas will become too hot for Pinot Noir than Alexandra .
- After experiencing winegrowing in Burgundy in France 2012 on Burgundy Central Otago exchange programme, we cannot imagine an expansion of a village into a viticultural area would ever be imagined or sanctioned in France. Similarly, Dr Alan Limmer’s battle for Gimblett Gravels in Hawkes Bay to be preserved as a viticultural area is relevant to this PC19. Once viticulture/agriculture land is lost it can not be reclaimed for example the urbanisation of the Soils of National Significance in South Auckland including Pukekohe at best short sighted land use.

- If our land is zoned as Urban the value of our land for rating purposes will increase dramatically and force us to abandon our vineyard to urban houses.
 - Also there is potential reverse sensitivity issues than may impede our flexibility to trade as a winegrower and allow site cellar door visitors, We require flexibility for future possible construction of a winery, workers accommodation plus houses for our immediate family and grandchildren.
-
-
-

We seek the following decision from the consent authority:
(Give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

That the Plan Change 19 is properly defined as expansion of the Urban Zone. Particularly, as a prerequisite it requires reticulated wastewater to the soon to be upgraded Alexandra wastewater treatment plant to enable this expansion.

Also the LLRZ should be redefined as LLUZ.

Under Section 32 Analysis of PC19 that Council considers higher density properties closest to Alexandra to enable more sustainable staged development while minimising disruption to the existing rural character while still meeting the Urban Development Act 2020 legislation to enable planned capacity for urban development.

We request that PC19 is not applied to our land and that our Land is zoned a "Viticultural Zone " with the existing underlying Rural Residential Zoning provision which will have less environmental effects while protecting against urban sprawl.

- **We oppose the PC 19 application.**
- **We wish to be heard in opposition to PC 19**
- **We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission**
**Delete this paragraph if not applicable.*

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.



Signature

Date 23/08/2022

Submissions close at 4pm on Friday 2 September 2022

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

Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that a 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.*

