

Resource Management Act 1991

FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE TO THE CENTRAL OTAGO DISTRICT PLAN

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

(FORM 6)

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340

RECEIVED
20/12/2022
CODC

19/212

Name of person making further submission

Name: Wally Sanford_____

Postal address: 28 Ethereal Crescent Pisa Moorings

(Or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act)

Phone: 027 408 1916

Email: mrwallysanford@gmail.com

Contact person: Wally_____

(Name & designation, if applicable)

This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on Proposed Plan Change 19 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:**

Because my submissions seek to affect better planning outcomes for Central Otago

I support the submission of:

Matt and Sonia Conway (80), Judy and John Hamilton (91), on Plan Change 19

The reasons for my support are:

Existing Rights of Way and service easements could well be the biggest barrier to the implementation of intensification from this plan change. A clear framework to facilitate access and access to services needs to be established taking a spatial cue from existing Rights of Way or service corridors. Vested roads of appropriate design in logical places must be required in new developments. Council also needs to take on a responsibility of assisting developers in every way possible to cancel existing Rights of Way in favour of vested roads in order to facilitate new development

I seek that the whole of the submission be **allowed** (see above)

I support the submission of:

Neroli McRae (18) on Plan Change 19

The reasons for my support are:

Re: Common green space and connectivity. I concur with the need for more green space to be included in developments of increasing density. Green space is hugely important for the welfare of local residents and allows a sense of community to develop.

I seek that the whole of the submission be **allowed** (See above)

I oppose the submission of:

Stephen and Lorene Smith (20),
Andrew Wilkinson (23),
Jan Hopcroft (25),
Bernard and Clare Lynch (35),
Lyll Hopcroft (38),
Yvonne Maxwell (39),
Roddy Maxwell (40),
Bob Scott (55),
Barbara Walker (57),
Trevor Deaker and Mark Borrie (66),
Lakefield Estate Unincorporated Resident Group (118),
Lois D Gill (131)

on Plan Change 19

The reasons for my opposition are:

The current 4000m² RRA 6 Zoning of the land north of SH8B in Cromwell is an inefficient use of the land within Cromwell's spatial footprint. This zoning needs to be changed to allow sections down to 500m² in places (but generally 1000m²) to delay the onset of urban sprawl in the Cromwell basin into either natural landscapes or productive land.

I seek that the whole of the submissions be **disallowed** as the current zoning will not provide the planning outcomes that Cromwell needs now and into the future.

I **support** the submission of:

Fulton Hogan Limited on Plan Change 19

The reasons for my support are:

Re: Parkburn Quarry site to be included in PC19 provisions as future growth area. It would be short sighted to not include the Parkburn Quarry site as a future growth area providing for low and medium density residential zoning in the PC19 process and implementation. The site lends itself well to future development with water, wastewater and roading already in the area, it is located adjacent to a state highway, is currently not a productive site (in the context of agriculture or horticulture) and the landowner has already indicated of future development intentions.

I seek that the whole of the submission be **allowed** as development of this site will delay the onset of urban sprawl on to productive horticulture or agriculture land and the current landowner appear to be willing to give affect to a plan change of a higher density residential nature.

I **support** the submission of:

Brian de Geest (21) on Plan Change 19

The reasons for my support are:

Re: Setbacks from Highways and lake frontages. The old methodology of 30m setbacks from highways is not an NZTA requirement and ill effects from noise in dwellings received can be countered by modern and proven building practices. The idea of 15m setbacks from “lakefront” boundaries is an absolute farce when the physical lake edge is tens of metres or even over 100m from the property. 15m setbacks do not prevent private properties from impeding on public spaces and are not needed to combat lakeshore erosion creeping toward dwellings. The practical effect of 15m setbacks from lakeside boundaries and 30m setbacks from highway boundaries is a reduced development yield on a block and inefficient use of private land which I believe is contrary to the outcomes PC19 is seeking.

I seek that the whole of the submission be **allowed** as it seeks to achieve a better outcome from PC19 than the provisions that were originally circulated for consultation.

I wish to be hearing 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.

.....
Signature of person making Further Submission

Date: 20 December 2022.....

Email: mrwallysanford@gmail.com.....

Telephone No: 027 408 1916

Postal Address: 28 Ethereal Crescent, Pisa Moorings.....

.....

.....

Contact Person: Wally
(name & designation, if applicable)

Submissions close at 4pm on Tuesday 20 December 2022

Submissions can be emailed to districtplan@codc.govt.nz

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.