

RECEIVED
17/03/2026
CODC



SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

1 Dunorling Street
PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340
New Zealand

03 440 0056

Info@codc.govt.nz
www.codc.govt.nz

(Form 13)

Section 95A Resource Management Act 1991

To: The Chief Executive
Central Otago District Council
PO Box 122
Alexandra 9340
resource.consents@codc.govt.nz

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Russell and Yvonne Binns

Contact person (if applicable):

Electronic address for service of submitter: binncy@xtra.co.nz

Telephone: 027 313 7545

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

110 Pukerangi Drive
Queensberry 9383
Otago

This is a submission on the following resource consent application: RC No: **250077**

Applicant: **Awa Koura Mining Limited** Valuation No: **2842107654**

Location of site: **Luggate-Cromwell Road (SH 6), Cromwell**

Brief description of application: **Land use consent to extract alluvial gold in the rural resource area**

Submissions close: **4.00pm on Thursday 19 March 2026**

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

We oppose parts of the application and have
attached our reasons. (Page 1)

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.

See Page 1

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

Decline application

I/We support oppose / neither support or oppose the application (circle one)

I/We wish / do not wish to be heard in support of this submission (circle one)

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

*I/We ^{are} ~~am~~ / am not (circle one) 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 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.~~

Russell

I/We request* / do not request (circle 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.**

James Burns
James Burns

Signature of submitter
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

15. 03. 26

16/3/26

Date

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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

the Ap
flood
river

- Potent
for
reme

- Dust
Espe
high
pot

- The
keep
and
off

We



Section 100A of the Act, that you
decide the application to 1 or more
authority.
request.

16. 03. 26

16/3/26

ate

ding contact details, are considered
part of this process.

Protection Authority, you should

sent authority is the 20th working
ation is given. If the application is
may adopt an earlier closing date
ves responses from all affected

pplicant as soon as is reasonably
n the consent authority.

submission may be limited by the
ource Management Act 1991.

source Management Act 1991, you
after the close of submissions and
of the hearings commissioner or
Typically, these costs range from

submission) may be struck out if the
plies to the submission (or part of

allow the submission (or the part)

to be independent expert evidence,
independent or who does not have
expert advice on the matter.

the Applicant cannot guarantee the ^{Clutha River} Flooding and the sediments not leaching into the river

Pg 10 of submission

- Potential damage to the edge of SH6 (State Highway) for access would endure for 3 years before remediation (tar seal repair)

Pg 11 of submission.

- Dust is a concern when soil is disturbed. Especially a nuisance when close to a major highway (SH6). We see this as adverse and potentially dangerous.

Pg 6 of submission

- The proposed mining activities are not in keeping with the aesthetic values of the landscape and the recreational activities that the environment offers.

Pg 15 + 23 of submission

We oppose the activities of this application ~~submission~~

James Bevan.
Russell Bevan