

SUBMISSION ON NOTIFIED APPLICATION CONCERNING RESOURCE CONSENT

(Form 13)

Section 95A Resource Management Act 1991

1 Dunorling Street
PO Box 122, Alexandra 9340
New Zealand

03 440 0056

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



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

DETAILS OF SUBMITTER

Full name: Gillian Wilson and Raewyn Paviour

Contact person (if applicable):
Gillian Wilson

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

Telephone: 02102774802

Postal address (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):
176 Pearson Road, RD2, Cromwell 9384

This is a submission on the following resource consent application: RC No: **250374**

Applicant: **Mark Sugrue & Imogene Sugrue** Valuation No: **2842128905**

Location of site: **126 Pearson Road, Cromwell**

Brief description of application: **Subdivision and land use consent for two-lot subdivision in a rural residential 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)

Please see separate pages

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.

please see separate pages

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

That the application for subdivision and change of land use is denied

~~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 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.**

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.**

G Wilson

Signature of submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

11.03.2026

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.

We (Gillian Wilson and Raewyn Paviour) oppose the application for a subdivision consent (RC No: 250374) based on the following:

- 1) This subdivision consent is a non-complying activity and does not meet the District Plan requirement for 2ha average section size as per Rule 4.7.5(iii) of the District Plan.

To allow this subdivision to proceed would set a precedent for this group of properties and potentially undermine the rural lifestyle and environmental values of the area.

We are aware that one other residential lifestyle block of approximately 0.75ha (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 504660) has been subdivided in the same vicinity to this proposal but this occurred when the average block size of 2ha would have been achieved as the vineyard titles and subdivided lot 1 were under one ownership.

In the last year the vineyard has been removed with the current owner planning his own subdivision and to allow the proposed subdivision would set a precedent for the larger vineyard block to be subdivided into smaller section sizes creating a more suburban aspect within this rural residential area.

We contend that smaller block sizes will result in a loss of the current rural amenity.

This amenity is important in that the area is clearly visible from the existing rural residential blocks and the public walkway along the Kawarau River edge. The site is also highly visible from the opposite side of the river and will impact views across from the historical area of 'the Sluicings' and the soon to be completed cycle track.

With the rapid expansion of the Cromwell area, it is important to retain the rural amenity in some areas of the district.

Smaller residential blocks will place greater demand on supporting services such as the roading network with an increase in traffic along Pearson Road, impacting existing residents with increased traffic noise and dust. It will also impact the intersections at the end of Pearson Road as it enters/exits SH6 from Queenstown and Bannockburn Road from Cromwell.

The demand for potable water available from Pearson Road Irrigation Society may require changes to the supply and management of drinking water if the number of people being serviced by this facility exceeds the number permitted as a small provider of drinking water under the rules of Taumata Arowai.

Similarly, an increase in the number of septic tanks, if not managed properly, may impact on future water quality from our groundwater take.

In summary, we believe the potential precedent, that will be set if this notified consent is approved, will be harmful to the overall rural residential lifestyle, amenity and environmental values currently present.

We also oppose the granting of consent to allow the change of land use proposed on the subdivided lot.

The area enjoys a rural residential lifestyle and current block sizes allow for some productive use of the land. Pearson Road currently supports the use of land for olive oil, cherry growing, nut trees and grazing; these activities contribute to the rural amenity of the area.

Smaller block sizes will reduce the possibility that the land will be productively used and retain its 'rural' aspect.