



## **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: John & Mary Fletcher

Postal address: C/- Fletcher Consulting & Planning, 4 Primrose Hill Lane, Casebrook, Christchurch 8051

Phone: 021 0234 6903

Email: stewart@fletcherconsulting.co.nz

Contact person: Stewart Fletcher

(Name & designation, if applicable)

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

I am not a trade competitor for the purposes of <a href="mailto:section308B">section 308B</a> of the Resource Management Act 1991

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

- 1) The density provisions for the zone Large Lot Residential Precinct 3. This specifically includes proposed standards LLRZ S1, SUB S1 and any other consequential or related provisions.
- 2) The site coverage provisions for the zone Large Lot Residential Precinct 3. This specifically includes proposed standard LLRZ S4 and any other consequential or related provisions

#### This submission is:

**Density** 

Proposed standards LLRZ – S1 and SUB – S1 (and any related provisions), as they relate to the zone –

Large Lot Residential – Precinct 3, are opposed. It is sought that the density provisions are amended to

provide for a smaller allotment size.

The reasons for this opposition include, but are not limited to, that the proposed minimum lot size is larger

than what is currently provided for in the Operative District Plan, a smaller allotment size will still maintain

the amenity and character of the area, there is no difference in character between this precinct and other

areas close by which provide for a smaller allotment size and further analysis could be undertaken to

determine what the appropriate allotment size should be.

Site Coverage

Proposed standard LLRZ – S4 (and any related provisions), as it relates to the zone – Large Lot

Residential – Precinct 3, is opposed. It is sought that the site coverage provisions are amended to provide

for greater site coverage.

The reasons for this opposition include, but are not limited to, that the current site coverage provisions are

understood to provide for up to 40% building coverage and a reduction to 10% is considered to be a

significant drop and that further analysis could be undertaken to determine what the appropriate coverage

requirement should be.

I / We seek the following decision from the consent authority:

Proposed standards LLRZ – S1 and SUB – S1 (and any related provisions), as they relate to the zone –

Large Lot Residential – Precinct 3, are amended to provide for a smaller allotment size and that proposed

standard LLRZ - S4 is amended to provide for a higher building coverage.

I oppose the application

Stewert Makehar

• I wish to be heard in support of this submission

I will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission

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.

PР

2 September 2022

**Signature** 

Date

## 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.