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: .....Janeen Margaret Wood.....

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.
I 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:

a Cromwell resident, in the tourism industry and a supporter of motorsport.

3. The local authority for the relevant area.
I support ~~(or oppose)~~ the submission of:

1. Thomas Alan Coull, thomascoull@gmail.com, 63 – support all
2. Highlands Motorsport Park Limited, bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz, 144 – support all
3. Motorsport NZ, brian@motorsport.org.nz, 248 – support all
4. Mt Difficulty Wines, matt@mtdifficulty.nz, 249 – support all, particularly 249/13 landscape visual amenity
5. Werner Murray, carolynwerner@mac.com, 252 – support all
6. Wally Sanford, mrwallysanford@gmail.com, 308 – support all
7. David Garth Stark, davidstark@meadstark.co.nz , 349 – support all
8. Greg & Vivienne Wilkinson, greg.a.wikinson@gmail.com, 396 – support all

on Plan Change 13.

The particular parts of the submission I support ~~(or oppose)~~ are:

- 249, 308, 349, 396 – **Effect on Orchards:** Incompatibility with orchard operation (349/2) Land use priority should be in favour of horticulture (308/1) A loss of agricultural land, impact on economy, Cromwell is known as a great region to grow very high quality fruits, and is one of our communities sustainable industries (349/4), Impact on tourism, reverse sensitivity particularly spray drift – orchards by their very nature generate noise and undertake activities that are not conducive to a residential neighbourhood (396/4). These matters have been raised by submitters but there is insufficient information in the application to address these matters. We request a report in accordance with S42A(1) of the Resource management Act 1991.

- 249, 252, 396 – **Effect on Infrastructure:** Impact on wastewater or other amenities do not seem to have been addressed (249/3) Significantly overload the town infrastructure and associated amenities (249/4) Extending services to this part of the basin is not economically viable (252/13) Additional residences will add strain on existing wastewater and reticulated water infrastructure.(396/8) Insufficient detail in Matt McDonald report to make infrastructure decisions, and to determine cost on rate payers in the future, we request a report in accordance with S42A(1) of the Resource management Act 1991.

- 63, 249, 252, 308, 396 – **Effect on Community**: Immediate and untimely disproportionate effect on the small Cromwell community in relation to its current population; the proposal has adverse effects on the

environment and its resources (63/4, 252/3, 308/14), Cromwell community plan has not been addressed in this regard. Dark sky policies have not been addressed (63/16). Effect on landscape and amenity (249/13). Connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians (396/11) Effect on the economy (144/16)

- 249, 252, 349, 396 - **Effect on Master Planning and Urban Design**: Out of centre development, no analysis on established commercial uses in Cromwell, no comment on retail hierarchy has been made (252/1), Ensure effective and meaningful development of Masterplan exercise (249/1 & 2, 252/1, 396/2 & 13) Against our town evolving in an ad hoc unstructured manner (349/6)

- 144, 248, 249, 349 – **Effect on Tourism**: Employment in Cromwell (144/2), Tourism (144/16, 248/4, 349/5), Visual amenity in relation to views and against CODC regional identity 249/13. Insufficient information provided in application to address these issues, We request a report in accordance with S42A(1) of the Resource management Act 1991.

- 249, 252,396 - **Effect on Traffic**: Additional traffic on Cromwell to Bannockburn roads, commuters to Queenstown put pressure on roading network (249/5) Safety concerns not addressed or the cost of congestion with commuters (252/11 & 396/10) Sandflat Rd would need to be sealed and upgraded (396/8). Traffic report is insufficient and a Council peer review should be conducted. NZTA have not applied enough rigger as the development will impact the Kawarau Gorge and ultimately the Shotover bridge. Further information is required.

(Please clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal and continue on an additional page if necessary)

The reasons for my support ~~(or opposition)~~ are:

As detailed above there are a number of outstanding issues that need further information and are also significant enough to mean that ultimately the issues cannot be mitigated making this plan change at this scale and in this location un-supportable.

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

.....

I ~~wish~~/(or do not wish) to be heard in support of my further submission.

(Please strike out as applicable)

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

Signature of person making Further Submission Date

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

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

Electronic address for service of person making further submission: ...

.....janeenmwood@xtra.co.nz.....

Telephone No: .....027 445 4488.....

Postal Address: .....271 Bannockburn Rd, RD2, Cromwell, 9348.....

Contact Person: .....Janeen Wood.....

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.

ENTERED 29/10/18