

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

FORM 5

SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE
TO CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
ALEXANDRA 9340

Name of Submitter: ANDREW GRANT MCFARLANE

(Full name)

This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 14 to the Central Otago District Plan (the proposal).

I ~~could~~/could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

(* Select one)

I am/am not* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that-

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

(Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission)

(* Select One)

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

(1) ALLOWING QUALITY HORTICULTURAL LAND TO BE USED FOR

SMALL LIFESTYLE BLOCKS.

(2) SENSITIVITY ISSUES ARISING FROM SUCH DEVELOPMENT
IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO HORTICULTURAL ACTIVITY.

(Please give details and continue on additional page if necessary)

(3) DETRIMENTAL VISUAL ASPECTS TO THE CROMWELL BASIN
My submission is:

ON the accompanying sheet

(Please include:

- whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and
 - reasons for your views;
- and continue on additional page if necessary)

I seek the following decision from the local authority:

Decline the application. I would not be
averse to the land in question being split
up into horticultural blocks providing they are
of a useful size.

(Please give precise details)

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

(Please strike out as applicable)

I oppose plan change 14 for the following reasons:

(1) In this day and age there is an increasing awareness of the need to preserve areas suitable for growing food as this land is limited. A large percentage of the land under consideration for development is of a quality and gradient suitable for horticulture and should be used as such.

(2) SENSITIVITY ISSUES

Allowing residential development in close proximity to orchards will lead to conflict. Normal operations of cherry orchards in particular may involve the use of bird scaring boomers, shotguns, wind machines and sprayers of the air blast type. These are not compatible with housing development. Because of (1) above and the fact that orcharding is an existing use in the area residential development should be declined.

(3) VISUAL ASPECTS TO THE CROMWELL BASIN.

One only has to see the effect the "Schooner Development" has had on the Cromwell basin outlook to envisage what the hillside will become. A main part of Cromwells attraction is the landforms that surround it. We should seek to preserve them and concentrate housing development in the urban area in line with the councils own master plan for Cromwell.

- ✓ 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 Submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

(A signature is not required if you make a submission by electronic means)

17/12/2019
.....
Date

Electronic address for service of submitter: robgrant316@gmail.com
.....

Telephone No: 4451566
.....

Postal Address: MCFARLANE
.....
316 RIPPONVALE RD.
.....
R.D. 2 CROMWELL 9384
.....

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

SUBMISSIONS CLOSE IN RESPONSE TO PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14 ON
WEDNESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2019

Note to person making submission

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

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.