

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: Shirley Ann Calvert
(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 rate paye

(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 the submission of:

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. MotorSprot 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@gallowaycookallan.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 – oppose – insufficient detail, would support if more detail
14. Greg and Ros Hinton, alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz , 146 – support all

on Plan Change 13.

The particular parts of the submission I support 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. I **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, I **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 (2008)** 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), **Undermines the Master Plan process** which will determine planning aspects of the reviewed District Plan. I **request a report** in accordance with S42A(1) of the Resource management Act 1991.
-
- 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, I **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 **request a report** in accordance with S42A(1) of the Resource management Act 1991.
-
-

The reasons for my support 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. There are key issues that need independent reports to be undertaken as part of s42a(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

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

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

.....
...
.....

...
(Please give precise details)

I 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:shirleyc@pl.net.....

(Please write clearly)

Telephone No: ...0212526916.....

Postal Address: ...17 Ortive Street.....
.....Cromwell.....

.....
Contact Person: ...Shirley Calvert.....

(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.