

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

FORM 6

RECEIVED
02/03/2022
CODC

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: Cerise Orchard Limited
(Full name)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on Proposed Plan Change 18 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:

N/A ; or

2. A person who has an interest in the proposal that is great than the interest the general public has, the grounds for saying this being:

An owner of land within the Plan Change 18 area ; or
(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:

Werner Murray on Plan Change 18
(Please state the name and address of original submitter and submission number and submission point number of the original submission)

The reasons for my support ~~(or opposition)~~ are:

1. Cerise Orchard supports the whole of Plan Change 18 as publicly notified for the reasons set out in its submissions dated 1 December 2021.
2. Mr Murray's submission is ambiguous. It is unclear whether he opposes the Plan Change as publicly notified, or seeks modifications. If Mr Murray seeks modifications it is unclear what they are.
3. The area contained within Plan Change 18 is appropriate for industrial use and recognised as such through the development of the Cromwell Masterplan and Spatial Plan.

(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 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

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making further submission)

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

1 March 2022

Date

Electronic address for service of submitter: alastair.logan@rossdowling.co.nz

Telephone No: (03) 951 2363

Postal Address: Ross Dowling Marquet Griffin

PO Box 1144

Dunedin 9054

Attention: Alastair Logan

Contact Person: Alastair Logan

(name & designation, if applicable)

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO, ANY SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED
PLAN CHANGE 18 CLOSE ON THURSDAY, 3 MARCH 2022.**

Note to person making 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.

4. The proposed rezoning of the area for industrial use will not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre.
5. Provision of industrial land is necessary to meet present and future demand of land to accommodate industrial activities. Questions of development feasibility and readiness for development do not arise.
6. Rezoning the area will not adversely affect the entrance to Cromwell.
7. National Planning Standards?
8. In this case a structure plan is unnecessary; no justification is given by Mr Murray.