

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: Matthew Squires (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.

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: Owner of land cur of Pearson Rd/Bannockburn Rd ; or, (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: Please see attached on Plan Change 13. (Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission point number of original submission)

The particular parts of the submission I support (or oppose) are: Please see attached. (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: Please see attached. (Please give reasons and continue on an additional page if necessary)



Names and addresses of submitters on Plan Change 13 to whom I support:

1. James 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
4. DJ Jones Family Trust, and Suncrest Orchard Limited, jones.fam@xtra.co.nz , 164 – support in full
5. Andrew John Iremonger, Iremonger.AJ@gmail.com, 156 – support all
6. Thomas Alan Coull, thomascoull@gmail.com, 63 – support all
7. Werner Murray, carolynwerner@mac.com, 252 – support all
8. Horticulture New Zealand, rachel.mcclung@hortnz.co.nz , 151 - support all
9. MotorSport NZ, brian@motorsport.org.nz, 248 – support all
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, simongiles1@mac.com, 131 – support all
13. NZ Transport Agency, richard.shaw@nzta.govt.nz, 254 – support in part – insufficient detail
14. Greg and Ros Hinton, alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz , 146 – support all

Particular parts of the submissions I support and the reasons for these are:

- 90 , 92, 228, 164, 151 – Effect on Orchards: being loss of agricultural land, impact on economy, impact on tourism, reverse sensitivity particularly spray drift (164/2), 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.
- 156 – Effect on Infrastructure: insufficient detail in Mott 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, 252, 249 – 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), 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).
- 252 - 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),
- 249, 144, 131 – Effect on Tourism: employment in Cromwell (144/2), tourism (144/16), 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.
- 254, 146, 252, Effect on traffic: traffic report is insufficient and a Council peer review should be conducted. NZTA have not applied enough rigour as the development will impact the Kawarau Gorge and ultimately the Shotover bridge. Further information is required.



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

.....

.....


(Please give precise details)

I wish/~~er~~ 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.~~

(Please delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)



24 / 10 / 2018

Signature of person making Further Submission  
(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)

Date

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

(Please write clearly)

Telephone No: ..021 1412161

Postal Address: ..281 a Pearson Rd  
Rd 2  
Cromwell.

Contact Person: .....  
(name & designation, if applicable)

**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.