



**Summary of Decisions Requested for:**

**Variation 1 to the Proposed District Plan**

**Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016**

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS DUE THURSDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2016**

Submitter No.	Submitter	Point No.	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary
1	Wayne Hulls 13 Merioneth St, Arrowtown, 9302 wayne@hulls.net.nz	1.1	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Oppose	Extend the coverage of the guidelines to include all alterations and buildings throughout Arrowtown with the applicability reducing as the distance from the town center and historic zone increases. This will help Arrowtown retain its character and extend the look and feel of it to the proposed medium and low density.
		1.2	2.5.1-2.5.1 Six Neighbourhoods identified...	Other	Maps are outdated and confusing. Each map should include an 'Accurate as at dd/mm/yyyy' statement. At best the maps should be updated from the latest QLDC aerial photography which I understand is as at 2014
		1.3	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	believe that the 2006 guidelines have worked thus far for this category
2	Judith Hanan 69 McDonnell Road, Arrowtown, 9302 jmhanan@gmail.com	2.1	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Other	Restrict spread of urban areas. No more urban sprawl that compromises the District's landscapes (character is rural and is important to retain) and ability to produce its own food etc. thus putting more pressure on the road network.
		2.2	2.1-2.1 Historic Overview	Support	Discourage future development and maintain the character of Arrowtown - beauty of the hill and rural surrounds.
3	Elizabeth Hanan 159 HIGHGATE, DUNEDIN, 9010 ehanan@xtra.co.nz	3.1	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Support	In the map on page 4 ADG please update the boundary as per PC29 - the Jopp Street extension shown on the map is outside the boundary.
		3.2	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.3	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.4	2.3.3-2.3.3 New Town	Oppose	Plan 2 on page 15 needs to be updated - the green 15 is not Butel Park but outside the PC29 determined boundary of Arrowtown - the boundary is in Jopp St. Also, the McDonnell Road area needs to be corrected as there is no spill over into the rural zone.
		3.5	2.6.6-2.6.6 Neighbourhood 11	Oppose	The brown section opposite the Dennison Fairways is now beyond the urban boundary as designated under PC30 and PC29 and although this is reflected as reserve, it should be retained as a reserve and Rural and not be built on
		3.6	2.6.7-2.6.7 Neighbourhood 12	Support	The walkways, reserve land and public open space designated should be clearly marked, maintained and protected from McDonnell Road to Cotter Ave and beyond. Vistas from the Cotter Avenue must be protected where possible. Housing almost closes in these vistas.
		3.7	2.4-2.4 Neighbourhoods	Support	McDonnell Road now has defined urban boundary (PC30 and PC29) plan 4 page 19 need updating to reflect this. No spill over of house from McDonnell Road into Rural Zone. Parking should not be permitted on Rural Zone side of road.
		3.8	3.3-3.3 Views and Vistas	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.9	1.3.8-3.8 Parking	Support	Parking should not be extended in the Town centre. The proposals are acceptable
		3.10	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	The Arrowtown refined and improved guidelines are essential and extremely important. They must be included in the proposed District plan. Strongly support Option 2 from the S32 (refine and improve the ADG) Strongly oppose Option 3 (delete ADG and only use PDP as guide for protecting Arrowtown). On-going management of Arrowtown through the PDP is imperative.
		3.11	2.1.1-4.2.5.2	Support	Support as is critical for future of Arrowtown
		3.12	2.2.1-7.2.5.1	Support	Include reference to ADG in LDR
		3.13	2.2.2-7.4.10	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.14	2.3.1-8.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.15	2.3.2-8.2.6.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.16	2.3.2-8.2.6.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		3.17	2.3.3-8.4.11	Support	Supports the provisions.
3.18	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.19	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.20	2.5.1-14.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.21	2.5.2-14.4.2	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.22	2.5.3-14.4.4	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.23	2.5.4-14.5.1	Support	Supports the provisions.		
3.24	2.5.5-14.5.2	Support	Supports the provisions.		
4	J Hanan 69 McDonnell Road, Arrowtown, 9302 jmhanan@gmail.com	4.1	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Support strongly. Design guidelines are essential to curb development and protect values of Arrowtown.
5	Thomas Jenkins 21 Anglesea Street, Arrowtown, 9302 ak.jenkins@xtra.co.nz	5.1	4-4 Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Support	Supports the Design Guidelines wants limit to the Town. Wants Guidelines to be requirement not guide. Seeks that traffic speed be reduced to 40km in historic zone.
		5.2	4.11-4.11 Street Lights and Exterior Lighting	Other	Seeks improved street lighting on main thoroughfares eg Merioneth Street. Increased intensification of the town will result in increased pedestrians and vehicular traffic, safety will become issue. Street lighting will improve this.
		5.3	4.12-4.12 Pedestrian Networks	Other	seeks more gravel footpathing provided on main thoroughfares eg Merioneth Street. Increased intensification in the zone will result in increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic, without appropriate footpathing could lead to safety issues.
6	Chair, Akarua Arrowtown Autumn Festival in 2016. (Pam Hulls) 13 Merioneth Street, Queenstown-Lakes District, Arrowtown, 9302 pam@hulls.net.nz	6.1	1.1-1.1 Purpose of the ADG	Support	Supports guidelines as a way of keeping Arrowtown concise. Believes broken roof lines should be incorporated in all houses.
		6.2	2.5.7-2.5.7 Neighbourhood 6	Other	Do not agree that a single home on a section should be exempt from the Design Guidelines.
7	Elizabeth Winstone P.O Box 99253, Newmarket, Auckland, 1149 lizandphilwinstone@xtra.co.nz	7.1	4-4 Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Support	Broadly supports Design Guidelines
8	Jane Hazlett 19 Merioneth Street, Arrowtown, 9302 d.j.hazlett@xtra.co.nz	8.1	1.4-1.4 Use of Guidelines	Other	More information/education on the LDR and where consent might be needed required.

Submitter No.	Submitter	Point No.	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary
9	Noel Beggs 154 Centennial Avenue, RD 1, Queenstown, 9371 beggsy@xtra.co.nz	9.1	1.1-1.1Purpose of the ADG	Support	Supports the Design Guidelines. Ensure they are integral part of Resource Consent/Management process.
		9.2	1.5-1.5Use of Guidelines	Support	Supports the Design Guidelines in their entirety.
		9.3	2.3.2-2.3.2Old Town Residential	Support	Supports entirely.
		9.4	3.1.2.1-3.1.2.13.1.2.1	Support	Supports as it is clear and concise.
		9.5	3.1.2.2-3.1.2.23.1.2.2	Support	Supports in entirety. Considers the document to be extremely well compiled.
		9.6	4.1-4.1Conserve Heritage Character	Support	Supports as gives clear guidelines within the ARHMZ and is sympathetic to the zone.
		9.7	4.1.2.1-4.1.2.14.1.2.1	Support	Implement in entirety. Vital to be included.
		9.8	4.1.2.2-4.1.2.24.1.2.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.9	2.1.1-4.2.5.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.10	2.2.1-7.2.5.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.11	2.3.1-8.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.12	2.3.2-8.2.6.1	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.13	2.3.3-8.4.11	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.14	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.15	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.16	2.5.1-14.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		9.17	2.5.2-14.4.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
9.18	2.5.3-14.4.4	Support	Supports the provisions.		
9.19	2.5.4-14.5.1	Support	Supports the provision		
9.20	2.5.5-14.5.2	Support	supports the provisions		
10	Verona Courmane 4 Tipperary Place, Arrowtown, 9302 verona.courmane@xtra.co.nz	10.1	2.1.1-4.2.5.2	Support	Supports as it ensures that village characteristics are maintained
		10.2	2.1.1-4.2.5.2	Support	Supports will preserve and maintain the village atmosphere of Arrowtown.
		10.3	2.2.1-7.2.5.1	Support	Supports the provisions
		10.4	2.2.2-7.4.10	Support	Supports provisions for smaller units and greater housing affordability which is currently lacking in Arrowtown
		10.5	2.3.1-8.1	Oppose	Neither option fully expresses my thoughts. The problem is an individual may plan to settle in Arrowtown but needs time to pay down a mortgage on a property. 5 years may not be sufficient time. Yet conversely speculators may buy up available property or bare land then land bank this for years and years for the purpose of capital gains only.
		10.6	2.3.2-8.2.6.1	Support	Supports contained urban form. Against urban sprawl.
		10.7	2.3.3-8.4.11	Support	I support in principal, but consent should still be required and judged on a case by case example
		10.8	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		10.9	2.4.1-10.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		10.10	2.5.1-14.2.1.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		10.11	2.5.2-14.4.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
		10.12	2.5.3-14.4.4	Support	Supports the provisions.
		10.13	2.5.5-14.5.2	Support	Supports the provisions.
11	Kerry Hapuku PO Box 1501, Invercargill, 9840 kerryhapuku@hotmail.com	11.1	2.4-2.4Neighbourhoods	Oppose	Our tree is included in the established tall trees and vegetation of Neighbourhood 1 but it is also an entirely inappropriate tree for its current location as determined in the Table of Structure Trees - Plant Lists Thuja plicata pg 165 ADG.
		11.2	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Oppose	That the STEM evaluation methodology be added to the Proposed District Plan so that the public have an understanding of what qualifies as a significant tree. This should include attachment 4 to this submission.
		11.3	4.20-4.20Vegetation: Plant Materials	Oppose	The ADG is applying a blanket tree rule in section 4.20.1 by using the following guideline "Retain and maintain all large trees, hedges and other vegetation that contribute to the character or sense of enclosure of the ARHMZ and the Town Centre." This is despite the fact that our tree, and no doubt others, are identified as inappropriate species for that area.
		11.4	4.20-4.20Vegetation: Plant Materials	Other	I appreciate the aesthetic and value that trees add to the Arrowtown landscape and agree there should be measures to protect heritage trees but consideration should also be given to private property owners where the benefits of scheduling the tree are outweighed by the negative impacts that the tree is causing.
12	Sandra Zuschlag 20 Bracken Street, Arrowtown, 9302 sandra@creationgreen.co.nz	12.1	5.1-5.1Plants	Oppose	Considers that Amelanchier (as it grows to 7m and as it is planted around the museum) is listed in the wrong table and not ticked for Historic Arrowtown. Check other trees and tables also, need good list of medium sized trees for Arrowtown as Oak or Maple are too big for normal sections.
		12.2	2.3.2-8.2.6.1	Oppose	Wants the Design Guidelines to have more power - like the Jack's Point ones.
		12.3	5.1-1Introduction	Oppose	Every Arrowtownner should know about them and be helped implementing them.
		12.4	5.1-1Introduction	Oppose	ADG should have the same power as the Jacks Point design guidelines. Every new project needs to be signed off by a review board of professionals.
		12.5	5.1-1Introduction	Oppose	ADG needs to be used and acted upon and not just a guide to keep Arrowtown Special
13	Vicki Patton 26 Essex Avenue, Arrowtown, 9302 vickiandmichael@paradise.net.nz	13.1	2.2-2.2Arrowtown's Heritage Character	Support	Supports the retention of the low key, rustic and rambling nature of Arrowtown. Esp the stone/iron elements and vegetation. Supports redevelopments and new features not 'pretending' to be old.
		13.2	3.8.1.1-3.8.1.13.8.1.1	Other	What are the options for future parking if not in the places listed in this section?
		13.3	3.17.1.6-3.17.1.63.17.1.6	Support	I support the use of multiple cells to accommodate larger homes and businesses in the town centre and the 'old town'. We do need our town to continue to develop and not be hamstrung by guidelines that restrict growth. Multiple cells could be subtly joined together to form larger developments.
		13.4	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Support	I am happy to support cohesion in the town by applying as many guidelines as possible and practical when redeveloping the 'new town' houses and landscapes. I like the many examples given in photos of what aspects work with the Arrowtown look and those that don't.
14	John Murray Hanan 159 Highgate, Dunedin, 9010 jmhanan@xtra.co.nz	14.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	Support the ADG as they protect the boundary of Arrowtown as decided in PC29, and maintain the 'smallness is beautiful' concept of Arrowtown village life, controlling the tourism attractions that are contrary to the character of Arrowtown.

Submitter No.	Submitter	Point No.	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary
15	Michael Martin 20B Wiltshire Street, Arrowtown, 9351 michael@nzthoroughbred.co.nz	15.1	2.4-2.4Neighbourhoods	Oppose	Please update the maps using 2014 aerial photographs. In particular map 20 page 51 does not show development from 2012 (tree removal in 2012 and new buildings in 2014)
16	Martin Barrett 24A Advance Terrace, Arrowtown, 9302 nandm.barrett@gmail.com	16.1	3.3-3.3Views and Vistas	Oppose	ADG in past has allowed designs that are considered eye-sores. ADG needs new clause: "All buildings in addition to particular or generic requirements for a site or zone, also need to be considered for their visual impact from a distance and a variety of view points, especially where those view points relate to tourist routes, historic areas, and other areas."
		16.2	4.13-4.13Views/Vistas	Oppose	ADG in past has allowed designs that are considered eye-sores. ADG needs new clause: "All buildings in addition to particular or generic requirements for a site or zone, also need to be considered for their visual impact from a distance and a variety of view points, especially where those view points relate to tourist routes, historic areas, and other areas."
17	John Moore 62/207 Riddell Road, Glendowie, Auckland, 1071 johmar@paradise.net.nz	17.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	Support in its entirety
		17.2	2.3.3-2.3.3New Town	Other	Strongly oppose developments such as that in area 13, Chartres. Not appropriate for Arrowtown
		17.3	3.2-3.2Apply Best Practice Heritage Conservation	Support	Support use of ICOMOS
		17.4	3.15-3.15Existing Buildings	Support	Support use of ICOMOS
		17.5	3.16-3.16New Construction – General	Support	Support use of ICOMOS
		17.6	4.2-4.2Apply Best Practice Heritage Conservation	Support	Support use of ICOMOS
		17.7	2.3.3-2.3.3New Town	Oppose	Maps need to be updated from the 2006 version. In particular map 51 doesn't show buildings from 2014 and trees no longer there since 2012.
		17.8	2.3.3-2.3.3New Town	Oppose	update the maps using 2014 aerial photos and put dates on the maps in the guidelines.
17.9	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	Supports the ADG. The boundaries from PC29 need to be maintained to protect the heritage values and 'smallness is beautiful' village life of Arrowtown.		
18	New Zealand Fire Service Commission (Alice Burnett, C/- Beca Limited) PO Box 13960, Wellington, 6140 alice.burnett@beca.com	18.1	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	requests the fire station is recognised as an essential community activity within the ARHMZ by exempting any alterations and/or redevelopment relating to the operation NZFS in terms of height and bulk of buildings/structures, and the configuration of parking and access.
		18.2	4.7-4.7The Cottage and Shed Building Types	Oppose	Request exemption for NZFS. The height and bulk dimensions are focused on residential development and do not take into account other land uses.
		18.3	4.4-4.4Redevelopment, Upgrade and New Subdivision	Oppose	Request exemption for NZFS. The NZFS will not be able to comply with these given the operational requirements.
		18.4	4.14-4.14Parking, Driveways and Garages	Oppose	Request exemption for NZFS. These requirements are focused on residential land uses. Fire Station requires open access ways and extra car parking.
		18.5	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Oppose	Request exemption for NZFS from the ADG to ensure the continued effective protection of Arrowtown during fire and other emergencies.
19	Shaping our Future (David Kennedy) executive@shapingourfuture.org.nz	19.1	2-2Heritage and Character	Support	The authentic character of Arrowtown as a village is maintained
		19.2	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	Historic areas are protected by design controls
		19.3	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Support	Historic area are protected by design controls
		19.4	4.10-4.10The Streetscape	Support	Support that streetscapes are protected and enhanced to reflect the character of Arrowtown
		19.5	3.4-3.4Streetscape	Support	Support that streetscapes are protected and enhanced.
		19.6	3.7-3.7Exiting Vegetation	Support	Supports that trees are protected and enhanced
		19.7	4.16-4.16Existing Vegetation	Support	Supports that trees are protected and enhanced to reflect the character of Arrowtown
		19.8	3.5-3.5Public Open Spaces, Linkages and Courtyards	Support	supports the enhancing, protecting and maintaining the heritage of Arrowtown's green spaces and environment
		19.9	3.1-3.1Conservative Heritage Character	Support	support enhancing, protecting and maintaining the heritage of Arrowtown's buildings
		19.10	4.1-4.1Conserve Heritage Character	Support	supports enhancing, protecting and maintaining the heritage of Arrowtown's buildings green spaces and environment
		19.11	4.24-4.24Reserves and Parkways	Support	supports the enhancing, protecting and maintaining of the heritage of Arrowtown's green spaces and environment
		19.12	4.25-4.25Private Boundaries with Reserves and Parkland	Support	supports the enhancing, protecting and maintaining the heritage of Arrowtown's green spaces and environment.
		19.13	4.12-4.12Pedestrian Networks	Support	supports efforts to support pedestrianisation of the town. prefer to keep design of which in character with Arrowtown and avoid 'traditional forms of footpaths'
		19.14	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	The New Town needs requirements to adhere to the ADG to ensure new development reflects Arrowtown's vernacular. The ADG as proposed are possibly too constraining to be applied to the New Town, this would possibly result in a contemporary version of the Old Town, thereby limiting the evolution of Arrowtown's design landscape. Recommends less prescriptive guidelines for the New Town, which are applied rigorously.
		19.15	2.3-2.3Arrowtown's Character Areas	Oppose	Amend to recognise the common traits in development of Arrowtown over the years has been: modest scale, use of local/natural materials, simple structures/forms, sizable trees, uncluttered spaces, connectivity of green spaces.
19.16	2.3-Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential	Other	MDR threatens to undermine the value of the ADG unless they are applied in all cases.		
19.17	5.1-5.1Plants	Other	All relevant agencies (DoC etc.) should be consulted on the tree lists before the ADG are confirmed.		
19.18	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Other	suggest there be incentives/support for sustainable designs		
19.19	5.1-1Introduction	Oppose	Need a section that outlines the process of application and enforcement.		
20	Ian Robertson 12villiers@gmail.com	20.1	4.12-4.12Pedestrian Networks	Other	Restrict the traffic in Surrey Street, below the planned entrance to Cleary's subdivision for the walkers/cyclers into the walkway to the Chinese Village. A few bollards would work, and the subdivision would have access by car from above the bollards through to Caernarvon Street.
		20.2	4.24-4.24Reserves and Parkways	Other	Talk the Cleary family into turning the wonderful old stone home land, including the orchard, into "Eamon Cleary Park" - the area on the lower terrace. this area is big enough for a small wonderful park.
21	Judith A Stevenson PO Box 109610, Newmarket, Auckland, 1149 judy_stevenson2002@yahoo.co.nz	21.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Other	If the proposed MDR in Arrowtown does go ahead, I fully support the incorporation of the ADG into the PDP.
		21.2	2.3-Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential	Oppose	Strongly object to MDR in Arrowtown. This would cause Arrowtown to lose it's character and uniqueness. Need to celebrate Arrowtown's uniqueness, history, and differences and not make it the same as other areas.
		21.3	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Other	Traffic will be a problem if the proposed MDR goes ahead with so many extra people.

Submitter No.	Submitter	Point No.	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary
22	Alanna Harrington alannaharrington@hotmail.com	22.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	I support the inclusion of the ADG in the District Plan. This will give them more statutory weight, but they will still require local community having some involvement in the process.
23	Mark Kramer 6 Criterion Street, Arrowtown, 9302 mjkramer@xtra.co.nz	23.1	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	ADG should apply to all new dwellings. ADG should not apply to small/low key conversions of existing buildings/dwellings. The ADG should be trying to create more affordable housing for Arrowtown, and this should be reflected in the process required in creating them.
		23.2	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	I support the extension of the ADG to cover Arrowtown in its entirety.
		23.3	2.3-Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential	Oppose	The proposed MDR in Arrowtown is contentious and the changes in site coverage and height recession planes mean buildings seven meters high by sixteen meters long could be possible to be built one and a half meters off a common boundary with no control.
24	Ange van der Laan 13 Invernes Cres, Arrowtown, 9302 angevanderlaan@xtra.co.nz	24.1	3.6-3.6Surfaces: Paving, Drainage & Kerbs	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.2	3.9-3.9Fences and Walls	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.3	3.10-3.10Vegetation: Plant Materials	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.4	4.17-4.17New Trees and Planting	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.5	4.18-4.18Structure Trees	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.6	4.19-4.19Native Plantings	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.7	4.20-4.20Vegetation: Plant Materials	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.8	4.21-4.21Hedges, Fences, Walls and Gates	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.9	4.22-4.22Paving Surfaces and Materials	Oppose	Delete section. Too prescriptive.
		24.10	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Oppose the ADG being applied to the whole of Arrowtown. Should apply to ARHMZ only. I support the concept of tighter development controls but the DP is the appropriate mechanism for this. Requiring all neighbourhoods to incorporate the character of a mining town risks compromising the integrity and history of the original historic area.
		24.11	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Oppose	abandon the ADG for all of Arrowtown - apply only to ARHMZ. If ADG are adopted the process for decision making must be transparent and robust, those involved must be accountable, and the ADG needs to be revised to recognise and respect the distinctly different development phases, and that it is inappropriate to impose a 'heritage' framework in the New Town.
24.12	2.6-2.6New Town Neighbourhoods	Oppose	ADG should not apply to the New Town. this is because most of Arrowtown has been built after 1950. All of the era's of development are distinct and unique chapters in the evolution of Arrowtown, and no less important than the historical miners.		
25	David Clarke dwclarke@xtra.co.nz	25.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	I support the 2016 ADG being used across the whole town. In a lot of cases the guidelines have been ignored in the 'new town' and the result has been a number of large houses being built that do not reflect the Arrowtown vernacular. For the guidelines to be relevant they need to have some teeth.
		25.2	2.3-Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential	Oppose	The ADG need to include all the new town with specific reference to the MDR
		25.3	2.6-2.6New Town Neighbourhoods	Other	Prefers to have no MDR and to infill the 'new town' in LDR on a case by case basis, taking into account scale, character, and amenity of any intensification.
		25.4	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Other	Opposes the proposed MDR and prefers that infilling of the 'new town' be done on a case by case basis taking into account scale, character and amenity of the proposed intensification. Requirement of a review panel for vetting the developments in the 'new town'.
26	Lakes District Museum Inc (Bob Farrell) 49 Buckingham Street, Arrowtown, 9302 info@museumqueenstown.com	26.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	Supports the provisions.
		26.2	4.1-4.1Conserve Heritage Character	Support	Supports the provisions.
		26.3	4.2-4.2Apply Best Practice Heritage Conservation	Support	Supports the provisions.
		26.4	4.3-4.3Settlement Pattern: Street Layout, Lot Size and Pattern	Other	Heritage should be protected and maintained, at the same time the ongoing development of appropriate infrastructure to service the 'old town' is supported. This needs to be developed alongside the guidelines.
		26.5	4.4-4.4Redevelopment, Upgrade and New Subdivision	Other	historic character is to be maintained, at the same time the ongoing development of appropriate infrastructure to service the 'old town' is to be supported. This needs to be developed alongside the guidelines.
		26.6	4.4-4.4Redevelopment, Upgrade and New Subdivision	Support	supports intention to bring the scale, character and appropriate planting from old town into new town.
		26.7	3.21-3.21Construction and Materials	Oppose	There is a requirement to use certain building materials in the heritage zones. We understand these are recommendations only and that colour steel, aluminium joinery and linear weatherboard have been used and are acceptable in certain circumstances, providing they fit with other design criteria. Support the use of other materials.
		26.8	4.27-4.27Construction and Materials	Oppose	There is a requirement to use certain building materials in the heritage zones. We understand these are recommendations only and that colour steel, aluminium joinery and linear weatherboard have been used and are acceptable in certain circumstances, providing they fit with other design criteria. Support the use of other materials.
		26.9	3.10-3.10Vegetation: Plant Materials	Support	Support the retention and under planting of the towns heritage trees.
		26.10	4.17-4.17New Trees and Planting	Support	Support the retention and under planting of the towns heritage trees.
26.11	4.20-4.20Vegetation: Plant Materials	Support	Support the retention and under planting of the towns heritage trees.		
27	Arrowtown Planning Advisory Group (David Clarke) dwclarke@xtra.co.nz	27.1	1-Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016	Support	Overall support the ADG, that allows continuing development while incorporating the character of the town. Hope for a more overarching use of the guidelines to cover all development. Note that many people are disappointed in what has occurred in some parts of Arrowtown with houses that pay no respect to Arrowtown's vernacular. Generally in the 'old town' the results of the ADG are considered excellent - the old town has retained its character and amenity while allowing for sustainable redevelopment and new building to occur.
		27.2	3.6-3.6Surfaces: Paving, Drainage & Kerbs	Support	Support the status quo as outlined in the guidelines but seek better Council maintenance in terms of graveling footpaths and cleaning out drains and swales.
		27.3	3.10-3.10Vegetation: Plant Materials	Support	Support the status quo as outlined in the guidelines but seek better Council maintenance.
		27.4	4.11-4.11Street Lights and Exterior Lighting	Support	Support the sensitive street lighting that adequately guides pedestrians but allows the night sky to be viewed.
		27.5	4.22-4.22Paving Surfaces and Materials	Support	Support the status quo as outlined in the guidelines but seek better Council maintenance in terms of graveling footpaths and cleaning out drains and swales.
		27.6	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Other	what the message seems to be is that there is no need to take any notice of the guidelines if you don't wish to but we are hoping you will take consideration of them. APAG had hoped for a more overarching use of the guidelines to cover all development.

Submitter No.	Submitter	Point No.	Lowest Clause	Submitter Position	Submission Summary
28	Philip Blakely PO Box 121, Arrowtown, 9302 blakelywallace@gmail.com	28.1	1.1-1.1Purpose of the ADG	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.2	1.2-1.2Planning Framework	Other	Supports the provisions.
		28.3	1.2-1.2Planning Framework	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.4	1.2-1.2Planning Framework	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.5	1.3-1.3Scope of guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.6	1.3-1.3Scope of guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.7	1.4-1.4Use of Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.8	1.4-1.4Use of Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.9	1.5-1.5Use of Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.10	1.5-1.5Use of Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.11	2.1-2.1Historic Overview	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.12	2.2-2.2Arrowtown's Heritage Character	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.13	2.2-2.2Arrowtown's Heritage Character	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.14	2.3.1-2.3.1Arrowtown's Three 'Character' Areas	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.15	2.3.2-2.3.2Old Town Residential	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.16	2.3.3-2.3.3New Town	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.17	2.3.4-2.3.4Town Centre	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.18	2.4-2.4Neighbourhoods	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.19	2.4-2.4Neighbourhoods	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.20	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.21	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	Supports the provisions.
		28.22	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Reorganise the ADG to separate out the Old Town and have separate guidelines for MDR and MDR. I oppose the combining of the Old Town and New Town Guidelines. This has resulted in the weakening of the Old Town guidelines and creates confusion in how they have been reorganised from the 2006 Guidelines. It creates the perception that the cottage styles and forms of the old town are to be used in the New town when the intention is to encourage some of the characteristics of the old town into the New Town but not slavishly adhere to cottage styles
		28.23	5.1-1Introduction	Support	Retain the introduction chapter
		28.24	2-2Heritage and Character	Support	Retain the Heritage and Character chapters
		28.25	3-3Town Centre Design Guidelines	Support	Retain Town Centre Design Guidelines
		28.26	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Start with a general discussion on the elements that create the character of residential Arrowtown (with emphasis on the Old Town) and include the general guidelines that flow from that.
		28.27	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Have a separate section devoted to the Old Town so that its guidelines remain strong and clear to owners and developers in that zone.
		28.28	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Have a separate section for Medium Density Residential
		28.29	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Have a separate section for Low Density Residential
		28.30	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Add new section with discussion on possible styles and it is not the intent of ADG to stifle new evolution of new design styles.
		28.31	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Amend Guidelines to allow for development / evolution of new building styles but the key characteristics they retain are scale and modular, or broken up forms.
		28.32	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	should start with general guidelines (Old and New Town Residential Areas) with Old Town guidelines separate, to avoid criticism the ADG appear to be intent on making cottage style buildings apply to the whole town when that is not the case.
		28.33	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Other	Amend MDRZ section to better deal with shading, stormwater and parking.
		28.34	4-4Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines	Oppose	Amend 'Threats' heading to 'Issues / Threats'
		28.35	2.3.3-2.3.3New Town	Oppose	add under threats – lack of a footpath.
		28.36	3.1-3.1Conservative Heritage Character	Oppose	Plan 20 page 51 new buildings in the Post Office development are shown as heritage buildings – delete
		28.37	3.2-3.2Apply Best Practice Heritage Conservation	Oppose	remove the photo of historic cottage which is out of context for Town Centre Guidelines
		28.38	3.4.5-3.4.5Guidelines: The Lanes and Buckingham Street	Oppose	3.4.5 (g) – delete 'Lighting will be installed in Arrow lane' as lighting has been installed.
		28.39	3.4.5-3.4.5Guidelines: The Lanes and Buckingham Street	Oppose	3.4.5 (h) remove text about Willow trees that have been removed from Arrow Lane
		28.40	3.4.5-3.4.5Guidelines: The Lanes and Buckingham Street	Oppose	3.4.5 (i) delete powerlines underground – this work is completed.
		28.41	3.5-3.5Public Open Spaces, Linkages and Courtyards	Oppose	capital G from Buckingham Green
		28.42	3.5.5-3.5.5Post Office Precinct	Oppose	remove Thompson Street photo which is out of context
		28.43	3.6.1-3.6.1Guidelines: Surfaces	Oppose	3.6.1(a) – replace 'Do not use' with 'Avoid'
		28.44	3.7-3.7Exiting Vegetation	Oppose	Delete 'all' of this species and replace with 'some of these species'.
		28.45	3.8.1-3.8.1Guidelines: Views and Vistas	Oppose	3.8.1.1(d) – delete 'plant Willows behind the Bus Park to decrease its dominance as this planting is done.
		28.46	3.17-3.17The False Front Shop Building Type	Oppose	Figure 5 – MDR and LDR, correct spelling of component.
		28.47	4.8.2-4.8.2Guidelines: Proposed MDR and LDR Zones, New Construction	Oppose	4.8.2.3(b) – correct spelling of 'element'.