

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: Natasha Livinnia Sinclair
(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:

I am a person who holds an interest greater than the general public as I am Cromwell resident and ratepayer, a parent of children attending Goldfields Primary School and Cromwell College. I support motorsport and I am a customer of the orchard businesses neighbouring area covered by the proposed plan change.

(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:

1. James Dicey, james@grapevision.co.nz, 90 – support in full
2. Robin Dicey, rhmdicey@gmail.com, 92 - support in full
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 in full
6. Thomas Alan Coull, thomascoull@gmail.com, 63 – support in full
7. Werner Murray, carolynwerner@mac.com, 252 – support in full
8. Horticulture New Zealand, rachel.mcclung@hortnz.co.nz , 151 - support in full
9. MotorSprot NZ, brian@motorsport.org.nz, 248 – support in full
10. Mt Difficulty Wines, matt@mtdifficulty.nz, 249 – support in full, particularly 249/13 landscape visual amenity
11. Highlands Motorsport Park Limited, bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz, 144 – support in full
12. Simon John Douglas Giles, simongiles1@mac.com, 131 – support in full
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 in full

on Plan Change 13.

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

ENTERED
29/10/18
ID

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.

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 of the submission be allowed:

As specifically laid out above.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

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:

nlsinclair78@gmail.com

(Please write clearly)

Telephone No: 021 041 8555

Postal Address: 1 Cobb Court, Cromwell 9310

Contact Person: Natasha Sinclair

**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 at 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.