

As an Arrowtown resident and ratepayer I am not in favour of the three proposed new sub divisions. Bracken Ridge, Rafa Trust, Park Partnership. For years there has been much debate around the boundaries of Arrowtown and this loop hole in the law (special housing areas) looks like it will make all that work for nothing. The only people that will benefit from it are the developers who will be lining there own pockets. More pressure needs to be put on land owners who are sitting on areas that can be developed now, rather than changing laws to get around the decisions from PC29 and PC39. Next we will be asked to foot the bills for better infrastructure (schools, roads, etc) to cope with this influx of residents.

I am not against some development by way of creating larger 4000+ square metre lots, but I am against the proposed density in these developments. I want to keep Arrowtown the way it is.

Dear Councillors

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] However, it seems that the SHA legislation may have created a 'lolly scramble' effect for potential developers without any high level 'town planning' to determine the best areas for Arrowtown to expand into.

Some [REDACTED] concerns with the SHA proposals at Arrowtown are set out below. Some of these points are more relevant to individual proposals than others:

1. The western entrance to Arrowtown at the intersection of Malaghans and Lake Hayes- Arrowtown Roads has been protected against inappropriate development for a number of years. The resulting look and feel of this entrance is of itself a valuable amenity that is worth maintaining. To enhance this amenity, [REDACTED] agreed to the land swap/gift of Millbrook Park at the Arrowtown corner. This contribution to the open space in the vicinity of the western entry to the town is consistent with the 'Urban Edge' established as a condition of the Butel Park development. Both the Manse Road and the Feeley proposals are at odds with the well-established look and feel of this important entrance to the town.
2. The location of Affordable Housing is critical to its success. It should be located so as to utilise existing networks and connections in order to reduce traffic movements and to provide the best access to schools and other community facilities. Developments which are designed for local families should not be dislocated from the community facilities that are so crucial to the concept of affordable living.

3. [REDACTED] is concerned with the ability of Arrowtown's infrastructure to cope with the proposed level of growth. In particular, [REDACTED] has pre-paid substantial headworks' fees, to cover all of its future development. These fees were used by QLDC to upgrade the Arrowtown water and sewer networks/systems in the 90's. However, [REDACTED] is yet to complete its development and is concerned that the capacity it has funded will be taken up by new developments leaving [REDACTED] with reduced capacity and/water pressure for yet to be developed stages.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] seeks confirmation that it will be notified as an affected party in respect of any subsequent resource consents required by these proposals.

[REDACTED] understands that there has been some discussion about the definition of 'adjacent' in the SHA legislation as it relates to notification of resource consent applications. In this regard, The Ayrburn and [REDACTED] titles are contiguous, however with both the Feeley and Manse road proposals [REDACTED] is only separated by road reserve, and are effectively adjacent. This appears to have been accepted by the Council officers who have consulted with [REDACTED] about these proposals. Please confirm that [REDACTED] is deemed to be 'adjacent' neighbours and will be notified if and when resource consents are sought for special housing developments in these SHA's.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide some feedback to your important SHA process.

To all councillors. Arrowtown residents have made their wishes very clear to elected members of council.. They do not want any further development outside the accepted Urban Boundary which they fought hard to establish in Plan Changes 29 and 39. Council members supported the voters. Now the present council wish to ignore their past community support and go against the wishes of the people. Why can't the QLDC say "NO" to SHA?. There are sections in the Waikaitipu basin zoned residential yet to be built on! [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
One of the many ratepayers who voted for a council to listen to the people.

Hi there,

I would be grateful if you could please forward this on to the appropriate person on our behalf, thank you.

We own and live at [REDACTED] being a road frontage property which borders the suggested road access to the proposed development at [REDACTED]

While we do not object to the land in question being developed under its current Rural General zoning, we do however object to the Expression of Interest under the Special Housing Accord to change this land to high density zoning. Our reasons for objection are as follows:

- When we bought the land back in 2006, we purchased it with the security that the zoning of the surrounding land provided for low density housing (nothing less than 800m² per lot). To approve this zone change to high density housing impacts immensely on our entitlement to quiet enjoyment of living at our property.
- The land in question as it is currently zoned would cater for around 10 individual lots. Under the Special Housing Accord, this would increase in excess of 20 lots. This increase of lots will significantly increase the amount of vehicles accessing the new road situated on the southern boundary of our property. This increased volume of vehicles accessing the new road, will therefore significantly affect our quiet enjoyment of our property. From what has happened with this form of developments in the past (ie. Queenstown Community Housing Trust Development at the top of [REDACTED]) the houses are not just occupied by Mum, Dad and two children. These types of developments attract a lot of people renting out rooms, therefore each property may have in excess of 3 vehicles at each property, which is going to result in a lot of traffic passing down our southern boundary, the impact of which affects our entitlement to quiet enjoyment of living at our property.
- As is evident with the High Density housing already in place at the top of [REDACTED] (the Queenstown Community Housing Trust houses), there is never enough off street parking provided for on these forms of development, and therefore all overflow vehicles from these properties end up parked along [REDACTED], which creates significant issues of road safety with children playing (this is already an issue at the top of [REDACTED] where the Queenstown Community Housing Trust development is located). The top of [REDACTED] is always lined with parked vehicles, which reduces road access down to one lane. [REDACTED] is a busy road (it is part of the Connectabus bus route), and having a the street lined with extra vehicles is a safety issue for the buses, and the residents of [REDACTED] and other near by streets.
- [REDACTED] is a busy road already as it has extra traffic with the dairy/restaurant, the Connectabus route, the child care facility, the sports turf and the increased street parking at the Queenstown Community Housing Trust homes, these things combined already make [REDACTED] a very busy road catering for the existing properties, and changing the land zoning at [REDACTED] is going to put even more pressure on the current volume of traffic.

As noted above, we do not object to the owner of the land in question developing the land under its current Rural General zoning to provide for a development of reasonable sized lots that are in-keeping with the existing surrounding development, thereby not bringing any negative impact on the existing surrounding properties. I am aware there is demand for land being available to enable people to build new homes, but think it is reasonable that these homes should be built on land of not less than 800m².

We would be grateful if you could please take our comments above into serious consideration.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Dear Mayor and Councilors

With continual population growth experienced in the lakes district there is a strong demand to live in the village of Arrowtown.

Brackens Ridge residential proposal is an opportunity for the natural seamless expansion of Arrowtown that will allow Kiwi families an opportunity to reside in an affordable home of their own.

From the detailed proposal Brackens Ridge residential development at Arrowtown has the following meritorious features-

Effective usage of the land with natural boundaries of existing roads and golf courses.

Quick start pre approved house designs that are consistent to Arrowtowns character which will provide a visually appealing layout that has no impact on the natural ridge line.

Modern and energy efficient buildings that make effective usage of the land foot print.

Expandable principle living houses to allow affordable extension options which suit family growth.

Ability to key into existing reticulated infrastructure with no additional off site upgrades required.

Ability to key into existing reticulated infrastructure with no additional off site upgrades required.

There is a social and moral responsibility to provide affordable housing in NZ and Brackens Ridge is an ideal opportunity for this to be incorporated in the Wakatipu basin.

I fully support the Brackens Ridge development.

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

It pains me that yet again, after 26 years of going into bat over Arrowtown issues both as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in my capacity as the [REDACTED] and as an individual, that I am still having to do it. Of course I am not the only one.

Our concerns have often been greeted with being called a 'nimby', 'anti-development' or whingers' however that is the price you pay for sticking your head above the parapet. It is also unfair labelling, because generally such concerns are made with good justification.

The results of lobbying for the protection of Arrowtown's character have been worth it however. Strong protection measures in the historic zones, both residential and commercial, and a collaborative approach to new development, has created a town that is a stunning place to both live and work in. Arrowtown has also become one of the gems in the whole Wakatipu visitor experience

and this is a major economic driver. As a consequence Arrowtown is hot property and we have become a victim of our own success. People want to live here and that is understandable.

This environment is fragile and the special qualities can be easily eroded. The scale, sense of community, tree lined streets and low impact infrastructure are things people cherish. The blunt instrument of proposed mid density zoning will do absolutely nothing for Arrowtown's character. This was forcefully expressed to council staff at a recent community meeting. Bad planning decisions have already seen ugly development in parts of the new town, especially on ridges behind the school.

Since 1990 there have been two community workshops conducted by the council with the findings then ratified by the council. They were held in 1994 and 2003. The Arrowtown Design Guidelines were commissioned in 2006. We have been fortunate that these documents along with the District Plan have remained living documents used to regulated growth and development in the town. That is apparently until now. My call at the mid density meeting for the conducting of another workshop, perhaps as part of 'Shaping our Future' fell on deaf ears. Such a workshop would enable the community, along with councillors to come up with creative solutions for issues like growth and affordable housing.

All of the living documents (that are on Council's web site) are under threat as you consider the Special Housing Accord applications on the outskirts of Arrowtown. All of those documents outline as a threat to Arrowtown's character and amenity, urban sprawl. The 2003 workshop advocated and produced a map showing a 100 metre no build setback on all the roads leading to Arrowtown. All three Arrowtown proposals breach those setbacks. Mc Donnell Road was marked as a defensive line that should not be broken. The Centennial Ave entrance has already been compromised.

Last week the Council advertised that Plan Change 29 and 39 were to be adopted. These plan changes deal with the issue of development beyond the Arrowtown Boundaries (Arrow South) and the defining of the Arrowtown boundaries growth boundaries. 5 years of wrangling at great expense to all parties has seen the Environment Court ratify the boundaries and grant some development for Arrowtown South. This appears to account for nothing given the current proposals. The RAFA proposal doesn't even consider protection documents or plan changes in its assessment yet we are told that past planning documents will be considered. Similarly Bracken's Ridges makes no mention of the previous planning decisions and plan changes that relate to this very same bit of land.

I do not believe the proposed SHA on the boundaries of Arrowtown will deliver a single affordable house. Like elsewhere, the land will be snapped up by speculators and cashed up baby boomers. Whilst I am sure you are getting some support for this development it will be from people who have not thought about alternative solutions. The SHA is simply being used as a loop hole to allow developers subdivisions on rural land on the pretext they are being benevolent and providing a solution. All you will do by granting development without community input is create animosity and an unattractive entrance to Arrowtown from both directions, something that the community and the Environment Court backed by expert landscape advice has rejected. More houses on ridges, more stockade like fences, more traffic and congestion in and around Arrowtown and more pressure on the infrastructure.

While Arrowtown does have a finite population if we want to protect its character, there are creative solutions to housing needs. There is zoned land unbuilt on. Infilling can occur in parts of

Arrowtown but not on a 'one size fits all' basis. The council owned sewage pond land should be investigated again. It was identified as a mixed housing area by the community in the 2003 workshop but rejected by the council and Court due to localised opposition. These two solutions would avoid boundary jumping. The Affordable Housing Trust development in Suffolk Street is a good creative solution.

We are all well aware of the abundance of undeveloped suitably zoned sections that are in the district but not available to the market. It is up to you as councillors to find ways to rectify this. Stop developers land banking and get zoned land to the market, before allowing development on rural general land to occur by stealth.

I have just read Sam Hazeldine's excellent article in the Mountain Scene about his concerns that we don't sink into mediocrity in terms of future growth. The proposed SHA's on the outskirts of Arrowtown represent mediocrity. You can take the easy option or you can achieve a result that is creative and has community backing, as we have done over the last 25 years. The decisions are in your hands. Remember you are the elected representatives and the bureaucrats are there to carry out your vision - not the other way around.

Dear Councillors,

I am writing with regard to the recent expressions of interest for affordable housing in the Queenstown Lake District.

I support Brackens Ridge as the preferred option for extra housing in Arrowtown and surrounds because:

- 1) it is a carefully planned, quality development with strict guidelines, not ad-hoc as is the infill medium density housing planned for Arrowtown;
- 2) the infrastructure is appropriate and manageable; ie: it does not overload the existing Arrowtown infrastructure;
- 3) visually more appealing than infill housing in Arrowtown;
- 4) close to community services such as schools, parks etc;
- 5) established natural boundaries such as the Golf courses;
- 6) removed from the Historical zone and central hub of Arrowtown and therefore has no real impact on the visual amenity of that;
- 7) fits the SHA requirements of being close to an urban boundary and other requirements for affordable housing

8) opportunity for families to remain or enter the Arrowtown housing market; as it is very unaffordable at the present (average house price of over \$780,000 up over 23% from \$635,000 for the same period last year, see attachment)

9) Arrowtown and immediate surrounds needs to contribute to the growth expectations of the wider Wakatipu area and this growth needs to be well planned for our future generations.

In relation to the Queenstown Lakes District Council's consideration of the special housing areas (Arrowtown related) I ask you to first consider the purpose of the Local Government Act before addressing the Special Housing Area guidelines which I understand have been provided for you. As you know -

The purpose of local government is –

- To enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities
- To meet the current and future needs of communities for good-quality local infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses. (Local Government Act 2002, section 10 (1)).

The role of local authorities is to lead and represent their communities. They must engage with their communities and encourage community participation in decision-making, while considering the needs of people currently living in communities and those who will live there in the future.

I also ask you to maintain an awareness about the previous discussions and decisions around the Arrowtown urban boundaries. The following document off the QLDC web site paints a reasonable picture of the Arrowtown situation based on consultation sessions.

www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/OldImages/Files/Small_community_plans/Arrowtown_community_plan_-_the_plan.pdf

Please respect the Arrowtown urban boundary at least until proper consultation is possible to determine the democratic wishes of the community. I have no objection to the proposed SHA within the Arrowtown boundary as long as it is thoughtful and meets special housing needs and land banking is controlled by RMA conditions.

SHA's should, in my opinion be located close to centres of employment so as to take pressure off the road network. Locating houses on the outskirts of Arrowtown. I would suggest that Arrowtown has limited potential for employment and/or business growth based on the size of the commercial and industrial areas.

Thank you.

To the Mayor and Councillors, QLDC

Re Special Housing Areas

SHAs surely do require consultation with affected parties.

Why do the money-making, tax-dodging land developers have all the swing with Council?

We, in Shaw Street, do not wish to look down on [REDACTED]

Arrowtown is not a suitable place to be surrounded by any SHAs, even if they are conveniently outside the defended and defined boundary.

Please concentrate on those developers who are currently speculating in areas that are already zoned 'residential'. After all it is they who are holding on to land for the sole purpose of profit; they are the ones who are not interested in selling off to satisfy 'special housing' requirements.

Why, pray, should the problem be shifted to the common unsuspecting ratepayers; those who do not relish the thought of being surrounded by a sea of cheap drabness?

Dear Councillors,

I have been watching with interest the Affordable Housing debate and I feel Brackens Ridge is the best area for urban growth in the Wakatipu Basin.

It is right next to Arrowtown and any sprawling houses will be confined by the Arrowtown Golf Course and the roads.

It is unfair on others living in the Wakatipu Basin if Arrowtown does not take on some of the growth required in the Basin and this land would be ideal for this.

Please utilise Brackens Ridge for the Affordable Housing use.

Dear Councillors, Greetings from Arrowtown.

I am sending this message to express my views on the SHA proposals. The proposals are in breach of the agreed Urban Growth Boundary for Arrowtown. The work and financial cost to the rate payer to put in place a protective boundary, I understand, was substantial, quote; "With strong community support, QLDC has put a lot of time, money and legal effort into establishing a boundary for Arrowtown. We understand council costs alone to protect the urban boundary have been, for Plan Change 29, \$40,000 fees plus staff time over 8 years and, for Plan Change 39, \$44,000 fees plus staff time over 6 years.

Why, then, do an about-face on PC29 and PC39. Why allow development beyond the UGB, setting a precedent for further development, with uncertainty that the SHA's goals will be achieved."

I also understand that there is a great amount of land available for housing, in the QT area, without spoiling the magic and beauty of Arrowtown! [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Ms van Uden,

Thank you for giving us, as Arrowtown home-owners, the opportunity to express our opposition to the approval of Special Housing Areas adjacent to Arrowtown.

Two of the proposed SHAs breach the Arrowtown urban boundary established by your Council with strong community support at much expense over a period of eight years. This effort aimed to keep and protect the special character of Arrowtown – itself a major economic asset.

It makes no sense now to allow residential development beyond the established Urban Growth Boundary, especially when we understand there are already 11,000 sections in the Whakatipu Basin that are zoned residential, but have not yet been built upon.

How can you allow these sections to be land-banked so developers can reap large future profits, and break your own rules to compromise the community & economy of Arrowtown for the short-term financial benefit of three private investors?

Unfortunately, your decision not to consult formally with communities over the proposed SHAs does not encourage any confidence in the integrity of your process. We would not have known about your Council's intentions unless the Arrowtown Village Association had asked you to contact us.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We have recently built a home in Arrowtown's Historic Zone where stringent rules are applied to the construction of new buildings. Compliance with these rules added substantially to our construction costs, but we found the process reasonable and appreciated its importance in preserving the coherence of the Village environment.

It is that coherent & charming Village environment which attracts an increasing number of visitors to Arrowtown. In March 2013 23% of Queenstown's visitors said they would visit Arrowtown during their trip, or already had. A year later, in March 2014, that figure had risen markedly to 34%.

Mayor/ Councillors - as people elected by the Queenstown/ Arrowtown Communities, you are supposedly our representatives to ensure all future plans for these areas are made public and open for submissions whether we are or you are , for or against the plans.

The recent public awareness of the ramifications for the non obligation of such notification under the Special Housing Act 2013, runs totally against the rights of every resident, whether a rate payer or not, to be advised.

There is growing mistrust in how some people seem to be allowed building concessions within the QLDC areas, while other are tied up in red tape and Council restrictions for years.

My specific concern is the planned Rafa Trust, Mc Donnell Rd, Arrowtown development [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Will these sections actually be priced within the first home buyers budget?

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

You all have an obligation to ensure this open - notification of all facts are made available to all.

Hello Councillors,

We are not usually moved to lobby but feel we must this time. We wish to make our views known about the applications for SHAs by Brackens Ridge and Rafa Trust (and, to a lesser extent, Park Partnership). We are motivated by an urge to keep the special village character of Arrowtown intact, not by a desire to preserve house prices.

We oppose these applications strongly and would feel betrayed by the Council if they were to go ahead.

This is purely on the basis that everyone - Council and Arrowtown residents and ratepayers - worked and compromised hard to develop the Arrowtown Urban Boundary.

[REDACTED]

We see the actions of the applicants as purely selfish and opportunistic. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From what we have heard the plans will not achieve the intention of increasing low cost housing in the Wakatipu Basin as:

- It is unlikely that many truly affordable houses will be built.
- There are vast numbers of sections not on the market now but landbanked. Allowing more building in inappropriate sites will just cause the other developers to hold more sections back until any small drop in prices is absorbed by the market and demand pushes the prices up again.

So, nothing will be gained but Arrowtown will be changed for ever.

We believe that your Council will have little hope of changing house prices in Wakatipu until some way of preventing developers drip feeding sections onto the market is found.

Please, do not approve these SHAs.

If it comes to a compromise then of the 3 Arrowtown SHAs we would rank from least desirable to less undesirable:

Rafa Trust

Brackens Ridge

Park Partnership

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To our councilors and Mayor,

Its a rare occasion when i get irked enough to write in about something ! , so this is a big issue for me.

No consultation has happened in regards to these special housing areas that we are reading about that are going to happen all around Arrowtown. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I don't mind affordable housing when integrated into an area like the homes that have been built to replace the campground cabins in Arrowtown but huge blocks of the housing areas are going to be just plain horrible !!.

When we had our first home it was a shed and caravan in the middle of the boondocks because we could not afford to live in expensive areas. Why should first home owners have such huge expectations to be able to live in expensive areas like Queenstown. What is wrong with Southland or other areas of Otago for a first home ??

The special landscapes and character of this area are going to be spoilt forever if this sort of development gets the green light. Everyone I speak to is unhappy. There has been no consultation at all and it is really rude to have this forced upon us when other developments have been stopped because of the opposition from the people of our local community.

We are opposed to the development of Ayrburn Farm from the current rural landscape into an intensive residential development.

Our reasons for opposing this development are:

- This proposed development will be clearly visible from our site and will alter the existing rural vista of the area. The proposed development will be detrimental to our visual amenity.
 - The likely light generated from these 150+ houses and their activity will pollute our environment and reduce our amenity.
 - The likely noise generated by these 150+ houses and their occupants will pollute our environment and reduce our amenity.
 - This land is zoned Rural General --- which is completely appropriate for the green spacious nature of the rolling landscape.
 - To change the current zoning to an intensive housing area is contrary to the wishes of the community.
 - This proposed development will be clearly visible from the Millbrook to Lake Hayes walking and biking trail and will alter the existing rural vista of the area. The proposed development will be detrimental to the visual amenity of this tourist trail.
 - To develop an intensive housing area in this location is contrary to the expectations of the visitors that use the Millbrook to Lake Hayes walking and biking trail. Tourist visitors positively impact this area and it is the unspoilt landscapes and dramatic scenery that feature highly on the feedback from this group. The rural vista should remain as a low--- density environment.
 - This proposal to insert a pocket of intensive development of 150+ houses into this landscape is completely inappropriate and will be out of context with the surrounding rural zoned environment.
-

Dear Councillor,

Myself and my partner are already home owners in Arrowtown and are in full support of the Bracken Ridge housing development. It is our view that it will enhance Arrowtown's uniqueness and fill an urgent need of housing in the district.

It doesn't make sense that little satellite subdivisions are being created outside of Arrowtown where people have to travel to access the facilities schools library etc, Bracken Ridge is within walking distance of these and has an attractive outlook.

To your worship the Mayor and all the councillors

Thank you for the opportunity to air my views and experience of life in Arrowtown

I believe it is the responsibility of the QLDC to protect the environment of this unique area of New Zealand and filling that environment with developments designed primarily to maintain the lifestyle of the entrepreneurs does not fulfil the responsibility given to the councillors voted into their incumbent positions by the ratepayers. To use the excuse that you are following the directives of the RMA is false and devised by the power brokers not the ratepayers to whom your very existence in your positions are your primarily responsible.

The hard earned cash spent on the recent plan changes should not be squandered by further attempts to circumvent the present rules.

However the proposal to reduce the building footprint requirements for Arrowtown and to increase the height restrictions is an abomination and should be prevented at all costs.

I have seen what this height restriction has done in Twizel. Here there has been a totally unexpected result. To prevent homes being built out whenever possible home owners have been purchasing vacant sections and preventing buildings being constructed to maintain vistas or being crowded out, some would argue this is land banking. But the owners of those properties who value the reason why they choose to live or holiday in this part of the country know the real values they cherish. Further, there is of course the realisation that these vacant sections recover minimal rates to the Council.

From owning our property in Arrowtown for the past ¼ of a century I have experienced the extremes of the weather conditions in our environment and it is to this effect that the footprint / height restriction has not been properly calculated. By this I mean that in the middle of winter the shadowing effect of the neighbouring constructions will leave homes with a lot less sun and the prospect of allowing affordable houses to be wedged in in this type of environment would lead to a miserable existence in winter albeit cheap for the occupants.

The miserable winter lifestyle of the occupants of the Chinese village should be an example to future generations not to be recreated in this village of ours by cramming hovels into a sunless gully. I'm sure they only lived there because as poor they were not tolerated elsewhere. We should learn from there example preserved for all to see for the parallels are all too obvious in today's context.

The net sun effect in the depths of winter will probably be of little concern to most bar one of the executives of the QLDC because as we know few live in Arrowtown. The old houses that were located by local builders in the past knew the natural spacing that was liveable way before regulations such as these were devised in this location. That natural spacing, probably without regulation has long since stood the test of time.

The prospect of commissioning quality building companies to engage in the contracts to build cheap houses in this location defy logic because why would they commit to these enterprises when high value buildings are where the money is.

In Europe where similar surroundings attract tourists to view the scenery comparable to our own are totally protected, without exception and the legacy they have is there for all to enjoy from all over the world. Geneva is a chocolate box example that supports tourism on a vast scale without the necessity of being swallowed up by housing developments.

I would like to thank all who have taken the time to read these concerns. I know you have a difficult task to perform to satisfy all the ratepayers but in this instance these concerns are real not just perceived.

Dear Councillors

We support the Special Housing Area (SHA) proposed for Bracken's Ridge at Arrowtown.

Arrowtown has been our local town since 1952. From the 50,s until the late 80,s it was the base for all our grocery and service requirements as well as the local school for our children.

The town has continually expanded since then and will continue to expand into the future. Bracken's Ridge is the most logical and well placed SHA next to Arrowtown.

I have been a resident of Arrowtown since 2006.

I am totally against 2 of the three Special Housing Areas proposed for the edge of Arrowtown: Brackens Ridge and Rafta Trust. Both of these proposals lie outside the previously debated and approved Urban Growth Boundary as established under PC29 and PC39. These two development proposals would set a dangerous precedent for future sprawl thus destroying the unique qualities of the Arrowtown community. I am not convinced that they would provide any real affordable housing anyway. I urge you not to approve these two proposals.

Scott

As our elected QLDC representative please note that

- I am completely opposed to the proposed Arrowtown area SHA's
 - I believe that these SHA proposals are simply a disingenuous vehicle to circumvent the RMA
 - I believe we need to take action now to ensure that both today & in the future the extensive Arrowtown town planning of recent years is not eroded overnight
-

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to support the Brackens Ridge proposal for Arrowtown housing. This seems a logical area with a well-designed plan to put some of the much needed housing in Arrowtown. This will add to our ability to be more self-sustaining and avoid the need for infill which will stand to degrade the character of this great town far more than adding to the population. It makes far more sense to add on to our urban boundaries rather than start random satellite towns such as Ayrburn.

Dear Mayor van Uden and Councillors

I am writing re concerns with the housing developments as proposed in the SHA Expressions of Interest and in particular Expression of Interest 3,(Centennial Ave), 9, (Malaghans/Manse Rd(and 10,(Mc Donnell Rd) These three proposals lie at Arrowtown's only entrances. Two of them fall outside of the urban boundary. If these boundaries are going to be extended and the Environment Court decision of 2009 be ignored, then please insist on quality developments such as on Arrowtown's eastern boundary, Chartres Green.

Arrowtown is a unique tourist town. It deserves protection. We do not want urban sprawl of low cost housing radiating out from its current boundaries.

I don't know where the statistics for your growth projections came from? Or the high demand for housing you say exists. Market forces should dictate supply and demand rather than the QLDC creating an artificial platform.

What is worrying is that rural property owners and developers are using the Special Housing Accord to fast - track their developments and therefore circumventing the need for rigorous approval. Of particular concern is the so called affordable housing.

A better solution is to extend where possible the areas where affordable housing already exists and where there are natural boundaries. Some of the Expressions of Interest do cater very well for

extensions of what is already there. Additionally any new subdivision proposals should be required to have a small portion of the subdivision set aside for affordable housing.

Affordable houses could also be created by increasing the current height restrictions in certain areas. Glenda Drive is one such area, maybe sunny parts of Gorge Rd, the base of hillside slopes of Shotover Country could all be considered for buildings of more than two storeys. This would suit the working population who are often transient, don't want gardens and who would welcome living close to their work. Bicycles not cars, would become the norm and would fit very well with your car reduction plans.

Finally, lessons should be learned from Lake Hayes Estate. It was to have been affordable housing. The reality was many of the builders becoming speculators by buying the houses at the outset and holding them until prices went up. This WILL happen again.

Dear Scott

Re Expressions of Interest/ SHA

While much could be said about the Expressions of Interest I will limit my comments and concerns to Expression of Interest no 3, Centennial Ave , no 9 Malaghans Rd and no 10, Mc Donnell Rd.

These three proposals lie at Arrowtown's only entrances. To allow affordable housing would be a travesty. Chartres Green on Arrowtown's eastern boundary is an example of quality housing. The houses are aesthetically pleasing and built with quality materials in keeping with the area.

I hope common sense alongwith architects, landscapers and planners will keep Arrowtown and indeed the entire Wakatipu Basin an area to which tourists will still flock We do not want swathes of low cost housing littering the landscape.

Arrowtown deserves protection. I hope as our representative you will be influential in determining a good outcome for us!

Dear Mayor van Uden and Councillors,

Arrowtown

I write as an Arrowtown home owner who is passionate about the Wakatipu Basin area and in particular Arrowtown. Hence I wish to concentrate my comments on the proposals for SHA around Arrowtown. Over the last few years there has been much public debate regarding keeping Arrowtown's unique charm and character. This debate reached its height with the issues regarding the Arrow South development and boundary changes. The outcomes of that debate were the Arrow South did not proceed and an Arrowtown boundary was defined for housing development.

Arrowtown's character can be described in many ways. Perhaps Arrowtown's key attributes are its quaintness, charm and natural beauty. To this, one needs to add its people, its buildings, and its history. These are attributes that are difficult to replicate.

The three Arrowtown SHA expressions of interest (Brackens Ridge, Rafa Trust and Park Partnership) are all on entrances to Arrowtown. Surely the last place you want cheap low cost housing is on the entrance ways to one of New Zealand's best tourist villages. What all three developments are doing is trading open spaces for development dollars. It is my firm belief that the Councillors need to stand up and be counted, and say no to the expressions of interest, in particular to the two outside the present designated boundary.

The alternative is continuing urban sprawl in the Arrowtown area.

Please also note the following additional comments.

Recent Communication

Low cost housing, I have recently written to the Council and wish to point out that by your own figures there are some 11,000 sections currently land banked awaiting development. Surely part of the answer must be to insist that any new development has say a minimum number of sites designated for low cost housing, say 15%. That would more than cover the 1300 low cost houses that are supposedly required.

Brief Comment on some other Proposals.

Ayrburn Farm. Urban Sprawl. Viewing the proposal it cannot possibly be low cost housing. Ownership connected to a noted property developer. Sees an opportunity to get around the regulations, and make an extra dollar.

Shotover, Onslow, Rere Rd. These proposals seem to make sense to me. Existing subdivisions. Original target market lower cost housing.

Highview Tce(6) and Arthurs Point Pub (5). These proposals seem to make sense to me. They are close to work, transport and amenities. Arthurs Point needs cleaning up.

Final Comment on Arrowtown SHA's.

Whatever the fine print says and no matter how many of the boxes the Brackens Ridge (3), Rafta Trust (10) and Park Partnership (9) expressions of interest tick, they are not in line with the wishes of the majority of the people of Arrowtown. Two of the three proposals lie outside present recently defined boundaries of Arrowtown. The council and government are providing a loop hole for property owners to get around the rules. Please listen to the people and stop the urban sprawl on the gateways to our wonderful town.

The government and council must say no to the Brackens Ridge, Rafa Trust and Park Partnership developments. I just hope the residents of Arrowtown do not have to resort to taking the matter before the courts, something I would be happy to support financially.

We wish to submit the following feedback in relation to the current Special Housing Areas (SHA) Expressions of Interest (EOI).

We acknowledge that we live in close proximity to one of the proposals received as an EOI, being that submitted under the title of 'Bracken Ridge'. We further acknowledge we have been past submitters to both QLDC PC29 (supporters) and QLDC PC39 (opposed), both of which have had subsequent decisions handed down by the Environment Court. Although a name change has been applied to the 'Bracken Ridge' EOI this is within the same geographic area applicable to PC39 under the previous name of Arrow South.

We wish to make comment on the two EOI close to but not within the Arrowtown Urban Growth Boundary.

SUMMARY:

That QLDC acknowledges Arrowtown community feedback and the already existing council consultation documents that indicate a low preference for residential intensification changes. Arrowtown is a unique settlement on a national and international basis, prized for its size and style both by residents and visitors to the town. Council should focus on infrastructure maintenance and upgrade ahead of a focus on increasing residential capacity. Such an increase is clearly against the wish of local ratepayers illustrated by current feedback as well as recent historic consultation accepted by council (PC29 and PC39). Both of these Plan Changes have recently been before council for approval following Environment Court rulings.

We strongly disagree with the premise that growth in Arrowtown should continue based on the District's growth projections. The character and qualities of Arrowtown cannot be sustained with continued growth and expansion. These characters and qualities are an integral part of the Queenstown area brand.

BACKGROUND:

The following extracts from the 2007 report A Growth Management Strategy for the Queenstown Lakes District are of direct relevance;

The community also needs to play its part in managing growth, participating in planning exercises and helping to set the overall direction

There are many examples of resort towns where growth, left unchecked, has ultimately undermined the very qualities that made the place desirable in the first place. The Council does not wish to replicate that experience

Whilst acknowledging the background and implications of the specific SHA legislation it would appear contradictory if council places itself in the position of being potentially willing to overlook its own established recommendations for Arrowtown. This would be the case should it agree to progress EOI. This is of particular relevance for the 'Bracken Ridge' EOI given the recent process and more importantly the Environment Court PC39 ruling issued in February 2015, which we understand has been before full council for adoption.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS IN RELATION TO ARROWTOWN AREA SHA EOI:

BRACKEN RIDGE;

Given the extensive discussions, council hearings, established community feedback and Environment Court consideration that have occurred for this area it should be clear that council has no option but to reject any SHA EOI for this particular area.

The area is outside the Urban Growth Boundary as adopted under PC29 and met clear and strong community opposition under the original PC39 proposal of intensive housing density on this land.

Environment Court ruling has further reduced the modified housing density for this area as subsequently put forward by the landowners. The resulting final PC39 housing density is clearly not of such an intensive density as put forward under the Bracken Ridge SHA EOI.

The ability of infrastructure, particularly relatively small main line water pipe size, to handle any intensive subdivision in this area is also questioned.

McDONNELL ROAD;

This SHA EOI is also outside, but adjoining, the PC29 Urban Growth Boundary for Arrowtown and raises questions about the ability of council to accept this as a possible development.

We do acknowledge this EOI is not of such an intensive nature in terms of impact when compared to the Bracken Ridge EOI, but given the Urban Growth Boundary ruling it would appear to disrespect community guidance as established.

The above points indicate that there is a strong case against the proposed Bracken Ridge SHA EOI as referenced and likely the McDonnell Road SHA EOI.

We request that council recognise past consultation and understand the community wishes for Arrowtown. We acknowledge the terms of reference for SHA legislation but have some concern with the manner in which council is handling the SHA process publicly to date.

Change does and will occur but this must be done collaboratively with a clearer understanding of community feeling, and whole Arrowtown brand. This has been explicitly established and expressed over recent history for Arrowtown.

Recently, the Arrowtown Village Association, of which I am a fully paid up member, sent out a newsletter that contained several emotional and incorrect statements that many impressionable people will consider as 'facts' rather than the biased and self serving opinions that they are. This letter is one small attempt to create informed debate over what is a very important proposal.

In their newsletter they state:

"Land supply is not the issue. There are already more than 11,000 sections in the Wakatipu basin that are zoned residential but have not been built on. Nearly 70 per cent of them have been land-banked by developers and not released for sale."

The facts: They do not stack up. As councillors you will be aware that the number quoted is only a theoretical number that could possibly be developed over many years, should consents be granted and developers be willing. For the AVA to state that these sections already exist and infer that some are on the market is ignorant at best and mischievous at worst.

In their newsletter they state:

"Will homes actually be affordable in SHAs? The goal of the SHAs is to make section prices more affordable. Section prices at QLDC's first SHA at Bridesdale Farm are not significantly different from the nearby non-SHA subdivision, Shotover Country. However section sizes at Bridesdale are significantly smaller. Not one of the new houses described in the Expressions of Interest would meet the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust's benchmark for affordability, which is \$300,000. Only some would cost less than \$450,000, the government's definition of "affordable". It is likely many would be categorised as unaffordable by anyone's definition."

The facts: Using benchmarks of \$300,000 and \$450,000 to describe affordability are incorrect. As a long serving realtor, I have first hand experience of dealing with families and first homebuyers. That experience has shown me that \$550,000 is considered affordable for first homebuyers and \$750,000 for maturing families. Changing lifestyles mean that people no longer want large sections and actually prefer the smaller and lower maintenance sections that are now available.

In their newsletter they state:

"They (SHA's) will encourage speculation. Past experience at Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country suggests people will buy sections at the "affordable" initial price, not to build on, but to on-sell later at a profit."

The facts: This is an emotional statement without foundation as very few sections have been on sold at Shotover Country. Speculation at Lake Hayes Estate in the 200's was caused by a lack of supply forcing up prices, something that SHA will prevent, not create.

In their newsletter they state:

[REDACTED]

The facts: This statement attempts to create unease amongst residents to give the impression of some in-house deals being done. This is grossly unfair as neither man can publicly defend himself

and this statement casts a shadow over the integrity of these men and of all council employees by association.

I would guarantee that every person who is both a member of the AVA and a ratepayer has benefited substantially from owning Arrowtown land. The AVA's stance seems to be that Mr. Feeley should be prevented from also benefiting from ownership of land. It should be seen as a case of "It's OK for us but not for you" in this AVA statement.

SHA's will not solve all the problems of lack of supply and skyrocketing house prices, but they will provide another mechanism by which this area can bring property to market without endless expenditure on resource consent applications, Environment Court hearings and appeals.

I strongly object to the development by Mr. Quinn McMahon of his 12 quill street leading on to Rere Road.

The reasons for this are listed below-

- over development of the section in regards to the houses and sections that are around it. It would look totally out of character with the sections around.
- in adequate water supply. Every year the estate is put on water restrictions for 2 to 4 months. this would put additional strain on a water supply that can not cope at present.
- sewerage system that is struggling to cope at the moment and needs a major up grade,
- the above two points are all ready straining due to shotover country and the new bridesdale farms development
- large volume of traffic coming out next to a children's park. from past experience on average each house would have 3 cars.
Meaning 30 cars coming out of a small drive way or parked on the road.
- Rere road is not wide enough to take the additional cars that would be parked on it or the grass verges.
A lot of people from town park next to the skate park at present.
- public transport system that does not meet the needs of families all ready living in Lake Hayes Estate.
- a power supply that has issues when it snows or is very windy.
- devalue of properties in Rere Road.
- the original developer of Lake Hayes Estate developed it with sections at a certain size with convents on them for single dwellings only for families. To make it special area that was not over developed with tiny sections.

Dear Councillors,

As a longtime resident of Queenstown and a Registered member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects I am writing to express my concern with the Special Housing Areas and affordable housing policy. I have reviewed the expressions of interest and whilst some of them on first glance seem acceptable (i.e. within existing urban envelopes or land designated for a similar purpose), I have concerns about SHAs being proposed and accepted in rural general zones.

Some developments may be appropriate in these areas, and I am not taking a uniform anti-development stance regarding this issue, however these proposals should be assessed like any other application, through the tried and tested resource management act put in place to prevent inappropriate development. Our landscapes in particular are of national significance, therefore I not believe having a national government policy override local council policy in this case is appropriate. For instance, in some applications, less dense developments have been proposed in these areas in the past but rejected through the environment court (after very careful and thorough consideration). Now they are being re-submitted under SHA designation, by-passing this process through a fast-track to adopt a much denser and probably more detrimental development.

I am also concerned that there is no real promise / requirement to provide any affordable housing within these areas once consented.

I respectfully ask that the councillors in their decision making award this utmost care and consideration. They are the sole custodians of our nationally important landscape in this matter.

To. Mayor Vanessa van Uden, Councillors Aoake, Ferguson, Forbes, Gazzard, Gilmor, Stammers-Smith, Cocks, Lawton, Macleod, Stevens.

Ayrburn Farm and Arrowtown Affordable Housing-Proposed Social Housing Area.

As residents in the rural community close to Arrowtown and Ayrburn Farm we wanted to convey our strong discomfort with the way these proposed developments have been thrust on our community. The lack of merit and issues with Ayrburn Farm will be well known to the Council so I do not propose to go through these one by one. In the case of Arrowtown after a number years, numerous legal challenges and significant costs the current boundaries have been set and this is clearly what the wider community want. Needless to say these development proposals have nothing to do with affordable housing but are purely an opportunistic use of a new law to fast track development by sidestepping community engagement.

In a fast growing area like ours development will occur and the nature of the rural environment will change but transparency and contestibility are the way to make sure we all have a say in the way that process takes place.

By opting in to the Housing Accord the QLDC has in effect taken away the rights of potentially effected parties to have a voice about their environment. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] perceived conflicts are as detrimental to the integrity of the QLDC as real ones. These types of actions potentially deminish the trust and respect we have for our local body.

We would ask that the Council declines these proposals.

SUBMISSION re EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

Brackens Ridge

I support this proposal because:

It "infills" the existing space between Chartres Green and the houses nearer to the Arrowtown Golf Course. ie Just "infilling" the present urban spread. ("Infill" a popular current buzz word.)

It is a good mix of section sizes.

16 between 200m² and 300m².

21 between 300m² and 400m².

25 more than 400m² and up to 870m².

It is nicely and sensibly planned, ie 2 entrances, extra car parking, green areas, a walking track connecting the two areas and access through the subdivision to the footpath to school.

It is a similar type of subdivision to neighbouring Chartres Green which also has a mix of small and large sections.

It will get good winter sunshine hours and the opportunity for good solar gain as well as nice views towards Tobins Track and the Crown Terrace.

It is close to riverside walking and cycle tracks with its own access to McDonnell Rd track.

It is close to amenities, ie school, dairy, recreation ground and bus transport.

Turning down Arrowtown South was an expensive and short sighted mistake for QLDC and ratepayers. It would have satisfied Arrowtown's housing demands for the next 10 or more years and was not visible to the tourist traffic. There would have been no need for a Special Housing Accord in Arrowtown. Let's get it right this time!!!!

The requirement to start building within 6 months of purchasing the section is a very good move, which will rule out speculators and ensure that the sections are not left sitting empty for long. All of the EOI should have a similar requirement.

It has the support of the Housing Trust.

It will contain "Arrowtown" style houses.

McDonnell Rd.

I object to this proposal because;

I did support Arrowtown South, but always saw crossing McDonnell Rd as sacrosanct!!!!

It encroaches on the open space entrance to Arrowtown.

This development is far too close to the main entrance to Arrowtown and there is no screening proposed.

The present pine trees provide good screening of the present houses on McDonnell Rd. as well as providing them with shelter from the wind.

This is unnecessary urban sprawl and flies in the face of previous planning decisions along the same road.

[REDACTED]

Go back to Arrowtown South, more sections, a sunny location on isolated farmland, away from Arrowtown entrance, out of sight from most tourists.

Manse Rd, Arrowtown

I object to this proposal because;

This would create a sudden impact of dense housing which would be at odds with the screening of houses at Millbrook and the 160m set-back for houses in neighbouring Butel Park.

It may be possible to expand the neighbouring approved but undeveloped subdivision (presently owned by Suburban Estates) in Manse Rd into part of this block. The rest would be better subdivided into larger rural residential type sections creating a softer approach to the entrance to Arrowtown.

A lot of this land does not get very good winter sunshine so is therefore not suitable for "affordable" housing as there would be very little or no solar gain in winter, just when it is needed, therefore pushing up heating costs for those who can't afford it. This I believe is one of the criteria for SHA's.

Onslow Rd, Lake Hayes Estate.

I support this proposal because;

It is an appropriate use of the land in this location without negative impact on most of the surrounding properties.

Rere Rd, Lake Hayes Estate.

I object to this proposal because;

This is not a good location, the access is not good, it is very close to the electricity pylons and high tension wires.

Any houses built would compromise the privacy of the houses below and also create shading on those houses in winter.

This land should always have been part of the adjoining Council Reserve, originally this was a ridiculously shaped section and this part was never meant to be built on.

The application should be refused and then the council negotiate to purchase it and add it to the reserve thus correcting a previous bad decision.

Ayrburn Farm, Arrowtown.

I support this proposal because;

Quite a large area that could be expanded in the future to become another Lake Hayes Estate, the big plus is that it is out of sight from major roads.

Shotover Country.

I support this proposal because;

An out of sight area attached to an already approved subdivision with nearby school, facilities and services. Provided that it is above flood level of course.

Frankton-Ladies Mile Hwy/Jims Way.

I support this proposal because;

It is not visible from a main highway.

It is close to amenities and work places.

Good sunshine.

Already zoned Low Density Residential.

I think that the access should be via the NW corner and then down a new road to the round-about to be formed shortly at the entrance to Frankton Flats. This would give an alternative route to Quail Rise residents and reduce the pressure on the Tucker Beach/Frankton Hwy corner which is already a big problem.

NOTES;

All subdivision conditions should include clauses that ensure that purchasers build within a reasonable time frame to discourage speculators and not leave the area as an ongoing building site for years.

Subdivisions should have a mix of site and house sizes, ie groups of medium density dwellings dotted around the subdivision among more conventional sections, not the medium density en-mass as proposed in the present Bridesdale proposal. The Housing Trust houses in Onslow Street, Lake Hayes Estate, are a good example of what can be done. I have also seen similar pockets dotted amongst new subdivisions in the Kaiapoi area.

QLDC has my full support in ensuring the timely delivery of special housing areas, and after reviewing all the EOI's, the Ayrburn Farm, McDonnell Road and Brackens Ridge are stand out proposals that should be developed for the benefit of the whole Wakatipu community.

The three EOI's mentioned above are all in close proximity to essential community services and places of employment, and even for those whose work place may be Queenstown based, at least they have the alternative transport route, rather than adding more traffic to the already heavily congested Frankton flats to Queenstown roading network.

The existing Lakes Estate, Shotover Country and Jacks Points developments, only provide housing environments with very limited community facilities and almost zero local employment opportunities. Consequently every household in these areas are in their cars everyday commuting to work and choking the existing roading network in these areas. The Frankton Flats - Queenstown roading network needs to be upgraded to handle increasing traffic flows, in conjunction with further residential development proceeds in these areas

My family first brought a property in Arrowtown back in the early 1970's, Boundary road was the actual end of the Arrowtown in those days. There was no McDonnell, no Millbrook and no Cotter Ave or Advance Terrace, or any housing on the ridgeline. If the residents back then took the same closed minded approach, of some of the current self appointed Arrowtown Residents Association, Arrowtown and the surrounding area would not have evolved to what they are today.

Closing Arrowtown's boundary a few years back, has only served to fill the back pockets of some local residents and especially our current Arrowtown Residents Association members. What is needed is controlled development with building and residential design that follow the old

Arrowtown precedent, and this is exactly what the Ayrburn Farm and Brackens Ridge Special Housing proposals will delivery.

Come on QDLC and councillor's look beyond the constant outspoken opponents, who when you look at the numbers, are in the minority and give these Ayrburn Farm, McDonnell Road and Brackens Ridge Special Housing area's the green light, for the benefit of the whole Wakatipu community.

Hello,

We have been made aware of a development application for a 'Highview Terrace Special Housing Area' on Lots 500, 501 & 502.

We would appreciate being kept up to date on this proposed development, we are opposed to this for a number of valid reasons some of which we have outlined below. We sincerely hope our input will be taken on board.

We built our home at [REDACTED] and know the issues with existing infrastructure and we also know these lots well. The reason that no one has built on the site/s to date is because (apart from a relatively small sloped area) the site is basically a step rock bank with the sites in permafrost during winter and shade most of summer. The area would be extremely expensive to build on due to the difficult site, access and conditions.

This area is Low Density Residential zoned and all new builds in this area certainly had to adhere to quite rigid standards/rules when building. The architecture also had to be sensitive to the standard of existing homes in the development. I know in our case there was insufficient water to the site and we had to pay to upgrade and install new water mains. I also can't see the existing sewage being able to handle a development of this scale. Off street parking is essential for any new build in this area also as street parking turns the roads into a oneway system.

To be honest we are really surprised that a poor site like this would be considered for a special housing zone?, it's a very difficult site, it would be an expensive build and would be very cold. We would be the neighbour to the housing cluster which would obviously devalue the area. We do understand the need for low cost housing but feel there are far better sites like the areas around the High School or any of the underutilized suburbs off Gorge road would be far better suited to a project like this - Flat sites, sun and walking distance to the CBD which relieves parking pressure in the town.

Thank you for your time,

Hi there,

We would like to raise our objections to the Special Housing Areas proposed for Lake Hayes Estate (those proposed for Rere Road and Onslow Road).

QLDC have already cleared the way for Bridesdale Farm without consultation with Lake Hayes Estate residents. Whilst we understand that the council do not have to consult the community regarding Special Housing Areas, we do feel that if these Special Housing Areas are going to change the make-up of our community then we have a right to a voice.

Bridesdale Farm will bring increased traffic, noise and strain on power, water and sewerage to our estate and we are very concerned about this. Now we discover that QLDC plan to allow a further two special housing areas to be added to Lake Hayes Estate.

We would like to raise our objection for the following reasons:

- many residents were attracted to LHE due to its open green spaces. QLDC are taking these away and crowding houses into small areas. This will damage the outlook of the estate.
- with only one entrance and exit to LHE we feel that QLDC has not adequately planned for the increased traffic these special housing areas will cause
- strain on sewerage, water and power. LHE already suffers many power cuts during Winter as the grid cannot cope with the number of houses in LHE and Shotover Country, an increase in housing will only make this worse. The same goes for water and sewerage
- Regarding Rere Road - building units so close to a park is not in the best interests of the community who use the park
- Regarding Onslow Road - this is far too close to the walking track at the end of Widgeon Place, which is already very close to Bridesdale Farm - this lovely walking area will be ruined.

We do not feel the council has fully thought through these actions and are rather panic building and in this not considering the families already living in these areas and the impact on them and the community. We strongly feel that whether this is a Special Housing Area or not the community should be consulted - this is our right.

Please consider this email as an objection to this plan.

Please advise whom we approach to air our concerns and objections.

Dear Councillors,

After consideration, I would like to express my support for the recent proposal of housing in Arrowtown under the name of Brackens Ridge. I believe the proposal to be a well thought out solution to the current housing issues that face the Wakatipu Basin and supportive of urban development of Arrowtown that will stand well in the future.

While some may argue for the establishment of more and more satellite communities, I believe that extending established communities will result long term in building communities of character and maximising the return on the development and maintenance of infrastructure.

We live in a slice of paradise, and others wish to come here to live, work and raise families as we are lucky enough to do. This growing population is supporting our burgeoning local economy. Accommodating this growth in citizens must be planned with a long term view to avoid development we regret in the future.

As you are well aware, integral to getting it right is incorporating well thought out development with the Special Housing Areas initiative by the Government in partnership with councils such as QLDC. Intended to open up land for affordable, good quality housing in districts where there is a shortage of accommodation and/or high prices, this will see 1300 new dwellings in the Wakatipu over the next 3 years.

A balanced application of this growth should see Arrowtown offer a share of the new homes, ideally developed in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the town and in doing so contribute to Arrowtown of the future..

With controlled development, Arrowtown can support a larger population and in turn a larger population will allow Arrowtown to support its needs locally. E.g. A larger population will support local businesses supplying goods and services to locals instead of a reliance on driving to Frankton or Queenstown. A larger ratepayer base will strengthen Arrowtown's right to a greater share of the rates take.

Population size does not create sprawl or consume community character, bad urban design and ad hoc town planning does.

From what I have seen, Brackens Ridge offers an appealing layout and design that integrates nicely into the character of Arrowtown and importantly, doesn't create infill. The design offers attractive housing options that integrate 'affordable housing' with less 'affordable housing'. (I say this tongue in cheek as what would parents and grandparents think of what is considered a minimum entry size dwelling in 2015!) Further, there is already housing directly adjacent to Brackens Ridge so it does not have a visual impact that development on a completely undeveloped site and environs would have.

It is my understanding that a key criteria for a special housing area is that land within and adjacent to urban areas will be considered first and have priority over those that are not. Brackens Ridge fits these criteria (amongst others). Brackens Ridge is within easy walking distance to key community infrastructure such as the Primary School, pre-school, workplaces, convenience shops, tennis courts, golf, rugby field, river, walking/cycling tracks and public transport route.

To summarise, the key reasons that I support the Brackens Ridge proposal are;

1. By breaking fresh ground Brackens Ridge does not result in infill which would potentially ruin the character of Arrowtown that many are fighting so hard to protect.

2. Brackens Ridge's location immediately adjacent to Arrowtown allows existing infrastructure to either be used more efficiently or at a lower cost of extension rather than 'from scratch' as would be required from satellite proposals at a distance from any existing settlement.
 3. By Brackens Ridge contributing to the development of the 1300 new dwellings coming to the Wakatipu Basin under the Special Housing Areas initiative, Arrowtown will share in the economic benefits of controlled population increase.
 4. Brackens Ridge's proximity to Arrowtown will not contribute detrimentally to vehicle traffic as it will encourage walking or cycling to amenities or use of public transport.
 5. Population size does not create sprawl or consume community character, bad urban design and ad hoc town planning does. Brackens Ridge's design is sympathetic to Arrowtown's character whilst being highly attractive to any would be resident. While including 'affordable housing' the quality and aesthetic is high end.
-

Hi

We are property owners in St Andrews Park and wish to object to the proposal for the subdivision and building of affordable housing in this area.

We bought our property on St George Avenue from the developer, [REDACTED], when he did the development. One of his main selling points was that it was going to be a high end development of low density housing and sections 600 sq metres and larger.

Now our understanding is, the same person [REDACTED] is a director of this company that wishes to subdivide his remaining sections to areas of about 350 sq metres and less, and build houses which will be out of character with the rest of the development.

With the high density housing we believe it will cause undue congestion. There appears to be no provision for car parking and with the majority of families having two cars or more we see the whole Highview Terrace (street) being cluttered with parked cars from the house owners and their visitors.

Thank you for taking time to read this and we hope the Council does not approve this proposal.

Dear Councillors,

After consideration, I would like to express my support for the recent proposal of housing in Arrowtown under the name of Brackens Ridge. I believe the proposal to be a well thought out solution to the current housing issues that face the Wakatipu Basin and supportive of urban development of Arrowtown that will stand well in the future.

While some may argue for the establishment of more and more satellite communities, I believe that extending established communities will result long term in building communities of character and maximising the return on the development and maintenance of infrastructure.

We live in a slice of paradise, and others wish to come here to live, work and raise families as we are lucky enough to do. This growing population is supporting our burgeoning local economy. Accommodating this growth in citizens must be planned with a long term view to avoid development we regret in the future.

As you are well aware, integral to getting it right is incorporating well thought out development with the Special Housing Areas initiative by the Government in partnership with councils such as QLDC. Intended to open up land for affordable, good quality housing in districts where there is a shortage of accommodation and/or high prices, this will see 1300 new dwellings in the Wakatipu over the next 3 years.

A balanced application of this growth should see Arrowtown offer a share of the new homes, ideally developed in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the town and in doing so contribute to Arrowtown of the future..

With controlled development, Arrowtown can support a larger population and in turn a larger population will allow Arrowtown to support its needs locally. E.g. A larger population will support local businesses supplying goods and services to locals instead of a reliance on driving to Frankton or Queenstown. A larger ratepayer base will strengthen Arrowtown's right to a greater share of the rates take.

Population size does not create sprawl or consume community character, bad urban design and ad hoc town planning does.

From what I have seen, Brackens Ridge offers an appealing layout and design that integrates nicely into the character of Arrowtown and importantly, doesn't create infill. The design offers attractive housing options that integrate 'affordable housing' with less 'affordable housing'. (I say this tongue in cheek as what would parents and grandparents think of what is considered a minimum entry size dwelling in 2015!) Further, there is already housing directly adjacent to Brackens Ridge so it does not have a visual impact that development on a completely undeveloped site and environs would have.

It is my understanding that a key criteria for a special housing area is that land within and adjacent to urban areas will be considered first and have priority over those that are not. Brackens Ridge fits these criteria (amongst others). Brackens Ridge is within easy walking distance to key community infrastructure such as the Primary School, pre-school, workplaces, convenience shops, tennis courts, golf, rugby field, river, walking/cycling tracks and public transport route.

To summarise, the key reasons that I support the Brackens Ridge proposal are;

1. By breaking fresh ground Brackens Ridge does not result in infill which would potentially ruin the character of Arrowtown that many are fighting so hard to protect.

2. Brackens Ridge's location immediately adjacent to Arrowtown allows existing infrastructure to either be used more efficiently or at a lower cost of extension rather than 'from scratch' as would be required from satellite proposals at a distance from any existing settlement.
 3. By Brackens Ridge contributing to the development of the 1300 new dwellings coming to the Wakatipu Basin under the Special Housing Areas initiative, Arrowtown will share in the economic benefits of controlled population increase.
 4. Brackens Ridge's proximity to Arrowtown will not contribute detrimentally to vehicle traffic as it will encourage walking or cycling to amenities or use of public transport.
 5. Population size does not create sprawl or consume community character, bad urban design and ad hoc town planning does. Brackens Ridge's design is sympathetic to Arrowtown's character whilst being highly attractive to any would be resident. While including 'affordable housing' the quality and aesthetic is high end.
-

Hello Mayor van Uden,

With the deadline fast approaching for the council's final decision on affordable housing areas around Wakatipu, I wanted to contact you and express my support for developing affordable housing in Brackens Ridge.

My partner and I moved to Queenstown last year, because we were expecting a child and wanted to be closer to his family. At the time, we were lucky enough to find a moderately-priced rental unit in Arrowtown. However, when we began looking for something more permanent, we were both appalled to learn that there was nothing (and, according to real estate agents) would be nothing in Arrowtown selling for less than 500,000.

We're both university graduates, tax payers and good parents - yet the serious lack of cost-effective housing in the area has sadly turned us away. I know several other new families worrying over the same issue, and would beg you to consider the many benefits of Brackens Ridge as the preferred option for extra housing in Arrowtown!

Help future families enjoy the benefits of Arrowtown, without pushing them away simply because too many wealthy area homeowners have jumped up prices and prefer to keep things that way.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dear Councillors,

I am writing to express my support for the Brackens Ridge affordable housing proposal. I believe this will provide some much needed housing for first home buyers and rentals in Arrowtown. It makes perfect sense to put some housing next to the urban area.

To: QLDC Councillors

I write regarding the housing accord and the growth required in the basin in the next few years. It is only fair Arrowtown shoulders some of the responsibility for growth in the basin especially when there is ideal land for urban development right next door to the town.

I feel the 'Brackens Ridge' option for affordable housing is well planned and ticks all the boxes for a variety of housing options for positive growth in Arrowtown.

I urge you to select this option next to the town before you allow other adhoc urban development on rural land in the basin.

Dear All,

I am writing to express my views on Special Housing Areas, specifically Lake Hayes Estate plots on Rere Rd, and Onslow Road. I am a home owner on nearby Herries Lane, and I am already negatively impacted by the 'affordable housing' project here in the Estate.

I am against the formation of high-density housing being put into an area where residents have come to expect low density housing in keeping with the overall Estate. Each day I drive passed the 'affordable housing' bordering Onslow Road, opposite the childcare centre I am frustrated at the lack of planning and foresight as I drive down a road littered with cars parked on road reserve, destroying the grass, reducing the aesthetics and potentially proving dangerous as visibility is reduced in an area full of children playing. It is an eyesore formed directly as a result of high-density housing, a lack of compulsory off-street parking where many of the dwellings have 2-4 vehicles where rooms are rented out to cut costs.

When I bought and built in the Estate, such eyesores were not in the brochure let's say. I do not support continuing to blot our community environment here with two-storey, back to back, poorly planned high density dwellings. I am a supporter of affordable homes, with my opinion being that they should blend into the community, be fully provisioned with car parking off the streets like the rest of us. I am also of the opinion that there should be provision in each large sub-division, at the time of sub-division for such projects. That way people will have an expectation of increased congestion and no latter effect on aesthetics, traffic volumes or their property value etc. I am against these projects being thrust onto unsuspecting neighbours or neighbouring communities. I would expect to see approximately 75 more vehicles driving passed the entrance to Herries Lane on Onslow Road, with the development of over 20 of these properties crammed onto that site. I can

cope with some development as it is bare land and privately owned, but to to have well over double what we would expect given the available land area is a bitter pill to swallow.

Please consider the desires and the long-term expectations of those of us that have made and call this area home, the values of our community and the direction we would like it to head in.

Hi there,

We would like to raise the following concerns regarding this matter, as it effect's us as homeowners of 58 Highview Terrace.

- the chosen site does not lend itself to affordable housing, due to its topography & geology
- due to the efforts that all the residents have put in to the appearance and appeal of St. Andrews Park area, we feel that this development will be detrimental to all parties
- we feel the size of the proposed sections will cause parking issues, as the onsite parking will be non existent or minimal at best, which will lead to an increase of on-street parking on an already clogged main road.

We may be in further contact if we have any additional concerns.

In the meantime, could you please keep us informed of any future developments on this matter.

SUBJECT:

Support of Brackens Ridge as the preferred option for extra housing in Arrowtown and surrounds

MESSAGE:

Dear Councillors,

I am writing with regard to the recent expressions of interest for affordable housing in the Queenstown Lake District.

I have read this submission, and totally agree with the points raised and would like to add my name in support of the Brackens Ridge option for Housing.

I have lived at Arrow Junction for 49 years and believe that Brackens Ridge is by far the best option for additional housing in Arrowtown.

Demand to live in Arrowtown will continue to increase for as long as we continue to promote its uniqueness and for as long as we continue to have children! To completely turn off the supply of residential, commercial and community space will only serve to make land even more unaffordable for our residents and employers and further exacerbate our over-reliance on Queenstown and Frankton for workers, income and food.

We cannot stop population growth. For local lobby groups and retailers to attempt to halt all forms of growth is short-sighted and no less authoritarian than the very organisation they are fighting. Population growth is a part of nature.

Until we learn to use our land more efficiently, reduce land prices and reach the critical population mass necessary to greatly improve Arrowtown's economic self-sufficiency, we will forever be condemned to relying on our cars to source our basic needs outside of Arrowtown and will continue to pay high rates by spreading the cost of services over a small population base. This is neither environmentally or economically sustainable. Brackens Ridge is offering a solution to a problem that needs to be addressed.

Many European villages sustain much higher population numbers than Arrowtown whilst maintaining quaintness and uniqueness these villages are popular and loved by tourists the world over.

Brackens Ridge offers an appropriate and logical place in Arrowtown to cater to affordable housing demand. It is within easy walking distance to key community infrastructure such as the Primary School, pre-school, workplaces, convenience shops, tennis courts, golf, rugby field, river, walking/cycling tracks and public transport route.

Brackens Ridge offers an appealing layout and design that integrates nicely into the character of Arrowtown avoiding the need for infill which has its own issues.

To have any significant affect on housing supply and therefore affordability, infill would require a large group individuals within the urban area to put forth their existing residential properties into smaller sections simultaneously. As well as not solving the affordability problem at hand, it can reduce privacy and sunlight for neighbours, and increase noise levels. It can also damage the character of an area, reducing amenity values such as open space, trees and vegetation, and thus property values. There are also environmental impacts such as increased run off, increased erosion, and removal of wind protection.

Brackens Ridge has established natural boundaries of 3 great golf courses and the existing roads (MacDonnell & Centennial Ave).

There is already housing directly adjacent to Brackens Ridge - visual impact is minimised.

Reticulated infrastructure makes efficient use of existing networks with no need for any off-site upgrades. Creating new connections in satellite developments will be costly. A full network analysis has been previously undertaken for a more widespread urban development of the land in question, and that reporting established that all networks have the capacity to cope with the additional demands on infrastructure (council has access to all said reporting).

Due to the imminent government pressure for affordable housing in our district, it is becoming increasingly obvious that Arrowtown will need to shoulder its portion of this issue. Rather than risk 'ad-hoc/piece-meal' development, Brackens Ridge offers a well thought out visually appealing addition to Arrowtown and provides warm energy efficient housing designed to be consistent with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines.

A rather more pessimistic view but non the less relevant (perhaps for those who are against Adam Feely's, Ayrburn or infill)

If there must be an increase in housing in Arrowtown, Brackens Ridge, is the preferred option.

To QLDC Councilor's

I have been watching with interest the affordable housing opportunities, especially around Arrowtown, and I want to express my support for the Brackens Ridge affordable housing opportunity. A few years ago we looked at the opportunity to develop a mid-range supermarket in the Arrowtown area, however we differed the project for two main reasons - one was the population volume of the town and the second was the issue of finding and holding staff in the Arrowtown area. My staff find it hard enough to find accommodation in Queenstown and we considered, at that time, it would be even more of a challenge in Arrowtown.

I feel Arrowtown needs more local population volume to attract new businesses and staff for the new and existing businesses. A housing project of the size and the locality of Brackens Ridge adjacent to Arrowtown is exactly the catalyst that will allow business owners to review their options for the future. It has been well planned and I don't believe it will have any detrimental effects where it is proposed. So please do seriously consider this option as great step forward for the town and its economic viability.

To: The QLDC Councillors

I am taking the time to lodge a submission in favour of the Brackens Ridge Affordable Housing opportunity for the Wakatipu basin.

My business is providing comfortable, affordable workers accommodation in Queenstown and around the Wakatipu.

Unlike many residential developers I am not a speculator as I buy build and hold all my rental stock. For several years I have been looking for an Arrowtown land opportunity to build and hold a stock of rental houses for the town - my criteria is land needs to be North facing and walking distance to the main town centre. The land at Brackens Ridge could provide me with this opportunity. It is adjacent

to the town north facing, bounded by golf courses and has easy access to school and the town facilities - ideal for residential rentals and building modern affordable housing.

Of the options presented for affordable housing around Arrowtown I believe this land offers the best volume for the town to get some future critical mass, but done in the most sympathetic way, in terms of environmental impact, landscaping and visual design.

As a long time local, an ex-Arrowtown School board member (with my children still at the school) and an active Arrowtown sports coach - I feel I have the best interests of the town in mind and I feel my future rentals would add to a positive future for the town which presently obviously needs more capacity before it will get several key investments like a supermarket and petrol station that we would all like.

After consultation with several Arrowtown businesses that struggle to attract staff because of minimal affordable rental accommodation, I know I could create great housing in this area that would be an asset for businesses in the town.

I believe a successful affordable housing project of this size will encourage investors and business owners like myself to invest in the town and help create a stand alone economy into the future.

I hope this submission helps you make the right choice for Arrowtown's long term future.

To the Elected Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Expressions of Interest for Special Housing Areas (SHA) in the Wakatipu Basin. We are concerned and disappointed that the Council will not undertake formal consultation of these development proposals that, if approved, will so clearly impact on existing communities and the integrity of the District Plan. We are unaware of any independent planning review of the proposals to assist the decision making by the Elected Members.

We are specifically opposed to the Ayrburn Farms proposal which will see the introduction of dense urban development within the Rural General zone. The proposal will represent ad-hoc and one- dimensional residential urban development well beyond existing urban areas. It will not allow for integration of different activities within the development, and will not maintain or enhance the character of the surrounding area. It will not be integrated with existing communities. It would be contrary to District Plan urban growth, rural, residential, and transport objectives and policies. We consider the only sensible decision the Council can make is to decline the proposal.

As permanent residents at [REDACTED], in the Rural Living (Mill Creek Zone), we have an expectation that fundamental zoning changes in our area would be undertaken in an open and well considered manner. Given the current planning provisions, there has been absolutely no reason to anticipate dense urban development in the immediate vicinity of our property.

We consider you should not seek to satisfy “affordable” housing targets at any cost. Rather you should very carefully evaluate the proposals, and have particular regard to your Lead Policy, which specifically states at 5.2.1 (emphasis added):

“The proposed area shall be located within or adjacent to existing urban areas. Areas in rural areas remote from existing urban areas and services will generally not be viewed favourably.”

The Ayrburn Farms site is not within or adjacent to an existing urban area, and therefore must fail this very important policy test.

To ensure good decisions are made, we urge you to consider the wider context of the developments in the community and environment. This requires consideration of the longer term affordability, planning, environmental, and social implications of introducing new greenfield development areas. This is particularly relevant where developments are within the Rural General zone, or are adjoining Rural Residential and Rural Living zones that are remote from existing centres. Those zones have very different characteristics to the comparatively dense developments required for a SHA.

We are also concerned that proposals for SHA in the Rural General zone are being used as an opportunistic planning “foot in the door” for urban development. We anticipate this will lead to future urban development pressure around those areas under the guise of expansion of “existing” urban settlements. This approach can already be seen in discussion within the Ayrburn Farms application attempting to justify the zoning of rural land on the basis of previous decisions to undertake urban development in the Wakatipu Basin in a disjointed and ad-hoc manner. We consider further urban development in this area would be inappropriate.

We consider that if Council determines there is any merit in proposals to allow urban development in the rural areas proposed, it should only be considered through the upcoming District Plan review, or a Plan Change subject to the full Resource Management Act process. Those processes allow comprehensive consideration of the full range of issues associated with possible urban development of Rural areas. They are also subject to community input, independent review, and robust decision making.

We provide further discussion of specific concerns in the attachment to this letter. If you would like to discuss these further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Attachment

Concerns with the Ayrburns Farms Special Housing Proposal Decision requested: DECLINE

1. Ad-hoc Development of the Rural General zone

The proposal does not join any existing urban area, and is located within the Rural General zone. It sits well outside the Arrowtown urban boundary. We are not aware of any future growth strategies or policies that anticipate urban development in this area. We consider that 150 houses is large enough to have a significant impact on the surrounding environment and community, yet is not large enough to offer residents of the proposed community the normal community facilities expected of an urban area.

This is inconsistent with Policy 4.7.5 of the District Plan:

“To avoid sporadic and/or ad hoc urban development in the rural area generally. To strongly discourage urban extensions in the rural areas beyond the Urban Growth Boundaries.”

2. Lack of Integration with the Existing Community

The surrounding area is characterised rural and by large lot rural living development where lot sizes are typically over 5,000m². The introduction of urban development in the immediate area with typical lots sizes of 300m² is such a significant difference that we have concerns how the proposed development will integrate with the existing community, both from a character and social aspect. Recognising the absurdity of this difference, the developer instead intends to hide the development as much as possible. However, it is not possible to hide access roads, traffic and noise!

This is inconsistent with Policy 4.7.8 and Policy 7.3.1 of the District Plan:

4.7.8 “To recognise existing land use patterns, natural features, the landscape and heritage values of the District and the receiving environment to inform the location of Urban Growth Boundaries” ;

7. 3.1 “To protect and enhance the cohesion of residential activity and the sense of community and well being obtained from residential neighbours”.

3. Uniformity of development

Developing a new urban area solely for those requiring affordable housing, and with very small sections would seem to be an inappropriate way to develop urban communities, and is inconsistent with District Plan Policy 7.3.10:

“To provide for and encourage new and imaginative residential development forms within the major new residential areas.”

4. Inappropriate location for future urban expansion

The proposed development would inevitably lead to pressures to develop the land around the proposal with a similar urban context. This is one of the few locations where those using Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road have the opportunity to take in the surrounds with a rural outlook. To the west, the rural land also becomes more visible from the cycle trail and Speargrass Flat Road.

This is inconsistent with Policy 7.1.5 of the District Plan:

“To maintain a distinction between the urban and rural areas in order to assist in protecting the quality and character of the surrounding environment and visual amenity.”

5. Services

We have just come off a summer with significant water restrictions. We fail to understand how the existing network could accommodate a further 150 households without affecting the security of adequate water supply to our property. We expect this could place additional cost on Council and ratepayers to rectify.

6. Transport

The site is totally dependent on private vehicle use. Cycle access to Arrowtown would be on a rural trail that requires travel up a significant hill, which will suit only a dedicated few. It would be unsafe at night due to lack of lighting. The direct route via Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road would be unsafe for cyclists due to traffic speed and volume. Community amenities and facilities are not in walking distance. The site is not sufficiently large to have a bus route deviate into it, and the

walking distance to possible bus stops on Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road is significant.

This car dependency will add to existing congestion issues further along the road network, such as at the SH6 intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, at other existing development accesses on SH6, and along Frankton Road. Overall, the car dependency and location of this development will carry a high transport cost for both residents and the community generally.

This is inconsistent with Policy 14.1.5:

“To promote the efficient use of fuel for transport purposes, by providing for a District wide policy of consolidated urban areas, townships, retail centres and residential environments.”

We are concerned that the access location is too close to Speargrass Flat Road / Hogans Valley Road cross-road intersection. The confusion caused by the closely spaced intersections could lead to serious accidents in this higher speed area. The widening treatment proposed at the access does not exist at the more important Speargrass Flat Road intersection, which will place additional cost on Council and ratepayers to rectify.

No assessment of the use of Speargrass Flat Road is made in the documents, which is a Local Road in the District Plan. Residents will want to travel down Speargrass Flat Road to access Queenstown. This will be both to avoid the busy route via Lake Hayes rejoining SH6 at the Shotover River, or to travel via Arthurs Point. This will lead to a need to change the one-lane bridge (which has marginal visibility) to two-lane to maintain safety for car drivers. No provision is made by the developer for this significant upgrade.

This is inconsistent with Policy 14.2.2:

“To ensure the intensity and nature of activities along particular roads is compatible with road capacity and function, to ensure both vehicle and pedestrian safety.”

The inevitable transport patterns will place pressure on provision of a full development access to Speargrass Flat Road. No consideration of the feasibility or impacts of such an access have been undertaken within the proposal.

Speargrass Flat Road currently has a lower volume rural character, and is well used by both road cyclists and recreational cyclists as one of the few rural roads where traffic volumes are lower and the environment more suitable for cycling. The increase in traffic will reduce the attractiveness for this activity due to safety concerns. Widening the road to accommodate the increase in traffic would increase speeds and affect the rural character.

This is inconsistent with Objective 6 - Pedestrian and Cycle Transport:

“Recognise, encourage and provide for the safe movement of cyclists and pedestrians in a pleasant environment within the District.”

To Whom It May Concern

As residents of Highview Terrace we were disappointed and saddened to read recently that our street is being considered for a “Special Housing Area”, so-called affordable homes, 18 in total to be built on 3 sections in the back of our subdivision.

St Andrews has become known as a prestigious area to live. Houses are currently selling for between \$700,000 to \$1,400,000.

It appears that the developer (St Andrews Park Ltd) is intending to hide these "affordable" homes behind the better quality houses already established in the area. We quote from the application from St Andrews Park Ltd,

"To the south is the existing line of houses fronting Highview Terrace. Most of these have been recently developed and the area is gaining a developed character..... Residential development on this site will largely be obscured from public view by the existing development fronting Highview Terrace."

Why should cheaper homes be allowed in this subdivision??

We strongly oppose this development for the following reasons:

- Low cost, high density housing is not acceptable in a very prestigious area. What effect will these low-cost homes have on the value of neighbouring homes ?
- In winter, the area in question for the development can be in permafrost for 3-4 months
- Traffic congestion. 2 lanes from this "Special Housing Area" would come directly onto Highview Terrace. Highview Terrace is already a very busy road. Recently speed bumps have been placed in the hope of slowing traffic down, With the congestion on Frankton Road, many people choose to use Goldfield/Highview Terrace as a way to dodge rush hour congestion.
- Parking. Is there sufficient room for car parking on the sections and lanes in this development? Should cars need to be parked on Highview Terrace (a real possibility in winter months) this will add to the already congested road. Many rental homes already have 4-6 cars parked outside them, more often on the street.
- Closeness of homes to existing houses
- Subdividing sections: Why is this developer allowed to have sections of such a small size? 12 of the 18 sections are less than 350sq m. We would not be allowed to subdivide our 750 Sq m section, directly across the road from the development.
- As we live at [REDACTED] and own the section at [REDACTED], the traffic flow from the eastern lane should this development go ahead, will impact on the access to and from our properties

We wish to be kept informed of any further developments in this "Special Housing Area" being submitted to council.

Thanking you

I am the owner of [REDACTED] Queenstown and wish to state my objections to such a project going ahead.

I wish to point out that this would devalue my property considerably. Existing homes in this area

of a high standard and 'Special Housing' would bring this level down.

The existing Highview Terrace/St George Rd corner is already a high traffic area.

The proposed site for these houses is permanently frosted during the winter with no sun whatsoever. The houses directly behind me would have to straddle a natural creek. This turns into a water feature as it crosses under St George Rd and to pipe this would be a travesty to the area.

Planned 2 bedroom houses would bring transient renters to the area and no public transport in the immediate vicinity.

I feel this is just not the site for cheap housing with little or no parking facilities and no bus route.

We also have wonderful wild life that come down to the creek and this would be lost to us forever.

Please keep me informed of any movements to these plans.

Thank you

As an Arrowtown ratepayer I am joining the growing ranks of disenchanted locals, and wish to make you aware of my serious concerns over Special Housing Areas.

The acceptance and effectiveness of SHAs needs to be considered as a separate issue to the actual location of such areas. Clearly if the concept of SHAs is rejected outright as potentially having more negative impacts than any possible benefits, then the question of where those SHAs might go, becomes irrelevant. My concerns over SHAs in the QLDC region are :

SHAs:

- 1) Circumventing of the traditional planning process.
- 2) No guarantee of desired outcome.
- 3) Lack of consultation and ratepayer input.
- 4) Perceived covert agenda by Council.
- 5) Untried and untested longterm.

It seems highly probable that sections will be bought by investors for land banking, or alternatively that properties will be rented out by investors. What does seem almost inevitable is that SHAs will not automatically provide affordable 'Cheap' housing as desired.

In addition to the principle of SHAs, there are considerable concerns with some, if not all, the proposed areas in Arrowtown. These are :

- 1) Existing and agreed town boundaries being overridden in most cases.
- 2) Visual impact. (Especially Brackens Ridge with little or no hiding from the main incoming tourist road).
- 3) Section sizes as low as 220 Sq M are too small and will cause problems long term.

4) The impact on services, schools, community facilities, etc non of which appear to have been researched by Council.

5) Car parking issues, with inadequate allowance for two car families.

Arrowtown is not just any New Zealand small town. Visitors come here in their thousands because of its uniqueness and village atmosphere and feel. This is just one of the reasons that the Arrowtown boundary has been so fully endorsed. Services and facilities are questionable should the town grow much more. Once Council approves these developments in historic Arrowtown the genie will be out of the bottle and any long term effects on this very special and historic little town will then be the legacy of those councillors that sanction them.

Dear Mayor Vanessa van Uden - please find below photos of flooding at Mill Creek - which runs through the middle of Mr Meehan's proposed development.

In his proposal, his consultants state that there might be a danger of a 'once in one hundred year flood' - this is nonsense, its more like a 'once every three year flood'!

I don't believe this is an appropriate place for a subdivision - not only would there be damage to housing but it would be a dangerous place to live for families with young children.

Thanks for taking the time to read this email.

Dear Cath - please find below photos of flooding at Mill Creek - which runs through the middle of Mr Meehan's proposed development.

In his proposal, his consultants state that there might be a danger of a 'once in one hundred year flood' - this is nonsense, its more like a 'once every three year flood'!

I don't believe this is an appropriate place for a subdivision - not only would there be damage to housing but it would be a dangerous place to live for families with young children.

Thanks for taking the time to read this email.

Dear Councillors et al

I hear a decision will be made soon regarding further development in Arrowtown. Brackens Ridge is the logical answer. It ticks all the boxes.

I would like to formally voice my support for the Brackens Ridge development in Arrowtown

I have read in the local media that council is due to make a decision around the much needed further development in Arrowtown. I support Brackens Ridge as it is close to the school, parks and heart of the town. It makes sense.

Thank you for your time.

Dear Mr Edmonds,

We would like to raise our objections to the Special Housing Areas proposed by your firm for Lake Hayes Estate, those proposed for Rere Road and Onslow Road. We have been advised to contact the builder proposing these areas directly along with the council to voice our concerns.

QLDC have already cleared the way for Bridesdale Farm without consultation with Lake Hayes Estate residents. Whilst we understand that the council do not have to consult the community regarding Special Housing Areas, we do feel that if these Special Housing Areas are going to change the make-up of our community then we have a right to a voice and will be opposing your plans most strongly to ensure the character of our lovely estate, that our green areas are maintained and that cramped housing is not built without consulting this close knit community.

Bridesdale Farm will bring increased traffic, noise and strain on power, water and sewerage to our estate and we are very concerned about this. Now we discover that your firm plan to add a further two special housing areas to be added to Lake Hayes Estate.

We would like to raise our objection for the following reasons:

- many residents were attracted to LHE due to it's open green spaces. Your firm is taking these away and crowding houses into small areas. This will damage the outlook of the estate.
- with only one entrance and exit to LHE we feel that your firm has not adequately planned for the increased traffic these special housing areas will cause
- strain on sewerage, water and power. LHE already suffers many power cuts during Winter as the grid cannot cope with the number of houses in LHE and Shotover Country, an increase in housing will only make this worse. The same goes for water and sewerage
- Regarding Rere Road - building units so close to a park is not in the best interests of the community who use the park
- Regarding Onslow Road - this is far too close to the walking track at the end of Widgeon Place, which is already very close to Bridesdale Farm - this lovely walking area will be ruined.

We do not feel you have fully thought through these actions and are not considering the families already living in these areas and the impact on them and the community. We strongly feel that whether this is a Special Housing Area or not the community should be consulted - this is our right.

Please consider this email as an objection to this plan and we, along with other members of the Lake Hayes Community, will be strongly opposing your plans to build housing on our lovely green areas. We have already lodged our concerns about your building plans with QLDC, Marc Bretherton, QLCHT and Mayor van Uden. We will also be forwarding our concerns to the Housing Minister.

Dear Mayor Vanessa

It is with deep concern and shock that I write this email.

I'm writing with regard to Ayrburn Farm Developments (Chris Meehan) proposed plan for a 150 section development right in the middle, of one of the Wakatipu's most revered and beautiful rural landscapes. Not only is it an area of great natural beauty, but it is also an important ecological area for various wildlife species, which live in this location.

Along with the wildlife, the local property owners would be severely compromised. The people who neighbour this RURAL GENERAL zoned land have paid handsomely to purchase their properties with the understanding, under the local RMA rules, any development on the farmland next door would be incredibly unlikely and without doubt, need to be publicly notified.

To allow Meehan's development, would be grossly unfair and undemocratic.

I've read through the proposal and find it to be [REDACTED]

Along with a long list of infrastructure issues that make this application an utter nonsense, one of the most alarming points, is the DEFINITE pollution that will occur if 150 sections are developed. The storm water run off, the various fluids the residents pour down their storm drains and the oil and fuel coming off the sealed roads, is going to run straight into Lake Hayes.

Would you like to see Lake Hayes ruined?

Is this really something you want to be remembered for?

Dear Queenstown Council,

I wish to submit this letter for my support for the Special Housing Accord;

My family is from around here and I returned home to Queenstown in 2007 to raise my daughter, I have seen a lot of change in the area and an immense growth. It is an exciting and beautiful place.

With personal experience searching for housing in this area both to rent and to buy I know we are in desperate need of an increase in the supply of housing in Queenstown Lakes, both for people to buy and also for rental.

The way I see it is that this shortage of housing has to be built, and built sooner rather than later. The need is for 'affordable' and with basic economics an increase in supply to meet the demand will mean the section prices will reduce. The cost of building is what it is but the government has allowances for help with this. Affordability is a complex issue but to start with we need land made available.

I have been onto the council website and have had a look at the expressions of interest; there is a lot of information available and the process is transparent. To me it makes sense for the submissions in already established housing areas like the ones in Onslow Road, Rere Road and Shotover Country to be allowed to go through fast in a streamlined process, these areas are already housing areas and the precedent has been set, there is no change to the land use. I see

that some developers seem very committed to this, for example the Onslow Road submission, it very comprehensive and looks ready for the land to be prepared and made available very quickly.

The same applies to Arthurs Point and to an extent Homestead Bay and above Frankton Road in Highview.

I really do hope that the council does not allow itself to get tied up in negative feedback and makes some quick decisions to help with the critical housing crisis we have in this area.

I am writing in support of the special housing applications.

I have reviewed all the applications listed on the site and see some real benefits in some of the applications, in particular those in already developed areas, such as lake hayes estate and shot over country.

I do struggle to see how small sections valued at over \$200k - \$280k can be classed as affordable, you can already purchase larger sections at jacks point for lower than this, although, these new developments may not have the covenants which increase build costs.

I fully agree with the comments made by Julie Scott in stating that \$450k is not affordable for the majority of people looking to enter the housing market. As a single dad, employed in a professional career, with a reasonable deposit, I can obtain finance to purchase a property of around \$350k.

I see some of the applications as an opportunity for developers to push through development with little focus on offering affordable housing, clearly they have based the affordable house price at \$450k which is based on the governments median house price %.

They seem to be focused on obtaining medium density housing with smaller sections, but still charging a premium for these.

I have looked at the Shotover Country application and this new development seems to fit with the criteria and the new infrastructure can handle the increase in population.

The Onslow Road application, is an ideal opportunity to utilise land to develop some small and hopefully affordable housing, without a major impact on the infrastructure and ideal for young families, plenty of sun and in an area where Bridesdale farm has already been submitted.

I currently rent in Arrowtown and would love for development to take place in this area, but unfortunately, I see the proposals as still been out of my reach financially, they appear to be at the higher end of the applications. I am also well aware of the consensus of arrowtown residents in relation to affordable housing, look no further than the reaction to the Suffolk street, community housing trust development, from the local home owners in arrowtown. Good on Lex Perkins and the council for pushing this through, an absolute improvement and fitting with the local area, an absolute success.

I wish the council to seriously consider the applications, but to take into consideration the concerns raised by Julie Scott and look at what is really affordable housing and not the opportunity to cash in on reduced bureaucracy in order to push through applications.

Dear Vanessa,

I am writing on behalf of The Arrowtown Promotion and Business Association.

We are in the middle of an Arrowtown ward by election, so the ward is presently unrepresented at QLDC.

We understand that proposals for Special Housing developments which may affect Arrowtown, are presently before the council.

Our Association, which is elected by the businesses of Arrowtown, believes it would be highly inappropriate for any decisions on this matter to be made – or advanced towards - while the ward is unrepresented.

At the very least, the ward's new councillor needs to be elected, and have the opportunity to consult within the ward, before decisions on this matter are considered by QLDC.

Dear Vanessa

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed Special Housing Development at Ayrburn Farm for the following reasons.

1. Water Supply.

Already we have regular water restrictions in place in the Lake Hayes area. It does not need an expert report to see that there would not be capacity for an additional 150 dwellings on the current Lake Hayes supply.

2. Pollution in Mill Stream.

The water quality of Lake Hayes will be adversely affected. Mill Stream is the only river flowing in to Lake Hayes and carries the majority of nutrients into the lake. The QLDC has identified in their

Lake Hayes Management Strategy (1995), that land disturbance in properties adjacent to Mill Stream must be minimised to preserve water quality in Lake Hayes.

As the proposed development has very small sections, there will be limited amounts of permeable land. The stormwater run-off into Mill Stream will be far greater than current flows. The pressure of greater flows on Mill Stream will cause erosion and more nutrients and sediment to flow into Lake Hayes.

The Lake Hayes Management Strategy (1995) has established that it is better for water quality if Mill Stream is a meandering stream (because of erosion and sediment deposition). A meandering stream would not occur if a large amount of non-permeable land is situated adjacent to Mill Stream.

3. School capacity.

Arrowtown School is already near capacity with no space for further buildings to accommodate

roll growth. The proposed St Josephs school on Speargrass Flat Road is looking unlikely to proceed due to decreased numbers at their current site in Queenstown. If it did proceed it would only be a suitable option for the Catholic students plus a 5% allowance for non-denominational students.

4. Urban sprawl into rural areas.

The latest Scuttlebutt magazine states the council would like to “minimise urban sprawl (keeping the town and country separate)”. This development would create a new urban area, not in keeping with the surrounding rural landscape.

5. Rental investors.

Speargrass Flat is one of the Wakatipu Basin’s rural treasures. It is very desirable land and hence it is likely to be an attractive option for investment. We believe many of these proposed properties will be snapped up by the wealthy looking for good rental investments and hence not help the issue of affordable housing.

SUMMARY

The current residents surrounding this development have chosen to live here as they want the rural life, away from the hustle and bustle of urban areas. We have all paid a premium for the land here to achieve that lifestyle. We understood that we would not be surrounded by urban areas as stated in the District Plan and that we would be protected by the RMA.

Paddy Baxter (Baxter Design Group) recently quoted to me... “We (properties adjoining Ayrburn Farm) have one of the most protected views in the basin. It is tied up so tight that no one will ever be able to sub-divide in front of us.” We find it incredible that Baxter Design Group is now undoing all their hard work put in years ago to save the rural character of Ayrburn Farm.

The adverse effects of this development on the surrounding properties will be high (as stated by Baxter Design Group in their proposal). Additional adverse effects include noise, air and light pollution and strain on water supply, sewerage and stormwater systems. These reasons alone are enough to reject this proposal.

The loss of quality views and rural characteristics of the area would cause drop in property values for the current owners (many of whom have large mortgages). Before purchasing we all did due diligence on the covenants on our own properties and the surrounding properties and believed the rural character of this area was protected. It is simply not fair to change that now.

We are not against growth and we understand that this demand needs to be accommodated somewhere but the chosen sites need to fit logically on all aspects and strive to keep the beautiful character of the Wakatipu basin.

We hope common sense prevails and that this proposal is firmly rejected by local and central government. Please feel free to call to discuss this issue further.

Our Environment in QLDC jeopardised

Special Housing Areas (SHAs) lack of consultation

Is the QLDC now planning wall to wall housing in the Wakatipu basin with blatant disregard for

the District plan and for the PC30 defining urban boundaries which defined the satellite villages and protected the rural landscape beyond? This was agreed by all parties at great costs with consultation and an Environment Court Hearing. A further six years was involved in defining the Arrowtown boundary in particular - more costs and Hearings (PC29 and PC39). The village character and size was emphasised as this is the jewel in the crown of the District.

The infrastructure within the village is already at capacity (schools, water, sewage, roading), yet we now have opportunists trying to get on the band wagon of so called "Affordable Housing" expanding the edge into the rural landscape. This would destroy the hard work done by all parties over many years to achieve a balance and provide the backdrop to the Wakatipu basin.

Let us be clear there are several subdivisions already agreed to and waiting for buildings. Our roading networks leading into Frankton for the shopping hub are already at capacity when coming from the Arrowtown end, and this must be a serious consideration before any special housing applications are considered.

For Council to delegate to the general manager of planning and infrastructure to enter negotiations with the land owners/developers in promoting their own interests in SHAs is irresponsible, as the Council is the elected body representing the community.

This whole policy is badly stated and the applications must be declined outright especially where there is threat to infrastructure, the District plan and decisions made by the Environment Court.

Arrowtown needs to embrace younger families into the community in order for it to remain sustainable. This will only happen if people can afford to purchase property, who are presently unable to do so.

The affordable housing will enable people who are renting a property to be able to purchase one of their own property or introduce new families into the area, which in turn puts more money into the community.

The Arrowtown shops and businesses need local support as we can't just rely on the tourist dollar. The people of Arrowtown shouldn't be forced to travel outside of Arrowtown to purchase the majority of their goods e.g petrol, pay their bills, post their letters, buy their children's medicine, therefore they need people to manage, run and work in these businesses, and it's these people that would generally want to reside in Arrowtown itself, but can not afford to do so. It is affordable housing and reasonably priced rental properties that, at present, are few and far between.

The proposed land seems like an obvious area to expand the boundary of Arrowtown, which is naturally confined by golf courses. It means that the demand for growth and the development is manageable.

Therefore I am in favour of the proposed land being released for the Housing Accord

Thanks for your time

Recently I have read an article on a proposed "Housing Accord" throughout the Queenstown Lakes District. I am writing to enquire about the location of where these 1300 sections will be allocated as there is a lack of residential sections available in Arrowtown. My partner and I are long term locals with 2 children and have been looking to purchase and build a home of our own. At the moment options are very limited.

I am concerned that if nothing opens up in Arrowtown we will be forced to leave our beloved town and home. Our goal has always been for our children to grow up and live in Arrowtown. There seems to be no opportunity for us to do so.

The Butel Park project has added value to Arrowtown over the past 10 years and I believe widening the boundary with affordable sections will do the same.

Can you please tell me if there are any plans to grow Arrowtown for our future generations?

Thank you for your time

I have recently come to learn that the expansion of current Arrowtown boundaries has the potential to be revisited.

I would formally like to convey my 100% support for this development. As someone who was born and raised Arrowtown and also now has their own business here, I feel that Arrowtown needs this development to sustain and meet the needs to returning residents and growth that will create a wonderful community for the future.

Having been away for 12 years I returned to Arrowtown with the plans to settle and build a future for my partner and I. It's a hard pill to swallow when you return to your place of birth to find it is impossible to not only buy your first home but not even be able to rent while saving. I am not a demanding sort of person but it's tough to move back in with you folks after 20 years of living on your own simply to have a roof over your head in your home town.

In my mind the expansion of current Arrowtown boundaries will benefit not only people like myself, but also the wider community, business owners, contractors, tourism and the surrounding public.

I am more than happy to be contacted should you require further information or comments.

I am writing to you regarding an email sent to me from Toni and Sam Monk about the lack of affordable land in the Arrowtown area. I am 32 years old and grew up in Arrowtown I love living in Arrowtown but the price of land and house's here is making it near impossible to stay here and raise my family, my generation is struggling in this wonderful place and it will only get worse if something is not done soon. I can't think why you would want to stand in the way of progress and I can't imagine how hard it will be for my kids to be a part of the Arrowtown community when they are my age the way things are going there's no way they will afford to live here.

I writing to you in support of the current proposed Housing Accord and would like to better understand what this means for residents of Arrowtown.

I am sure you are aware that the housing situation in Arrowtown, whether it be building, buying or renting is something that is of great concern to residents. It seems to be at a stage where it is virtually impossible for average couples or families to be a part of the Arrowtown community.

I am aware of many other stories of people having to move from Arrowtown to find accommodation that is affordable or even suitable to live in without major renovations. Some of the more concerning facts are that these people work (often in hospitality or retail services) in Arrowtown and are forced to commute from other areas. Not always ideal when you are finishing work at midnight.

Without these people who are willing and able to work in a part of the industry that supports tourism and local entertainment, Arrowtown nightlife, dining and hospitality scene will not be maintainable.

Working at Peregrine Wines I see the result of not being able to live near your employment all too well. One of the hardest roles for us to fill is Cellar Door Host. Quite simply because the cost of fuel and transport to be employed at just above minimum wage (a standard in the hospitality and retail industries) doesn't make it viable.

Personally I have a more emotional connection to the issues within the housing shortage. My partner, having been born and raised in Arrowtown, schooled at Wakatipu and qualified at a joinery in Frankton returned here three years ago to use the tools of his trade to put down roots and for us to build a future.

Sadly due to extortionate land and housing prices (created by a severe lack of supply) it was well out of the question for us to build anything within the current boundaries of Arrowtown. I am the first to admit that we very much "settled" for the house we have purchased and truthfully only did as when it came to us renting while we worked to save – we had absolutely no affordable options.

In summary I would like to place 100% support behind more building sections being released in Arrowtown. I feel it can only benefit the community of Arrowtown and the people who want to be here and genuinely build a life. I, in no way can see how a small extension to the very closed boundaries of Arrowtown will harm or be of detriment to the community as it stands.

Thanks you for your time and I am happy to be contacted for any further comments should you require.

Your Worship, the Mayor, and Councillors

Ayrburn Farm - Proposed Special Housing Area

I have studied the above proposal by Ayrburn Farm Development Limited (AFDL) dated February 2015, and wish to make the following observations reflecting claims made in the Executive Summary (pg 5) as to the suitability of the site for medium/high density development. I refer to the seven bullet points noted in the same order.

- It is stated that *“Ayrburn Farm is one of the only flat parcels of fully serviced sun filled land in the Queenstown basin where proposed housing cannot be seen from the surrounding roads whatsoever”*.

INCORRECT: There are roads existing from where this proposal will be able to be seen. Ayrburn Farm is zoned Rural General in the Queenstown Lakes District Plan. Medium/high density residential development is not an option. It is not relevant that the proposed housing “cannot be seen” from surrounding roads. It will be seen by immediate neighbouring property owners. It will be seen from many aspects of existing rural zoned property and from many neighbours existing residences. These neighbours have a right to expect Rural zone aspects of their own properties to be maintained “in perpetuity”.

- It is stated the proposal will be *“an appealing place to live”*.

INCORRECT: It is now an appealing place – one of the few remaining original Rural character zones left in the District. The additional population that this proposal will add (600-750 persons) in a 15 hectare portion of the site, and given the proposal to limit all buildings to a

single floor level format, the congestion both within and surrounding the site will have huge impact in many dimensions; appalling rather than appealing.

It is further stated *“single level construction will maximise daylight for all residences”*.

INCORRECT: as the reality proposed will not provide sufficient separation, one unit from the next, over the whole development to enable daylight to penetrate each component. The essence of good planning requires proper consideration of the spaces between buildings in addition to the buildings themselves.

Reference is also made to *“the other proposed natural amenities available”*.

Queenstown Trail – this will likely have limited attraction when it becomes over populated by the additional users crated by this proposed development.

Mill Creek – the proposed site is within this natural water body’s flood plane. The land indentation at this site has been created by successive flood events. Very simple logic should determine the building on this at-risk site is very unwise.

Related remedies being:

1. Alter the flood pattern to Mill Creek, which will destroy a natural trout spawning location;
2. Build the houses on stilts so that flood waters may disperse underneath – but then of course they will become completely visible in the landscape.

Neither of these of course, will be of assistance in the effort to make the place *“appealing”*.

- It is stated *“housing will be affordable”*

INCORRECT: So called *“affordable housing”* is generally agreed to start at \$225,000 not \$450,000. I have found during my practice of architecture that if we make something *“affordable”* it is then not attractive to a considerable cross-section of human community, it is in fact not saleable (sellable).

It is not financially prudent to build *“affordable housing”* on property with such a high value land content before even starting redeveloping. I have been advised the subject land value has been set at \$8 million. Thus:

Land Cost	\$8,000,000.00
Development site cost (at \$50,000 each: minimum)	\$7,500,000.00
Construction costs (150 x \$450,000: minimum)	\$67,500,000.00
	<hr/>
Basic outgoings total	\$83,000,000.00
Sales per unit will have to be (to break even)	\$553,000.00

This indicates that to achieve a target costs of \$450,000 the developer will incur a loss of \$22,950,000.00

This simple calculation allows for NIL development profit. A realistic developer expectation would be to obtain a 25% profit.

Nil allowance for infrastructure upgrade and reticulation;
 Nil allowance for Development Levies
 Nil allowance for Historic Buildings restoration

Clearly, the sums do not work.

In order to make them work the unit cost would need to increase above the budget \$450,000.00 price cap. Thus no longer qualifying as "affordable housing".

- Respecting the feel of Arrowtown

This is real estate nonsense. Ayrburn Farm is not Arrowtown. If potential buyers want the nostalgia of Arrowtown, the real thing is 2 km up the road, and that existing community includes all the adjunct amenities in the village that are required in addition to simply housing. These commercial functions are necessary for a residential development to work and be attractive. That is why additional housing needs to be located adjoining existing urban development, not in an existing more isolated Rural location.

- Increased community engagement with historical buildings

NOT REALISTIC: This aspect will add to the development costs significantly and these costs have not been included in my financial model. The realisation of this work will be abandoned, when actual cost over-runs are established for the project. In any event, the classified registration of these assets requires that this work be undertaken.

- A sustainable development

NOT CORRECT: These listed aspects are all required to obtain:

1. Building consent;
2. Produce a marketable and saleable end product; and

would be necessary for any well designed residential development wherever located.

Recent solar energy technology is unfortunately still lacking cost efficiency for installations located south of 40° latitude. The simple principle that when the energy is most wanted it is not available for long enough daily periods to be efficient, and thus has to be stored in expensive and bulky batteries.

- No capital cost to QLDC

NOT CORRECT: All major infrastructural services are not available on site:

1. Domestic water supply. The proposal to link in with the existing Lake Hayes Supply is not an option as that supply is already under severe over demand. I know this, as

my own property is supplied from this source, and I received written advice from the QLDC as recently as two weeks ago, that this is a reality.

The reservoirs are under capacity and will likely need to be relocated, and new additional reticulation is not in place.

So who will pay for this?

2. Stormwater and sewage disposal options are not in place. Disposal to Mill Creek should not be considered acceptable. Extending existing Arrowtown or Millbrook services should not be considered acceptable. I know this already, as some years ago I endeavoured to source these utilities from Arrowtown.
So who will pay for this?
3. Traffic demand on the existing Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road is currently overburdened by Arrowtown-Queenstown commuter use. The traffic analysis provided in the submission is lacking in considered detail. It presumes that the existing Road is there, therefore the consequential requirements for the additional load imposed by this development will work – It will not!
Who will pay for this?

- The Project Team “consisting of local consultants who claim experience with residential developments in the area”, is a curious banner to be waving in the circumstances.

Bridesdale Farm – has yet to be approved by the Minister or realised to date.

Jacks Point – is still a work in progress, property values have dropped in this area since the project was launched.

Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country – are each partially out of sight from main visitor/user roadways, but as urban residential developments they are both visually lamentable expressions of 40+ years behind in successful urban planning and design thinking, and lacking any sort of sense of place.

This Team has not exhibited any confidence that they have the “deep understanding of the area and its attributes”.

To the contrary – a deep understanding of the area surrounding Ayrburn Farm and its attributes would be to maintain its present original Rural character.

This is the true value of this location.

I have lived adjacent (over the road) to Ayrburn for the past 44 years.

I know its value.

In my opinion, it should not be changed, modified or reinvented.

Furthermore, and more importantly I do not wish to live in a Country where democracy is being eroded by Local Authority bureaucracy hiding behind a cloak of ill-conceived Parliamentary decree, with respect to my fundamental right to be consulted in this matter.

Consultation re: Special Housing Areas Act

It is a pity government has decided what's good for Auckland is also good for the rest of New Zealand. The epitome of this thinking is the rushed through Special Housing Area Act 2013 designed to cure Auckland's housing ills by artificially compelling supply to meet under-cashed buyer demand. The theory is that this will stimulate lower house prices- a simplistic marketing approach with little regard to the increased demand caused by migration and where it locates or of increased money supply whether from easier borrowing or from higher local wage & salary incomes or today's shift by choice from ownership to rental occupation or of normal building costs for a decent home. A formula to establish this inadequacy to determine areas for government correction is in the Act sec.9 9a&9b "that the median house price divided by the median take home pay of an individual exceeds 50% based on a 20% deposit and 'the median multiple is 5.1' ..etc, etc.

Without going into the question marks over what all this means we know Government is seeking to impose this Auckland solution to keep its books in order and has persuaded Queenstown to join in on the same basis that supply is not meeting cheaper housing demand so price is increasing and houses are therefore unaffordable to the "ordinary" wage earner.

But Queenstown's best business is its tourist industry which is dependent on its scenic pre-eminence and of its beautiful down lands setting off its mountains unspoilt by housing clutter. This looks the likely effect from the suppliers of land under the accord of the Act. There has been no cost/benefit analysis investigation into this or at what point interfering in the housing market or its detrimental effect on the tourist industry long term. The ability to put this other point of view has really been chopped off.

Unlike the Queenstown area Auckland lacks the scenic beauty which this Act is asking to destroy. We surely do not want wall to wall housing riding over the Wakatipu basin like a plague of papules and with respect to Mr Feely's application the utter erosion of the grasslands view upon exiting from Arrowtown would be a disaster. It would, like many of the other applications under this Act be quite contrary to Plan Change 30 which made a clear distinction between urban and rural land. Yet from a reading of the Act the prospect of this happening does not seem emphatically excluded.

But unless government subsidizes these "affordable" homes in Queenstown the increased supply unless these "cheap" houses are so extraordinarily basic and likely unattractive and possibly built in ghettos then the lowered price scenario through the formula designed to apply to give "compulsory cheap housing" will not prove easy to be reached. The price of land in the Wakatipu basin is also already not cheap for average lot sizes are in the vicinity of \$290-\$785,000 (say a mean of about \$350,000) so a house built on top (say at the minimum of \$120,000) means the cost price must be something like a minimum house price of \$470- 500000. The unit building cost per square metre suggests that the building cost of a minimum area house can not

easily be under \$120000 so that given the average mean section prices for small areas when added to the average building cost in Queenstown means the result is a house at least in the \$300,000 area. This can hardly be called cheap. About the average Dunedin home. Throw into this mix that already in Queenstown there are approximately 16000 housing units which have an average of 2.3 persons per household (roughly 37000 people) but that besides this there are over 15,000 building sites consented to which, assuming these will be built and occupied at the same rate say over the next two years, then we have Queenstown burgeoning to close to 70,000 [37 + 34] so very soon to take over Dunedin as Otago's capital city. Its infra structure [eg sewage, roading, schooling] is already creaking and this distortion of the market can only aggravate this situation.

The other problem is the intrusion of a big-brother attitude as currently there is no easy right of appeal to the decision made by the council and the Minister together as to the appropriateness the houses which is to be decried and with respect Mr Smith MP doesn't live in the Wakatipu area.

The sensible course in dealing then with all present applications is to seek input from neighbours and the community affected and to ensure that the basin is not overwhelmed by too rapid and excessive housing growth but have regard to the context of its rural and farming environment.

Sometimes one has to save and wait to get what one wants.

Dear Cr Gilmour,

Objection to Ayrburn Farm Expression of Interest (Special Housing Area) - Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road

We am writing to register our family's strong objection to the proposed development of 150 houses on Ayrburn Farm, which immediately adjoins [REDACTED] Speargrass Flat Road. We have only very recently learnt of this proposal through the media and contact from neighbours. Given the extent of development proposed we are astounded that the developer has not even shown the courtesy of communicating, still less consulting with us in respect of its plans.

We understand that the Queenstown-Lakes District Council has been asked to give its initial approval of this development under legislation (the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act 2013) which provides a fast track procedure where there is a need for affordable housing. In our view no such need exists which can possibly justify the use of this procedure for the proposed development in this location. It is doubtful in any event whether the scheme contemplates or can actually achieve the sort of affordable housing which the Act was designed to provide for. Rather, this appears to be an opportunistic attempt to circumvent and/or abuse the proper planning system and create a development which would be extremely damaging and wholly inappropriate in this location for a number of reasons. We respectfully submit that it must not be allowed by Council to proceed to the next stage of the approval process.

The site on which the scheme is proposed is in an area of natural beauty which has been identified by Council's own consultants as being unsuitable for this form of development. There are hundreds of undeveloped suitably zoned sites and substantial building potential in other areas throughout the District which are already zoned residential. The proposed scheme threatens seriously to diminish the amenity and character of the Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road and Speargrass Flat Road basin area.

There appears to have been little if any credible assessment of the environmental impact of the scheme. The proposed site will have a material adverse effect on Mill Stream, Lake Hayes, bird migratory routes and views, all of which would be irreparably damaged. The scheme would also result in unacceptable noise levels and light pollution. The proposed scheme will put a strain on the local infrastructure which will result not only in environmental consequences but also a considerable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties and other users in the area.

The Council will presumably also want to consider the potential cumulative effects of allowing this development pursuant to this special legislation. If allowed, it will be very difficult for Council to decline

similar types of proposals in the immediate or similar locations in the future simply on the basis of the fact this development should have been considered under different legislation.

There are a number of matters referred to in the Expression of Interest dated February 2015 which are either incorrect or speculative. There appears to be have been shallow if any consideration of the true impact of this development, with liquefaction, stormwater runoff and flood risk lightly dismissed and the impact on the area, the environment and neighbouring residents cynically down played.

We also question the suitability of this area for affordable housing. Our concerns appear to be supported by the fact that the developer, when faced with the uprising of concern as to its development from the community, has belatedly offered to "sweeten the deal" by proposing to build 15 low cost housing units and donate the same to the local Housing Trust. It is telling that the developer has not committed to build these within the Ayrburn Farm development but within 10km of the same. Such an offer would appear to reflect reservations about the suitability of the development for affordable housing. We trust the terms of this offer would cause you not to allow the application to progress without seeking to ascertain in detail what safeguards and controls would exist (if any) to ensure the ongoing affordability of what is being proposed

We look forward either to hearing that the scheme will not be approved by Council to proceed or, in the unfortunate event that it is, that we will be afforded the opportunity to participate in the process. We urge the Councillors to vote against the scheme after due consideration and trust that if the Council was to consider allowing it to proceed, that it would implement a fair, transparent and careful process before making any decision on the proposed development.

Your Worship the Mayor and Councillors

Proposed Special Housing Areas – Expression of Interest from Ayrburn Farm Developments Limited

I am writing to you on behalf of the trustees of the [REDACTED] which is the registered proprietor of a rural residential property situated at [REDACTED] and located [REDACTED] of the property known as Ayrburn Farm. My wife and I occupy the property and have done so for 29 years.

I have obtained from Council's website, a copy of the Expression of Interest : Special Housing Area ("SHA") February 2015 submitted by Ayrburn Farm Developments Limited ("AFDL").

I am authorised by the trustees of the [REDACTED] to write to you to express the trustees' grave concern in respect of the development proposed by AFDL.

In the first instance, can I state that the trustees who are the proprietors of land immediately [REDACTED] of Ayrburn were surprised to learn of the development through the media, as one would have thought the first thing any developer who was serious in its intention to have its site selected for such a development as is proposed by AFDL, would have been to contact its neighbours, being those who will be directly affected by such a development. Neither I, my wife nor the trustees have had any contact from any representative of AFDL.

As I learnt more about the SHA process, it became obvious to me that AFDL and others who have filed expressions of interest to develop SHA's, were clearly seeking to rely on what they assumed would have been a process whereby neighbours would not have been consulted, let alone made aware of such proposals before the same were considered for approval by Council, and if approved, central Government. To that end, I would like to thank and congratulate the Council for offering citizens of the district an opportunity to make representations to you in respect of such expressions of interest in the hope that the same will give some balance to your deliberations as to whether you allow any of the proposals to go forward for further consideration.

Notwithstanding the extensive protestations put forward by AFDL as to the attributes of the site for intensive residential development, it is the trustees' position that if you are to be true to requiring adherence and compliance with your published criteria for assessing SHA's, then you must reject this proposal by AFDL.

In particular, I would make the following comments in respect of the AFDL proposal and how it measures up to the Council's criteria:

Location

"The location criteria requires the proposed area identified as a SHA shall be located within or adjacent to existing urban areas. Areas located in rural areas remote from existing urban areas and services will generally not be viewed favourably"

It cannot be said that the Ayrburn Farm site is either within or adjacent to an existing urban area. The Expression of Interest filed by AFDL itself acknowledges this. AFDL seem to suggest that Millbrook Resort is an existing urban area and Ayrburn is located adjacent to it. In reality Millbrook is a Resort Zone with few, if any, public facilities normally associated with an urban area. Presumably Council sought to impose such criteria in order to avoid effects associated with reliance on motor vehicles to access schools, shops and other community facilities. Given its location, it is unrealistic to expect that residents would walk or bike from Ayrburn Farm to Arrowtown, let alone other urban areas located with the Wakatipu Basin.

Adequate Infrastructure

The criteria generally requires that Council is satisfied that infrastructure exists and has additional capacity to accommodate the likely community demand from a qualifying development in the Special Housing Area or that infrastructure is planned or programmed in the Council's Long Term Plan and development contributions policy or that such infrastructure can be provided and funded by the private sector ahead of Long Term Plan programme and at no additional cost to Council.

No evidence has been provided by AFDL that there is such adequate capacity in existing Council owned infrastructure or that there is the ability to access such infrastructure for the proposed development. Further, there does not appear to have been any consideration as to how this proposed development might fit in to Council's Long Term Plan in relation to the use of such unused capacity (if in fact it exists) and whether priority should be given to this development.

As regards stormwater, it is noted it is proposed by AFDL that they will utilise Mill Creek for discharge of stormwater. Mill Creek, as is well known, is an important ecological habitat in terms of trout spawning as well as a primary source of water for Lake Hayes which is already affected by discharges associated with land use in the Wakatipu Basin.

Given such, one would have thought that before any further consideration is given to this proposal, Council would need to be satisfied that any development of Ayrburn Farm would not result in any adverse effects in terms of Mill Creek. It does not appear that any such assessment has been provided.

Finally in respect of infrastructure, Council is also required to be satisfied that non-Council infrastructure, in particular, education facilities exist which could cope with the level of development proposed.

Again, no evidence has been provided to satisfy Council of such.

Demand for Residential Housing

Council is required to be satisfied that there is evidence of demand for the range of housing types that are proposed to be developed within a Special Housing Area.

No evidence of such is contained with the Expression of Interest provided by AFDL. Indeed, it appears that the proposal contains limited options in terms of a range of housing to be provided.

Affordability

AFDL appear to be offering similar types of housing at similar affordability levels as are already being offered in other developments in the Wakatipu Basin (ie: Shotover Country). In terms of affordability, the proposal by AFDL does not propose any retention mechanisms by which levels of affordability will be maintained.

Further, in terms of assessing whether what is to be proposed is in fact affordable, it is somewhat surprising to note the contents of the latest appendix to the AFDL Expression of Interest, which suggests that AFDL are willing to construct housing which will be leased to the Community Housing Trust, but most importantly, is not willing to commit to the fact that such will be built within the proposed Ayrburn Special Housing Area, as they reserve the right to provide such at any location within 10 kilometres of Ayrburn. Such proposal in itself must raise questions as to whether what is proposed is to be truly affordable housing.

Indeed, the Expression of Interest contains no proposal for any social housing to be contained within the proposed SHA.

Finally, it does not appear that any mechanisms have been suggested for ensuring that sites within the SHA would not be used for short term rental/visitor accommodation.

In addition to the above, it appears from the repeated references in the expression of interest that AFDL believes that the site is suitable for approval as an SHA and its proposed development, primarily because the development will not be visible from public roads.

Not only is it questionable if this is factually correct, but even if it was, it is certainly not one of the Council's stated criteria for consideration, let alone approval of an SHA.

Not only will the site be clearly visible from surrounding residential properties, I am also reliably informed that the Environment Court has, in many decisions relating to development in this area, confirmed that the mere fact that a development may be hidden and/or able to be screened from public or private places does not mean that the site is necessarily suitable for development.

Further, Council recently commissioned a report on the landscapes of the Wakatipu Basin from Read Landscapes, to guide Council in its deliberation as to what areas of the Wakatipu Basin may be suitable for future development, even to such a low density as is envisaged by the Rural Lifestyle Zone. The Speargrass Flat Basin north of Lake Hayes including the Ayrburn land, was not considered desirable for development for many reasons. Again, this is another reason why you should dismiss this proposal for further consideration as a possible future SHA.

I would also suggest to you that to approve this proposal for a SHA would give rise to potential for adverse cumulative effects in terms of future applications for urbanisation of the Wakatipu Basin. I suggest to you that if you were to approve applications for the proposal, even under the SHA legislation, it would be very difficult for you to resist further development in the immediate area in the future. Putting it simply, a consent authority considering a development application in the future under the Resource Management Act or other legislation, would not be able or entitled to differentiate the effects of the development proposed by AFDL simply based on the fact that it was approved under the special SHA legislation.

Whilst I accept that we may have affordable housing issues in the District, I, being someone with 54 years in the building industry, heading one of the larger construction companies operating in this area, question whether the issue of housing affordability is simply a result of lack of supply of reasonably priced land. Indeed, in the past few years we have seen land offered to the market at extremely affordable prices by both the private and public sector. You only have to look at the relatively low cost and development friendly sections on offer at developments such as Shotover Country, (who I understand have released some 300 sites within the past two years) which have quickly been developed by individuals and companies such as Classic Builders, who again have designed and built what can only be described as affordable medium density developments to meet market demand

All of this has occurred in an area which was planned over many years located immediately off the State Highway which from the outset provided for a Primary School and soon to be developed community recreational facilities and which was relatively easy to service in terms of sewage and water.

In terms of the proposed development in this location, it is important to note that Arrowtown is not an urban area which in itself generates demand for a large amount of staff accommodation unlike Queenstown with its many hotels and restaurants and where clearly it is desirable to provide affordable housing in close proximity to places of work.

This development being adjacent to another large urban area (Lake Hayes Estate), together with what is zoned at Jacks Point and rules which I understand are to be proposed for the review of the District Plan which encourage infilling, means that there already exists the ability to deliver a large proportion of the number of residential units sought in the Housing Accord, without the need for large green field developments, especially those located in rural areas and being physically isolated from existing urban communities and their associated public facilities such as is the case with Ayrburn.

Given all of the above, I encourage you to promptly reject the proposal by AFDL for any further consideration as an SHA. This will avoid the need for the many parties opposed to this development in this location, and the Council, having to be involved in costly litigation to determine the matter.

I thank you for the consideration of my submission.