

**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: **Werner Murray**

.....  
(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 a Cromwell resident**

(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](mailto:james@grapevision.co.nz), 90 – support all
2. Robin Dicey, [rhmdicey@gmail.com](mailto:rhmdicey@gmail.com), 92 - support all
3. Peter John Mead & Alastair Stark, [alanmckay@xtra.co.nz](mailto:alanmckay@xtra.co.nz), 228 – support in full
4. DJ Jones Family Trust, and Suncrest Orchard Limited, [jones.fam@xtra.co.nz](mailto:jones.fam@xtra.co.nz) , 164 – support in full
5. Andrew John Iremonger, [Iremonger.AJ@gmail.com](mailto:Iremonger.AJ@gmail.com), 156 – support all
6. Thomas Alan Coull, [thomascoull@gmail.com](mailto:thomascoull@gmail.com), 63 – support all
7. Werner Murray, [carolynwerner@mac.com](mailto:carolynwerner@mac.com), 252 – support all
8. Horticulture New Zealand, [rachel.mcclung@hortnz.co.nz](mailto:rachel.mcclung@hortnz.co.nz) , 151 - support all
9. MotorSport NZ, [brian@motorsport.org.nz](mailto:brian@motorsport.org.nz), 248 – support all
10. Mt Difficulty Wines, [matt@mtdifficulty.nz](mailto:matt@mtdifficulty.nz), 249 – support all, particularly 249/13 landscape visual amenity
11. Highlands Motorsport Park Limited, [bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz](mailto:bridget.irving@gallawaycookallan.co.nz), 144 – support all
12. Simon John Douglas Giles, [simongiles1@mac.com](mailto:simongiles1@mac.com), 131 – support all
13. NZ Transport Agency, [richard.shaw@nzta.govt.nz](mailto:richard.shaw@nzta.govt.nz), 254 – support in part – insufficient detail
14. Greg and Ros Hinton, [alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz](mailto:alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz) , 146 – support all
15. River Terrace Development Limited, [office@brownandcompany.co.nz](mailto:office@brownandcompany.co.nz) , 298 – oppose in full
16. Public Health South, [megan.justice@mitchelldaysh.co.nz](mailto:megan.justice@mitchelldaysh.co.nz), 285 – support in full

**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:**

- 90 , 92, 228, 164, 151, 285 – **Effect on Orchards:** being loss of agricultural land, impact on economy, impact on tourism, reverse sensitivity particularly spray drift (164/2, 285/8), 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), also the design is inward looking and does not connect with the greater environment or respond to the surrounding land uses making this site a poor selection for a site (151/18).
- 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.
- 298 - **Effects in relation to reverse sensitivity** – oppose claims in relation to covenants and insulation in noise sensitive areas as being able to mitigate noise effects. It defeats affordability which is claimed, and these effects that are placed on future residents mean that they will not be able to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. I support public health south in their submission to oppose on grounds of health related issues 285/6, 285/7, 285/8). Rules/objectives/ or policies cannot be written to remedy or mitigate, these effects covenants are not an equitable manner in which to deal with these effects – avoidance is the only course of action and as such the future residential uses cannot be in this locality.

(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.

(Please give reasons and continue on an additional page if necessary)

ENTERED  
29/10/18

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

I seek that submissions 90, 92, 288, 164, 156, 63, 252, 151, 248, 249, 144, 131, 254, 146, 285 be allowed.

(Please give precise details)

**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.**

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

**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:**

[carolynwerner@mac.com](mailto:carolynwerner@mac.com)

(Please write clearly)

**Telephone No:** 0274456845

**Postal Address:** 23A Miners Terrace Bannockburn

**Contact Person:** [Werner Murray](#)

(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.