

# SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

(Form 13)

## Section 95A (public) Resource Management Act 1991



To: The Chief Executive  
Central Otago District Council  
PO Box 122  
Alexandra 9340  
[resource.consent@codc.govt.nz](mailto:resource.consent@codc.govt.nz)

### DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Russell Tony Binns, Yvonne Marie Binns

Contact person (if applicable): Russell

Electronic address for service of submitter: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: 021 340 857

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act):

110 Puhurangi Drive RD3  
Cherrywell

This is a submission on the following resource consent application: RC No: **230217**

Applicant: **Sarah Taylor and James Dale** Valuation No: **2842107710**

Location of Site: **176 Queensberry Terrace, Luggate**

Brief Description of Application: **Subdivision consent for a two lot subdivision from one parcel of land. Land use consent for a building platform on new lot 2**

**Submissions close 07 December 2023**

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are:  
(give details, attach on separate page if necessary)

\_\_\_\_\_

This submission is: (attach on separate page if necessary)

Include:

- whether you support or oppose the specific parts of the application or wish to have them amended; and
- the reasons for your views.

WE OPPOSE THE SPECIFIC PART 4-7.6 TRANSPORT EFFECTS  
AND WISH TO AMEND PULHARANGI DRIVE IS AN OPEN SPEED ZONE.  
THERE IS INCREASED TRAFFIC WITHIN THE LAST 3 YEARS SCHOOL CHILDREN  
WALK ON THE ROAD TO CATCH THE BUS. IN POOR VISIBILITY SCHOOL  
CHILDREN ARE HARD TO SEE. WE BELIEVE A REDUCTION IN SPEED  
LIMIT IS REQUIRED NOTE VEHICLE ACCESS OFF PULHARANGI DRIVE DOES NOT

I/We seek the following decision from the consent authority: COMPLY WITH VISIBILITY IN  
(give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought) THIS APPLICATION

AS PULHARANGI DRIVE WAS CREATED AS PART OF THE PULHARANGI  
SUBDIVISION, PAID BY PURCHASERS OF PROPERTIES IN PULHARANGI.  
TO HAVE RESIDENTS OF QUEENSBERRY TERRACE USE A RIGHT OF  
WAY VIA LOT 1 OR USING DRIVEWAYS DIRECTLY ONTO PULHARANGI DRIVE

I support/oppose the application OR neither support or oppose (select one)

I wish do not wish to be heard in support of this submission (select one)

I am/am not\* a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991 (select one)

\*I/We am/am not\* (select one) directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:

- adversely affects the environment; and
- does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

\*Delete this paragraph if you are not a trade competitor.

\*I/We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission

\*Delete this paragraph if not applicable.

PLEASE SEE ADDITIONAL ATTACHED PAGE

THE DESIGN AND ORIGINAL PLAN OF PUKERANGI  
HAS CHANGED WE NOW HAVE A DIFFERENT  
PUKERANGI AND THE EFFECTS ON PUKERANGI DRAIN  
OF CURRENT CONTINUAL SUBDIVISION FROM  
QUENZSBERRY TRAFFIC WE BELIEVE SHOULD WARRANT  
CODE TO LOOK AT THIS AS A CHANGE OF ORIGINAL  
RESOURCES CONSULT.

QUENZSBERRY TRAFFIC & PUKERANGI DRAIN SHOULD  
HAVE THE SAME CONDITIONS APPLIED WITHIN APPLYING  
FOR SUBDIVISION (CURRENTLY PUKERANGI HAS A  
CONDITION ON TITLE WHICH DISALLOWS SUBDIVISION

OBVIOUSLY THERE IS A CUMULATIVE EFFECT IN THE  
APPLICATIONS - TO SAY THAT THE PROPOSED DOES NOT  
CONTRIBUTE TO THE "CUMULATIVE TIPPING POINT" IS INCORRECT  
ON THE CONTRARY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC, CHANGE  
LAND USE ARE FACTORS WHICH DO CONTRIBUTE TO  
CUMULATIVE EFFECT.

WE ALSO NOTE THAT SUCCESSFUL PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS  
HAVE NOT SEENED THEIR DRIVEWAY CONNECTION FROM  
QUENZSBERRY TRAFFIC ONTO PUKERANGI DRAIN RESULTING  
IN THE EDGE OF THE ROAD STARTING TO BREAK  
AWAY.

I request/do not request (select one), pursuant to section 100A of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority. "See note 4 below as you may incur costs relating to this request."



Yvonne Bins

26/11/2023

Signature

Date

(to be signed by submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

In lodging this submission, I understand that my submission, including contact details, are considered public information, and will be made available and published as part of this process.

**Notes to submitter**

1. If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

2. You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.
3. If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.
4. If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you will be liable to meet the additional costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners, compared to our hearing panel. Typically these costs range from \$3,000 - \$10,000.
5. 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.