

SUBMISSION SUMMARY
DAME ELIZABETH AND MURRAY HANAN
10, 18 and 1004
21 MARCH 2016

1. The strategic direction for the District Plan as laid out in the summary form clearly looks at the overall effect of rural/urban zoning to enable long term benefits to the region.

2. In our submissions we have emphasized the value of now established Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) agreed under PC30 (operative Nov 2010) . The UGB of Arrowtown in particular recognised the predominant views of residents which took in the special character and historic centre as well as the capacity of the primary school. The Ministry of Education submission emphasises this point. By formalising the UGBs under option 2 page 24 there are associated litigation costs to Council with potential increase in plan change requests seeking to amend UGBs. If the UGBs are formalised then developers are aware of the requirements of the District Plan.

3. The refined UGB under PC29 for Arrowtown allows for a further development within the boundary of 20 houses in the McDonnell Road region.

4 Further to this the PC39 Arrow South Environment Court Decision 2015 provided limited Rural lifestyle special zone beyond the boundary but also designated McDonnell Road as the absolute line between development and the Rural zone beyond.

5 Under Goal2 any further residential development should be within UGBs to prevent further erosion of rural land for Rural Residential, Rural lifestyle, so called affordable housing or retirement villages. Thus submission 88 to request 25 units in Jopp street adjacent to the UGB must be declined . It was recently litigated and refused in the Environment Court (May 2015 under PC29). It would certainly impact on the school roll.

6 Goal 4 emphasises protection of natural, environment and ecosystem - hence the need to limit urban grown in rural landscapes. We object strongly to 403.1 sitting on land on the "wrong" side of McDonnell Road to permitting a change from Rural General or Rural to Rural Residential. This is contrary to all the recent proceedings in the Environment Court (May 2015). This would mean housing is visible from Cotter Avenue as well as many viewing other points despoiling the rural backdrop, so it must be declined with the original and proposed map designation retained. There is also the potential for run off of contaminants into the stream flowing through part of the property into water ways, used downstream as potable water. Further traffic exiting onto McDonnell Road and potential of school aged children are also considerations. There is no obvious demand for sections/housing in the urban area on McDonnell Road so why jump the boundary. The Operative and proposed District plan must have some worth.

7. Likewise submission 437.1 to change the Hills golf course into a resort zone with multiple housing units . We are especially concerned at housing/development at A8 which exits onto McDonnell Road opposite housing and adjacent to the

boundary of 82 McDonnell Road, our property which ~~we~~ our family have owned since 1964. This is a known ponding area where bird life abounds. The track to the clubhouse from there goes along our rear boundary fence right next to our house and at busy times the traffic can be noisy and destroy the rural atmosphere. Further traffic would exacerbate this and be both noisier and obtrusive and the building near the road disfiguring the rural aspect from all the land above on the other side of the road. The extra houses and buildings now proposed for the resort are contrary to the original concept of keeping the area green even to underground housing.

8. Further along McDonnell Road under 443.1 to change again from Rural to Rural lifestyle although there are no extra exits onto McDonnell Road also impacts on the overall traffic and infrastructure requirements - water, sewerage and storm water and putting further strain on parking in the central business district of Arrowtown by residents living there. This will also impact on the walking trail on that side of McDonnell Road.

9. The cumulative effect of many of the submissions particularly those around Arrowtown have the effect of creating wall to wall housing and imposing restrictions on infrastructure, water supply, sewerage disposal, roading and traffic.

10. The strategic and integrated management of urban growth under the following sections must be preserved. To recommend the removal of sections 3.2.2.1.1 and the sections following is a mistake. The sections should strengthen what has recently been decided in the Environment Court under proper procedure: That is 3.2.2.1.1 - apply UGBs around urban areas, with the following clauses - avoid urban development outside of UGBs, manage form of urban development within UGBs, residential development close to town centres, local shopping zones, activity centres, public transport routes and non vehicular trail, ensure UGBs have zoned land for future growth (true for Arrowtown) and minimise effects of subdivision use and development on landscapes.

11. Therefore the strategic direction proposed with the goals of enhancing and developing the district to retain its values, environment and economy must not be ~~over~~ overruled by developments creating urbanisation of what ever style beyond the UGBs. The UGBs are a useful planning tool. The net effect may ^{be} to destroy these very qualities that tourists and residents expect. As planner Marion Read says the value of rural areas and landscapes are intrinsic and economic. When you compare Malaghans Road to Frankton Road it is the rurality that is enjoyed by tourists and locals alike. McDonnell Road leading into Malaghans Road is already becoming a busy bypass road with traffic avoiding the chaos of Frankton Road to go to Queenstown.

12. The District Plan must have integrity and be relied on by planners and people. It is easy to succumb to pressures and kill the goose that lays the golden egg. On a cost benefit analysis it might also destroy the advantage Arrowtown currently enjoys and its differentiation from other urban townships in the District.

159 Highgate
Dunedin 9010
ehanan@xtra.co.nz

Submitter Details

First Name: ELIZABETH & MURRAY
Last Name: HANAN
Street: 159 HIGHGATE
Suburb: ROSLYN
City: DUNEDIN
Country: New Zealand
PostCode: 9010
Daytime Phone: +64272211739
Mobile: +64272211739
eMail: ehanan@xtra.co.nz

OLS - 1461 - 13 - 12.205

3-4-12pm

1004

Wishes to be heard:

- Yes
- No

Preferred hearing location:

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 1 - Introduction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 2 - Definitions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 3 - Strategic Direction | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 4 - Urban Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 5 - Tangata Whenua | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 6 - Landscape | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 7 - Low Density Residential | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 8 - Medium Density Residential |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 9 - High Density Residential | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 10 - Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 11 - Large Lot Residential | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 12 - Queenstown Town Centre |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 13 - Wanaka Town Centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 14 - Arrowtown Town Centre | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 15 - Local Shopping Centres | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 16 - Business Mixed Use Zone |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 17 - Queenstown Airport Mixed Use | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 21 - Rural Zone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 22 - Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 23 - Gibbston Character Zone |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 26 - Historic Heritage | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ch 27 - Subdivision and Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 28 - Natural Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 30 - Energy and Utilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 32 - Protected Trees | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 33 - Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 34 - Wilding Exotic Trees | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 35 - Temporary Activities and Relocated Buildings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 36 - Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 37 - Designations | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 41 - Jacks Point Zone | <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 42 - Waterfall Park |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ch 43 - Millbrook Resort Zone | | | |

Are you a Certain Person:

- Representing Public Interest
- Having Special Interest
- Local Authority

Certain Person Comment: Our family have owned a property at 82 McDonnell Road Arrowtown since 1964 and have submitted on several Commissioner and Environment Court proceedings.

Submission

Consultation Document Submissions

Original Submitter: Elizabeth Hanan (159 Highgate, DUNEDIN, New Zealand, 9010)(Submitter No. 10)

Original Point: 10.1 3.2 Goals, Objectives and Policies

- Support
- Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

Murray and Elizabeth Hanan support the Proposed District Plan . The cumulative effect of many of the submissions particularly those around Arrowtown have the effect of creating wall to wall housing in the Wakatipu basin - imposing restrictions on water supply , infrastructure , roading, and traffic. The intersection of McDonnell Road , LAke Hayes ad Malaghans Roads is already dangerous and difficult in exiting McDonnell Road. Overall planning for the District is paramount so that the very ambience and economic development of the District can be retained and enhanced. Recent decisions carefully considered in the Environment Court and the operative District Plan should be upheld.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
Allow this submission

Original Submitter: Julie Scott (PO Box 1748, Queenstown, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9300)(Submitter No. 88)

Original Point: 88.1 4 Urban Development

- Support
- Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

The 25 units in Jopp St have been considered under the RMA in PC30 and PC29 and this land was seen as rural with open space and recreational value outside the urban boundary now defined and supported by the consensus of the population of Arrowtown. This development is excessive and could cause problems in overcrowding of the school which has no opportunity to expand. The zoning must remain Rural.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
This submission be disallowed and the proposed map adhered to.

Original Submitter: Maree Baker-Galloway (PO Box 201, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9300)(Submitter No. 513)

Original Point: 513.1 Part One - Introduction

- Support
- Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

This area should be retained as Rural as it is an entry point to Arrowtown via a rural landscape - there should be no change to its current designation.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
The submission be disallowed

Original Submitter: Sam Buchan (P O Box 124, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9300)(Submitter No. 403)

Original Point: 403.1 21 Rural Zone

- Support

Submissions on Proposed District Plan 2015 - Stage 1 from HANAN, ELIZABETH & MURRAY

Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

We strongly oppose any change from Rural General to Rural Residential and change to Map 27 and any subdivision of this land. This is contrary to all proceedings of the Environment Court and the proposed District Plan. McDonnell Road must be retained as the absolute boundary between Rural and Urban zoning.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
The submission be disallowed

Original Submitter: Ben Farrell (PO BOX 95, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9348)(Submitter No. 404)

Original Point: 404.1 Map 30 - Lake Hayes

Support

Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

The proposal for a Retirement Village adjacent to already urban zoned area is an appropriate site with easy access for residents to Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country where another Village is under consideration. There is nearby accommodation for the workers at the Village. We support the rezoning for this development with set back from the main road. It is also not far from the shopping and amenities at Remarkables Park and Frankton. This submission is being processed in the proper way unlike the Arrowtown Retirement Village proposal on a rural back road well away from amenities in a rural zone, and outside the Arrowtown boundary.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
This submission should be allowed.

Original Submitter: Amy Wilson-White (PO Box 1467, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9348)(Submitter No. 443)

Original Point: 443.1 21Rural Zone

Support

Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

The proposed map for the District Plan must not be modified and the zoning retained as Rural / Rural General. To change this to Rural Lifestyle is contrary to all Environment Court proceedings to date. Even with the 75 m set back from the road and entry via the main entrance to the golf course the traffic generated along McDonnell Road would be greatly increased as well as infrastructure requirements of water, sewerage, storm water disposal and a potential stain on the already overloaded parking in the village. We oppose changes to Ch 22, 27 and Ch 6 2.4. The west side of McDonnell Road should be retained as Rural not Rural Lifestyle.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
The whole of the submission must be disallowed.

Original Submitter: Amy Wilson-White (PO Box 1467, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9348)(Submitter No. 437)

Original Point: 437.1 21Rural Zone

Support

Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are

The change from Rural General into the new zone - Hills Resort Zone seeks to include multiple housing units, 10 clusters in addition to the 17 underground sites already consented to - hamlets, a worker accommodation and larger sized units including a helicopter pad. The urbanisation of the golf course with multiple dwellings/buildings is contrary to the Rural zone as it is currently. The houses will be visible from many viewing points. We are especially concerned with the housing/development located at A8 which exits onto McDonnell Road and is adjacent to the

boundary of number 82. This site is a ponding area and an unnamed stream runs through there into a pond where bird life abounds. The track to the club house along the boundary has the potential to be a nuisance with traffic to and fro destroying the very rural aspect of this side of McDonnell Road. There must be strict conditions imposed on helicopter movements and indeed the number of housing units if there is any consideration of this submission including removal of A8.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
This submission be disallowed

Original Submitter: Amy Wilson-White (PO Box 1467, Queenstown, New Zealand, 9348)(
Submitter No. 437)
Original Point: 437.1 21Rural Zone

- Support
- Oppose

The reasons for my support or opposition are
To change this block of land from Rural to Rural lifestyle with 10.2 Ha lots creates more traffic along a very busy road - Lake Hayes Road and part unsealed road Hogan Gully Road. This creates urban sprawl in a rural area. The submission on water and sewerage disposal on site is marginal and there should be no change in Chapters 6.22 and 27 to allow this development. The area should be retained as Rural.

I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed
The submission be disallowed.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.

Submission

10

Consultation Document Submissions

Part Two - Strategy > 3 Strategic Direction > 3.2 Goals, Objectives and Policies

- Support
- Oppose
- Other - Please clearly indicate your position in your submission below

I seek the following decision

Under Goal 2 Ensure any residential development should be within UGBs as determined to prevent any further erosion of rural land for say affordable housing, retirement villages or so called needy developments. These should be contained within areas already committed for urbanisation within UGBs. McDonnell Road must be retained as a boundary with the Rural zoning including the Hills golf course on one side and housing in different zonings on the other side. It is a low density traffic road where walking, cycling, families live. No urbanisation beyond the UGB for Arrowtown. Under Goal 5 To maintain the quality of the landscapes - limit capacity for residential activity in rural areas and visual amenity value when viewed from Tobins Track, Crown Terrace Coronet Peak etc. Limit night sky pollution with suitable lighting in urban areas , retain the rural areas "the lungs" for the Wakatipu basin , healthy ecosystems and by limiting urban sprawl prevents run off into streams and water ways of contaminants.

My submission is

Goal 1 Note that Frankton - Remarkables Park has a commercial zoning as well as Queenstown and Wanaka Goal2 Keep residential development within UGBs . Avoid urban development outside of UGBs and retain rural zoning beyond Goal 3 Support especially the heritage and unique character of Arrowtown Goal4 Protect and preserve the natural environment and ecosystems and especially care with runoff from subdivisions with contaminants Goal 5 Support distinctive landscape protection - avoid subdivisions in Rural General zones. Protect visual amenity values and quality of landscapes when viewing from say Crown Terrace, Tobins Track where change cannot be absorbed. Any village jumping over McDonnell's Road into the rural zone is another Lake Hayes Estate - a blot on the landscape and must be avoided. Goal 6 Housing - Encourage short term rentals for itinerant workers & employees. For Arrowtown - a balance to be retained - residents young and old - all generations Generally approve the plan review and ensure that Goals 2 and 3 are supported. Arrowtown Village boundary determined by PC30 is to be respected and no further erosion of the rural land beyond by subdivision or affordable housing. The village ambience must be retained for quality of living , heritage values protected and a place for all generations to enjoy - a place to live. Low lighting to protect the night sky and a designated area for business owners to park allowing parks for visitors and shoppers.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.



FORM 5: SUBMISSION

DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW



Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991 – as amended 30 August 2010



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council



YOUR DETAILS // Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by **email** and **phone**.

Name: JOHN MURRAY HANAN

Phone Numbers: Work: (03) 4774388 Home: (03) 4774398 Mobile: 027 2211739
& " 6621862

Email Address: jmhanan@xtra.co.nz

Postal Address: 159 HIGHGATE Post code: 9010
DUNEDIN 9010



PLAN CHANGE // To which this submission relates to:

DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

I NO gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

"I YES MAY AFFECT ME ** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission:
(a) adversely affects the environment; and
(b) ~~does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.~~

* Delete entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
** Select one.



SPECIFIC PROVISIONS // Of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

CONFIRMATION OF EXISTING BOUNDARY PROVISIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PRESENT RURAL ZONE

OPPOSED TO THE AS YET UNNOTIFIED RETIREMENT VILLAGE IN THE RURAL ZONE IN THE ^{SAME} MANNER AS OBJECTUM TO THE FEELER HOUSING DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE HOUSING ACT TO THE "AFFORDABLE" HOUSING ON THE RURAL LAND ON THE ROAD - BOTH INTENSE JUMPING THE EXISTING MCDONNELL ROAD URBAN/RURAL BOUNDARY DETERMINED BY QLDC PLANNERS AND JUDICIALLY APPROVED (OCT 2014)



MY SUBMISSION IS //

Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or with to have them amended, and the reasons for your views.

I THEREFORE SUPPORT THE EXISTING
BOUNDARIES SO INFERENTIALLY
THE ZONES



I SEEK THE FOLLOWING FROM THE LOCAL AUTHORITY //

Give precise details:

RE-AFFIRMATION OF THE URBAN/RURAL
BOUNDARIES

wish to be heard in support of my submission.

POSSIBLY consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.
YET TO BE DETERMINED

SIGNATURE

Signature (to be signed for or on behalf of submitter)**

Date

1/9/15

** If this form is being completed on-line you may not be able, or required, to sign this form.



Queenstown Lakes District Council
Private Bag 50072, Queenstown 9348
Gorge Road, Queenstown 9300

P: 03 441 0499
E: pcsubmission@qldc.govt.nz
www.qldc.govt.nz

Queenstown district plan *Review*

Submission J.M.Hanan

I was a submitter to the existing Plan Change 30.

It was then determined that Queenstown and Wanaka were to be the major hubs about which the urban satellite and rural land was to be attached and predictions were made to formulate plans for future growth. These growth estimates have proven inadequate primarily because of inwards migration rather than natural birth. The result has been a current housing shortage in low cost housing supply, infrastructure difficulties-in schooling adequacy, traffic congestion and potable water supply and, as importantly, increased urbanity at the expense of rurality. At the moment the primary driver for standard of living is tourism. As Dr Ralph Hanan of the World Bank has pointed out this income driver limitation has dependency dangers but it is upon this that the region still primarily depends and this is likely for the term of the current Plan. This in turn means the surrounding environment to perpetuate this tourist potential, must largely be maintained as is- which means the setting off of the mountains against its rural undertow must not be lost. For this reason alone there is an insurmountable argument that there must not be scattered growth in rural areas (the Wakatipu basin) or scenic zones (Arrowtown environs) despoiling them. Simply put, quantitative growth with qualitative loss must be avoided.

If then the population growth is to continue at its present burdensome rate where does it go? Dealing only with the Wakatipu side of QLDC for Wanaka ought never to have been brought into its regional orbit but kept apart and linked more closely to Cromwell and Central- a foolish gluing act which still ought to be undone- plainly because of its topographical tightness Queenstown must start going higher up (Up Queenstown hill, up more floors) and this is still the first site for increasing housing density.

But more predictably Frankton may now also be seen as the major business hub and the former concentration on Queenstown's urban growth ought to be secondary to Frankton. It does not have the same physical constraints and with the airport at its heart and with a new Convention Centre Frankton must inevitably develop even more quickly as the primary business (cf tourist) hub. For this reason it is easy to see it becoming the "parking lot" for a feeder service for going to Queenstown thereby avoiding the present congested roadway. It is suggested a fast overhead monorail service should be considered which would profit Queenstown as well as Frankton instead of what now happens - traffic peeling off at the hopeless roundabout at the BP junction to do their business in Frankton while the tourist proportion goes on to Queenstown. This dangerous corner would appear to be likely worsened by a penny-pinching re-jig of the existing Kawerau bridge unless the transport personnel action the case for a new bridge towards Lake Hayes estate off the main South highway. This satellite township, of what now is as much of Frankton as of Queenstown, can well expand but as the approaches to the hubs are attractive and flat areas restrictions ought to be in place restricting house sales on these driving approaches to retain the exceptional entrance charm to Queenstown if not also to Frankton-e.g prevention by compensation to the private developers being seduced to sell could be by way of rates relief on a guaranteed term of retention.

However my particular interest is in the affect of the plan as proposed on the Arrowtown area where I live and where my people have had connection since 1880.

- (i) Any attempt to "town-ize" Arrowtown is not sensible commercially. The main tourist flow into Arrowtown is of tourists who, having seen Queenstown and done the usual entertainments (launch trips, bungy jumping, skiing etc), decide to go and see the "old gold mining village" known to be small and captivating- a change from the jazzy feel that pervades Queenstown or

the domestic supply concentration of Frankton. If it were simply an ersatz antiqued quarter reserved out of a townscape the whole point of going to Arrowtown must be lost. It is upon this posit that any attitudes to housing supply and commercialisation flow.

(ii) It is acknowledged that now there are several fine modern homes on Arrowtown's outskirts and there is pressure to accelerate this "big house" demand. But thankfully these houses have not really altered the initial feel of the village and are somewhat disconnected. They have peculiarly arisen on the top of the terminal moraine upon which Arrowtown sits to view the unmatched scenery of the Wakatipu valley and the Hills Golf course. To some extent, they are cut away from the village stealing and blocking (as they do*) any public appreciation of the vista beneath them so they remain "secret" to visitors. This erosion of the public benefit must be controlled. If continued the result could be a cumulative effect and lead to a destruction of the hamlet charm of Arrowtown for the private and rather excessive gain of a few. **This is a case where the market needs some control.** (Ordinarily I think market forces create their own controls and must not be too interfered with but in this instance that correction is too subsequent to have this effect and be the determinant). It is therefore imperative that Judge Jackson's considered judgment limiting Arrowtown South growth is to be commended and the considerations that he adverted to in this regard maintained for all the remaining length of McDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue.

(iii) Consequently Arrowtown **must remain compact and unsprawling**. By "compact" it is not meant it should have a much denser infill advocated by some because this could further obscure the views of the Arrow water course. Peeps through the existing houses still give the sense of Arrowtown's natural settlement derived from its topography of a tilted moraine or geological esker. There is still the need for throughway spaces to enable easy "look down" views to the river and this must be kept to retain the sense of a nested hamlet that now exists. Just to cram in more houses to fulfil a supposed potential substantial population increase based on an affordability premise is too much at the expense of the existing environment. *The failure to have a lookout from Cotters Avenue to Advance Terrace for the public to view the grandeur of the Wakatipu basin is not to be repeated so "horizon" housing is to be avoided along Centennial Avenue coming into the town.

(iv) It has to be realised once urbanisation has taken effect it is impossible to correct back to where it was. As an aside the classic illustration of this is the huge area now occupied by Auckland city of what was once highly productive land which produce (and its returns) are now no longer available to us. In other words Arrowtown should really be left alone. The current economic/immigration boom may be temporary and disadvantageous when considering long terms and the consequences of loss of rural lands. So a restrictive approach must be adopted- admittedly this is a "greeny" attitude- but given the commercial advantage of Arrowtown's hamlet size (cf Queenstown/Frankton and the other unserved satellite towns) it is important. This is a production factor not a population factor in a planners brief. It is to be remembered environmental cost/benefit analyses are not undertaken and really can not be so because there are too many variables- unpredictability of prices/product choices/weather uncertainties etc. Extrapolations of population growths are, however, less unpredictable but must be considered cautiously, as was revealed in the QLDC v Monk case; the "projectionists" made claims of factual growth which were in fact merely hypotheses. If migration were turned off, growth would appear to be only 2%apx. [birth rate growth] if our economic boom fell flat. No assumption should be made- as are now being made -of continuous growth and therefore of need of supply for although there has been population growth continuously for at least a decade like any market this can never be guaranteed. There could be a fall just as in Russia or France

unlikely though that be, or say, if tourism reached saturation point that made the area over filled and less attractive. At the moment growth is simply anticipated baby supply graphed from past statistics projected forward and skewed by anticipated permanent migration similarly deduced. It is logically based on an assumption of somewhat similar typicality to previous years and comparable areas. Tourism [i.e short term migration] also has some effect but really only on infrastructure. Price as a reflector of demand so therefore an indicator of growth of population is just so questionable the Auckland affordability issue ought not become the guide to the environmental primacy for QLDC which some have wrongfully inferred.

(v) The other argument for change, beside population increase per se in demand, is **location**. This may arise from the perception of housing price or more particularly that the Arrowtown is scenically advantageous or well infrastructured (good water/sewerage/schooling availability) so preferable. This may cause (and presently is causing) a demand level above birth growth. It is easy to become sympathetic to pleas for cheaper housing (for low income peoples, old peoples gated communities/retirement zonings for older people and the like) but to give way to all these waves of demands by further nips and erosions off what is rural land is ultimately self defeating- a short view for a long term loss- people may come and go but the land stays forever and as stated above rural land once built upon is irretrievably lost...when with a nine billion (9000000) world population to be fed there must come a time when rural productive sources become insufficient so rise in price. At the moment machinery and capital stocks (e.g insurance/banking) secure a comparative premium to rural commodities but this must inevitably change as food demand ultimately exceeds adequate supply.

The current migration waves imploding upon Europe and Australia may well be fore runners of this prospect though it is acknowledged food shortages we read of primarily arise from distribution problems rather than inadequate supplies. The practical local solution to this Malthusian possibility has been a judicial determination making McDonnell Road a boundary against urban magnification of a kind that would provide a buffer to uncontrolled growth. A firebreak as it were. Otherwise the next steps would be intrusion into Hills Golf Course and the few farm lands (including our own) remaining- a loss of scenic advantage that the compact village of Arrowtown describes. Views from the ridge line of the terminal moraine of the remaining virginal Wakatipu basin will be lost.

It is therefore arguable that the pressure for more housing of any kind in and around Arrowtown is to be avoided so the golf course does not need to grow houses, the infrastructure can have time to catch up on adequate school space, sufficient potable water can come at reasonable cost, and there can be little increase in car parking difficulties about the village or jamming traffic. In a nutshell the District Plan for Arrowtown and its environs for the term of the plan should be to keep PC30 as it is . We must be wary of "well dressed salesmen bearing gifts" to accelerate subdivisions. What growth there is can go elsewhere as the perception "growth is good" is false if the quality resulting from this growth is diminished. It risks the commercial advantage that the village nicety of the Arrowtown's small size achieves. It could lose its beguiling intimacy.

There appears foreshadowed but not yet formally notified (although propaganda in support of the same has already been released by the promoters Anderson & Monk) a proposal for a retirement village. This is intended to be on the illegal landing strip of Mr R. Monk now no longer compliant as a permitted farm landing strip. The effect of this closure may well be following the tragic death upon landing of a pilot. This grazing land may now no longer be a sufficiently productive unit on its own without the usage of the nearby land owned by Mr Monk across the road which is now in the process of development per the decision of Jackson

131

J. As we understand it this landing strip is to be his contribution to the retirement village planned by Mr Ron Anderson of Arrow International Ltd. It is zoned rural. He points out the demographics indicate the aged portion of our population is majorly increasing so there is potential for returns and the development fits his company's business ideally. We are aware of the ageing statistics and the suitability of the flat Monk land and acknowledge there is a shortfall in old people's housing and care facilities. As such we have no objection to Retirement Villages per se.

What we object to, however, is the proposed location.

We are aware it also appears to many as an attractive chance to satisfy the growth wish indicated by many Arrowtownians and that it is considered by many to be far enough away to not affect the ambience of the Arrowtown itself. But these approaches are, overall, undesirable.

The proposed development would jump the boundary "firebreak" of McDonnell Road between the urban and rural zones.

It would erode the ever diminishing rurality of the Wakatipu basin.

It would create a bad precedent (wishingly denied).

There has to be a time when such developments even those superficially attractive, must be curtailed else the farm land is gone.

Looking at the precedent risk it is in the same category as the proposed Feeley affordable housing proposal. This was of worthy intent providing (as it did) houses for a disadvantaged group. It jumped the present urban boundary on to the rural land - the wrong side of McDonnell Road. For Anderson the same measure applies except this now is for elderly housing care. It too would cross the McDonnell Road judicially approved boundary protecting the remaining endangered rural zone. Both plans of themselves are well intended offering "cures" (as it were) of known problems. If the one is denied why not the other? What is the difference? Those with unaffordable means compared to those needing elderly care?

Underneath it all it is the rural land that creates the ambience of the Lake Wakatipu basin and sets off Arrowtown itself. To allow either is to open the way to wall to wall housing from Arrowtown to Queenstown. A stake has to be put in the ground else nothing will be rural so this "undertow" of rolling down and green sward which sets off the mountain grandeur that makes Arrowtown and the Wakatipu basin a paradise - and the pleasure of the tourist upon which the primary income of all present residents rely - will be gone.

This is the principle upon which I approach this proposal without raising questions of infrastructure - such as what will be the increase in traffic flow along McDonnell Road? and parking in Arrowtown itself? or what will be the effect on the rail trail that runs alongside the road? or whether the sewage increase will put extra strain on Arrowtown residential rates or its present system? and will such guarantees - as may be given to meet these requirements - endure? or cause infrastructure strain from lighting to continuous potable water sufficiency?

Nor at this point has the effect on the demographic mix been considered e.g. will there be a drain out of older people from the village to a ghetto area? or an influx of elderly from Queenstown itself? to the detriment of younger persons in Arrowtown? or perhaps a reverse flow, residents determined to stay where they are so that the tourist/resident balance is unduly tilted? - but the fact remains that if there are to be 92 units in phase one of the proposed development with say 2 persons per unit plus a proposed "hospital unit" within the retirement precinct a new ageing mix is likely to arise and a new ambience affecting Arrowtown. Will the present Arrowtown facilities provide this? or will it mean incoming traffic and food haulage trucks as new suppliers?

Lastly why at Arrowtown? The obvious locations are at the sources of highest supply - that's to say Queenstown and Frankton - where old age care demand is highest and where

family care from younger family members who maybe continuing to reside there must create the warmest family connections. So why not Jacks Point? Or why not the suggested flight site on Queenstown Hill? Neither are rural. Or is this just an exercise in minimising cost at the expense of environment?

For these reasons we submit no substantial growth changes should be made to the existing growth boundaries and current rural zone outside of the urban area be retained.