## **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991** FORM 6

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

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Central Otago District Council PO Box 122

**ALEXANDRA 9340** 

Name of person making further submission	:teliview Flights(Full name)
--	------------------------------

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on proposed Plan Change 13 to the Central Otago District Plan. am:

- 1. A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest, the grounds for saying this being: ....; or,
- 2. A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has, the grounds for saying this being:

I am an entity who holds an interest greater than the general public as I am a Cromwell tourism business, a horticulture supply business, a commuter on the roads, and a rate payer.

(Please state whether you are a person who may make a submission under 1 and/or 2 above and also specify/explain. the grounds for saying that you come within category 1 and/or 2)

- 3. The local authority for the relevant area. I support (or oppose) the submission of:
- fames Dicey, james@grapevision.co.nz, 90 support all
- 2. Robin Dicey, rhmdicey@gmail.com, 92 support all
- 3. Peter John Mead & Alastair Stark, alanmckay@xtra.co.nz, 228 support in full
- Df Jones Family Trust, and Suncrest Orchard Limited, jones.fam@xtra.co.nz, 164 support in full
- 5. Andrew John Tremonger, Tremonger. Af@gmail.com, 156 support all
- 6. Thomas Alan Coull, thomascoull@gmail.com, 63 support all
- 7. Werner Murray, carolynwerner@mac.com, 252 supportall
- Horticulture New Zealand, rachelmcclung@hortnz.co.nz, 151 support all
- Motor Sprot N2, brian@motorsportorg.nz, 248 supportall
- 10. Mt Difficulty Wines, matt@mtdifficulty.nz, 249 support all, particularly 249/13 landscape visual amenity
- 11. Highlands Motorsport Park Limited, bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz, 144 support all 12. Simon John Douglas Giles, simongiles 1@mac.com, 131 support all
- 13. NT Transport Agency, richard.shaw@nzta.govtnz, 254 support in part insufficient detail 14. Greg and Ros Hinton, alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz , 146 support all

on Plan Change 13.

(Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission

point number of original submission)



I seek that the whole or part [describe part], of the submission be	e allowed (or disallowed):
As detailed above, the impact of the proposed plan change and insufficient conclusion that the project is incompatible with the direction Cromwell's	ent information provided result in the
conclusion that the project is incompatible with the direction Cromwells	should take.
(Please give precise details)	
I wish/(or-do not wish) to be heard in support of my further subm	ission.
(Please strike out as applicable)	
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a	oint case with them at a hearing.
(Please delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)	29 October 2018
Signature of person making/Further Submission	Date
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submit (A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means	
Electronic address for service of person making further submiss (Please write clearly)	ion:info@heliview.co.nz
Telephone No:03 445 0444  Postal Address: PO Box 450 Cromwell 9342	
Contact Person: Richard & Jolanda Foale, Owners	
FURTURE CURMICCIONS IN CURRORT OF OR IN OPPOSITION T	O ANY CURMICCION

## FURTHER SUBMISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, ANY SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 13 CLOSE ON MONDAY 29 OCTOBER 2018

Note to person making Further 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 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.

