

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: James Drey (Full name)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on proposed Plan Change 14 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: I am a member of Residents 4 Responsible Development Cromwell and live in the area and am a member and past president of the Central Otago Winegrowers Association, Inc.

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 member of the Central Otago Winegrowers Association (and immediate past president), am a grape grower and live in the area and look at the proposed site from my house.

3. The local authority for the relevant area.

I support (or oppose) the submission of: Please see the attached document on Plan Change 14. (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 the attached document (appendix A)

(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 the attached document (appendix A)

(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 see attached document (appendix A)

(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)

[Handwritten Signature]

24/2/02

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: *james@gropevision.co.uk*
(Please write clearly)

Telephone No: *0274450602*

Postal Address: *128 Cambridge Road, LD2,
Cromwell, 9384*

Contact Person:
(name & designation, if applicable)

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, ANY SUBMISSION
ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14 CLOSE ON FRIDAY 28 FEBRUARY 2020**

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.

Appendix A

Submission	Particular Parts	Reasons	Whole/Part
1 Oppose	All	Submitter has not undertaken a full traffic analysis and understood the impact on Ripponvale Road nor the intersections to State Highway 6	Reject whole submission
4, 7, 8 Oppose	All	PC14 conflicts with the Cromwell Master Plan, particularly the Spatial Framework. Does not complement the Masterplan, will compromise its integrity and scope	Reject whole submission
2, 6, 39, 40 Oppose	All	No reasoning proposed for supportive submission.	Reject whole submission
9 Oppose	All	This is exactly a subdivision of prime rural land and goes in the face of Submission 9	Reject Whole Submission
10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 25 Oppose	All	Subdivision of land from rural to housing may have a short term benefit in terms of employment to build houses and infrastructure but long term will result in less employment due to removal of rural land from productive status. Short term view.	Reject whole submission
12 Oppose	All	Lifestyle properties not needed in Cromwell – already too many in play and this will add to the loss of rural productive land.	Reject whole submission
19 Support	All	Submitter correctly identifies conflict of PC14 with the Master Plan	Support whole submission
21, 22, 28, 36, 45 Support	All	Reverse sensitivity issues correctly identified (frost fans, spray drift, bird scarers)	Support whole submission
23 Oppose	All	Cromwell currently has already got a range of residential developments. Cherry farm future expansion potential in the future will actually contract with the residential subdivision on land highly suitable for the production of cherries	Reject whole submission
29 Support	All	Loss of rural character, particularly in the highly visible part of the ridge above the sloping land. Identifies reverse sensitivity issues.	Support whole submission
30 Oppose	All	Masterplan provides for future growth, does not need PC14. Reverse sensitivity cannot be fully managed with setbacks and amenity plantings	Reject whole submission
38 Support	All	High value of fruit grown in the region will be compromised if the subdivision is allowed, compromising economic returns for the CODC region. PC14 will compromise food security by with drawing productive land from the supply of suitable land in the CODC and in NZ. Fragmentation of urban	Support whole submission

		developments – the successful application of PC14 will set a precedent for additional developments outside the spatial boundary proposed in the master plan. Reverse sensitivity issues correctly identified. Loss of productive land and the change signalled by the NPS-HPL should mean that this land is protected for rural uses. PC14 will result in loss of Rural Character	
60 Support	All	Reverse sensitivity issues correctly identified (as per PC13), Visual amenity will be compromised, Conflicts with Cromwell Masterplan, compromises SAL area	Support Whole Submission
64 Support	All	Correctly identifies that PC14 pre-empts the district planning process, compromises Master Plan, correctly identifies that there is plenty of RRA land suitable for lifestyle development and PC14 is not needed in this regard, no LUC classification has been undertaken on the soils subject to PC14, full impact of PC14 on public infrastructure (waste, water etc) has not been calculated and may act as a tipping point which may not be fully funded, Light emission particularly on a hill slope above the valley floor has not be considered,	Support whole submission
65	All	Significant impact on traffic, roading and intersections, PC14 compromises spatial framework and transport infrastructure in and around Cromwell, precedent effect of PC14	Support whole submission
66	All	Air quality impacts due to spray drift correctly identified, impact on drinking water (lack of infrastructure)	Support whole submission