

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Mia Bennie	29/1/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Protect the unique village character and historic heritage of Arrowtown.</p> <p>Further submitters in support of submission:</p> <p><i>Valerie Couper (29/1/1/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/1/1/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/1/1/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/1/1/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/1/1/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/1/1/6)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submissions be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Mia Bennie	29/1/2	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Consider and give due weight to the majority view of Arrowtown.</p> <p>Further submitters in support of submission:</p> <p><i>Valerie Couper (29/1/2/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/1/2/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/1/2/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/1/2/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/1/2/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/1/2/6)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submissions be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions requires an evidential approach to the assessment of actual or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance on public opinion. • Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Mia Bennie	29/1/3	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Do not support the suggestion from the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust that boundary be</p>	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			extended to include Jopp Street (where affordable housing will be developed) because such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.	into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of the site within the urban boundary will erode the existing urban/rural interface that presently exists.
Grant Dalbeth	29/2/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Protect the unique village character and historic heritage of Arrowtown. Further submitters in support of submission: <i>Valerie Couper (29/2/1/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/2/1/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/2/1/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/2/1/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/2/1/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/2/1/6)</i>	That the submission and further submissions be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Grant Dalbeth	29/2/2	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Consider and give due weight to the majority view of Arrowtown. Further submitters in support of submission: <i>Valerie Couper (29/2/2/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/2/2/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/2/2/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/2/2/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/2/2/5)</i>	That the submission and further submissions be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions requires an evidential approach to the assessment of actual or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance on public opinion. • Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<i>Joanna Saxby (29/2/2/6)</i>	located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Grant Dalbeth	29/2/3	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Do not support the suggestion from the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust that boundary be extended to include Jopp Street (where affordable housing will be developed) because such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Inclusion of the site within the urban boundary will erode the existing urban/rural interface that presently exists.
Karen Miles	29/3/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Protect the unique village character and historic heritage of Arrowtown. Further submitters in support of submission: <i>Valerie Couper (29/3/1/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/3/1/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/3/1/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/3/1/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/3/1/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/3/1/6)</i>	That the submission and further submissions be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Karen Miles	29/3/2	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Consider and give due weight to the majority view of Arrowtown. Further submitters in support of	That the submission and further submissions be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions requires an evidential approach to the assessment of actual

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>submission:</p> <p><i>Valerie Couper (29/3/2/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/3/2/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/3/2/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/3/2/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/3/2/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/3/2/6)</i></p>	<p>or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance on public opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Karen Miles	29/3/3	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Do not support the suggestion from the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust that boundary be extended to include Jopp Street (where affordable housing will be developed) because such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.</p>	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. Inclusion of the site within the urban boundary will erode the existing urban/rural interface that presently exists.
Joanna Saxby	29/4/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Protect the unique village character and historic heritage of Arrowtown.</p> <p>Further submitters in support of submission:</p> <p><i>Valerie Couper (29/4/1/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/4/1/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/4/1/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/4/1/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/4/1/5)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submissions be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<i>Joanna Saxby (29/4/1/6)</i>	
Joanna Saxby	29/4/2	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Consider and give due weight to the majority view of Arrowtown.</p> <p>Further submitters in support of submission:</p> <p><i>Valerie Couper (29/4/2/1)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/4/2/2)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/4/2/3)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/4/2/4)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/4/2/5)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/4/2/6)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submissions be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions requires an evidential approach to the assessment of actual or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance on public opinion. • Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Joanna Saxby	29/4/3	Entire Plan Change	<p>Adopt the Plan Change as notified: Do not support the suggestion from the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust that boundary be extended to include Jopp Street (where affordable housing will be developed) because such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.</p>	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Inclusion of the site within the urban boundary will erode the existing urban/rural interface that presently exists.
Charlotte Aitken	29/451/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Charlotte Aitken	29/451/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/451/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/451/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/451/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/451/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/451/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/451/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/451/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/451/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Charlotte Aitken	29/451/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Vera Anderson	29/452/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Vera Anderson	29/452/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/452/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/452/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/452/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/452/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/452/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/452/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/452/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/452/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Vera Anderson	29/452/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
G C Antiss	29/453/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
G C Antiss	29/453/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave. Further submitters in opposition to submission: <i>James Bennie (29/453/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/453/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/453/2/3)</i>	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>Grant Dalbeth (29/453/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/453/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/453/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/453/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/453/2/8)</i></p>	
G C Antiss	29/453/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
BallaMac Holdings Ltd	29/454/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
BallaMac Holdings Ltd	29/454/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/454/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/454/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/454/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/454/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/454/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/454/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/454/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/454/2/8)</i></p>	<p>existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
BallaMac Holdings Ltd	29/454/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Emma Barker	29/455/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Emma Barker	29/455/2	Southern Boundary	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn,	That the submission be rejected , and the further

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
		of Arrowtown	<p>amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/455/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/455/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/455/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/455/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/455/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/455/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/455/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/455/2/8)</i></p>	<p>submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Emma Barker	29/455/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Firgrove Farm	29/456/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Firgrove Farm	29/456/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/456/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/456/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/456/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/456/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/456/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/456/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/456/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/456/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Firgrove Farm	29/456/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Richard Fleck	29/457/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Richard Fleck	29/457/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/457/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/457/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/457/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/457/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/457/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/457/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/457/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/457/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Richard Fleck	29/457/3	Southern Boundary	Policies should specifically recognise	That the submission be rejected for the following

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
		of Arrowtown	the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Toni Lewis	29/458/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Toni Lewis	29/458/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/458/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/458/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/458/2/3)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>Grant Dalbeth (29/458/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/458/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/458/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/458/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/458/2/8)</i></p>	<p>Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.</p>
Toni Lewis	29/458/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Carl Miles	29/459/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Withdraw the Plan Change.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Carl Miles	29/459/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/459/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/459/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/459/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/459/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/459/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/459/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/459/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/459/2/8)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Carl Miles	29/459/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
P E Newbold	29/460/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
P E Newbold	29/460/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/460/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/460/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/460/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/460/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/460/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/460/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/460/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/460/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
P E Newbold	29/460/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Pete Norman	29/461/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Pete Norman	29/461/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/461/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/461/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/461/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/461/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/461/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/461/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/461/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/461/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Pete Norman	29/461/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				extent of development in Arrowtown.
Andrew Pickard	29/462/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Andrew Pickard	29/462/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/462/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/462/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/462/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/462/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/462/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/462/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/462/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/462/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Andrew Pickard	29/462/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Niki Pickard	29/463/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Niki Pickard	29/463/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave. Further submitters in opposition to submission: <i>James Bennie (29/463/2/1)</i>	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>Mia Bennie (29/463/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/463/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/463/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/463/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/463/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/463/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/463/2/8)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Niki Pickard	29/463/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
James Rannard	29/464/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
James Rannard	29/464/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/464/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/464/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/464/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/464/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/464/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/464/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/464/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/464/2/8)</i></p>	<p>landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
James Rannard	29/464/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Adam Sakareassen	29/465/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Adam Sakareassen	29/465/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/465/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/465/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/465/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/465/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/465/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/465/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/465/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/465/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Adam Sakareassen	29/465/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Troy Stewart	29/466/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Troy Stewart	29/466/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/466/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/466/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/466/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/466/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/466/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/466/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/466/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/466/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Troy Stewart	29/466/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
John Thomssen	29/467/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
John Thomssen	29/467/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/467/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/467/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/467/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/467/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/467/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/467/2/6)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<i>Peter Roberts (29/467/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/467/2/8)</i>	
John Thomssen	29/467/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Susan and Ian Todd	29/468/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Susan and Ian Todd	29/468/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave. Further submitters in opposition to submission:	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>James Bennie (29/468/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/468/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/468/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/468/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/468/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/468/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/468/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/468/2/8)</i></p>	<p>result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.</p>
Susan and Ian Todd	29/468/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Andrew Turner	29/469/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Andrew Turner	29/469/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/469/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/469/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/469/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/469/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/469/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/469/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/469/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/469/2/8)</i></p>	<p>landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Andrew Turner	29/469/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Daniel Wedd	29/470/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				surrounding Arrowtown.
Daniel Wedd	29/470/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/470/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/470/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/470/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/470/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/470/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/470/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/470/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/470/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Daniel Wedd	29/470/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Jess Wilkinson	29/471/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Jess Wilkinson	29/471/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	<p>If the Plan Change is not withdrawn, amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/471/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/4713/2/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/471/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/471/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/471/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/471/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/471/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/471/2/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Jess Wilkinson	29/471/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Policies should specifically recognise the potential for planned and managed growth towards the Arrowtown Golf Club, and identify the	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			land that is appropriate for residential expansion of the township.	Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape. • Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			be assessed without the Policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary. The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same process. Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant guidelines' and what are not.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				surrounding Arrowtown.
Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk	29/472/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept that the Arrowtown South area will enable the town's growth needs to be met.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Arrowtown Business and promotion Association	29/473/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with Plan Change.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Arrowtown Village Association	29/474/1	Entire Plan Change	Neutral submission, but wishes to be part of consultative process on Plan Change.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Arrowtown Village Association submission

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>was made in accordance with the provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter attended the hearing and took part in the public process of Plan Change 29.
Barry and Ann Bain	29/475/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with Plan Change. Current boundary is sufficient, and emphasis should be on enhancing the historical aspect of the town.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Eva Balogh	29/476/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change and make no changes to the Arrowtown Urban Boundary.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Simon Beale	29/477/1	Entire Plan Change	Implement Plan Change 29 so it provides for a tight urban boundary.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
N W and C E Beggs	29/478/1	Entire Plan Change	Implement Plan Change 29 without change.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Terence Boylan	29/479/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Reconsider imposition of such a strict boundary and instead include provisions to ensure that growth is led by the Council rather than developers.</p> <p><i>Further submission in support of this submission:</i></p> <p><i>Eva Balogh (29/479/1/1)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Terence Boylan	29/479/2	Entire Plan Change	Consider establishment of new	That the submission be accepted in part for the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			township/s to direct growth thereby taking pressure off Arrowtown and other established settlements.	<p>following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown will require growth to be accommodated in other areas of the Wakatipu Basin, some of which may occur in new settlements or those more capable of absorbing some growth.
Terence Boylan	29/479/3	Entire Plan Change	Explore use of deferred zoning to signal which areas are suitable for urban development and will be serviced by infrastructure. Combine this with policies and rules to restrict growth outside those areas.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
David Clarke	29/480/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Support planting a town greenbelt to define the Arrowtown boundary.</p> <p>Further submissions in support of submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/480/1/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/480/1/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/480/1/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/480/1/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/480/1/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/480/1/6)</i></p>	<p>That the submission and further submissions be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowtown is already well contained within its landscape, and it is not considered necessary to further define the boundary by planting a greenbelt to provide further definition.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<i>Peter Roberts (29/480/1/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/480/1/8)</i>	
David Clarke	29/480/2	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Former sewage pond area could be comprehensively designed as a multi use area and absorbed into the town boundary.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Inclusion of the site within the urban boundary will erode the existing urban/rural interface that presently exists.
Raymond Clarkson	29/481/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with Plan Change. The boundary limits should protect the character of Arrowtown.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Michael Cleland	29/482/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with the Plan Change.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
G Deeley	29/483/1	Entire Plan Change.	Opposes Plan Change as further expansion is desired.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Wendy and Steve Ebsworth	29/484/1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose the Plan Change and consider the proposed boundary should be the 'inner boundary'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Shaun Faamalepe	29/485/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change and consider an alternate boundary.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
James Feehly	29486/1	Entre Plan Change	<p>The proposed boundary should be the 'Inner Growth Boundary, and that provision be made for an outer boundary to include the area to the south east between Centennial Avenue and McDonnell Road and from the inner boundary to the Golf Course.</p> <p>Rules should be provided for the Outer Boundary to protect the entrances to Arrowtown and special features of the <i>area</i>. The rules should require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 30m building setback from Centennial Avenue • A 50m setback from McDonnell Road • No building on the escarpment facing McDonnell Road • No building on the face of the ridge facing Centennial Avenue • Minimum allotment size on the ridge between the no build areas to be 4,000m² • Development in other areas must meet Low density requirements 	<p>That the submission be rejected and the further submissions accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • As no additional area is being identified for growth, there is no need to include any rules as suggested.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>of the District Plan.</p> <p>Further submissions in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk (29/486/1/1)</i> <i>James Bennie (29/486/1/2)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/486/1/3)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/486/1/4)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/486/1/5)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/486/1/6)</i> <i>Mt Soho Trust (29/486/1/7)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/486/1/8)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/486/1/9)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/486/1/10)</i></p>	
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	<p>That the submission be rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape. Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can be assessed without the Policy.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary. The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant guidelines' and what are not.
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Nick and Tania Flight	29/487/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept it.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan Change has been accepted to the extent that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary follows the extent of existing development in the Township. No changes are recommended the boundary.
Archie and June Flint	29/488/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				surrounding area.
Lorna Gibbens	29/489/1	Entire Plan Change	Opposes Plan Change – no decision requested.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources. This is best achieved by locating the urban boundary around the existing extent of development in Arrowtown. • Withdrawing the Plan Change and relying on the status quo to manage growth will result in an erosion of the quality of the landscape surrounding Arrowtown.
Jude Gillies	29/490/1	Entire Plan Change	Protect the unique village character and historic heritage of Arrowtown including clearly located boundaries along McDonnell Road, Jopp Street, Malaghan's Road and around the base of the hills and along the Arrow River.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Including the Jopp Street enclave within the urban boundary will detract from the present clear distinction between urban and rural at the Arrowtown Boundary.
Jude Gillies	29/490/2	Entire Plan Change	Council should consider and give due weight to the majority view of Arrowtown residents that future growth be contained within the current residential boundary.	<p>That the submission and further submissions be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions requires an evidential approach to the assessment of actual or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>on public opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Jude Gillies	29/490/3	Southern Boundary	Does not support extension of the boundary to include the proposed affordable housing site at Jopp Street. Such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Jopp Street enclave is not recommended for inclusion in the Arrowtown Urban Boundary. The recommendation to exclude the Jopp Street enclave is not based upon the matters raised by the submitter.
John Griffin	29/491/1	Entire Plan Change	Urban Growth Boundary should not be adopted as part of the District Plan.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
John Griffin	29/491/2	Entire Plan Change	Oppose Plan Change as the RMA states that the location of development should be assessed on its merits and through an effects based approach.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Applications for future development will still be assessed on their merits, but within the context of an urban growth boundary for Arrowtown that recognises protects te character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Allan Hamilton	29/492/1	Entire Plan Change	The Urban Growth Boundary should be expanded to the Golf Courses which act as natural boundaries.	<p>That the submission be rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Dame Elizabeth Hanan	29/493/1	Entire Plan Change.	Enforce the boundary as notified.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<p>existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
J M Hanan	29/494/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with the Plan Change	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
R Hanan	29/495/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Ken Hardman	29/496/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Melanie Hill	29/497/1	Entire Plan Change	Opposes Plan Change as notified and considers there should be a set back of 150m on all roads leading into Arrowtown, including Malaghan's Road.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Road setbacks are presently managed in the various Zone rules relating to development on the roads leading into Arrowtown. Changes to these rules are outside the scope of Plan Change 29.
Murray Keene	29/498/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw Plan Change and make no changes to the current boundaries.	<p>That the submission be rejected in part for the reasons:</p>

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Jo and Tom Maglaras	29/499/1	Southern Boundary	Extend the boundary to include Arrowtown South.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Don and Judith Mahon	29/500/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Opposes position of boundary at Jopp Street. Use the 3 golf courses, reserves and DoC land to form natural boundaries and a green buffer to the town.</p> <p>Land to the east of the Arrow River and Bush Creek should be identified as an ONL and act as a natural boundary.</p> <p>Centennial Avenue through to the Golf</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>Course and MacDonnell Road gives a clear containment boundary, with Butel Park completing the boundary.</p> <p>Centennial Avenue developed to the Arrowtown Golf Course will provide a well designed urban edge and entrance to Arrowtown.</p>	<p>Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.</p>
Mary Wallace and Philip Blakely	29/501/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt Plan Change	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Thelma and Russell Mason	29/502/1	Entire Plan Change	Oppose Plan Change – no decision requested.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Scott McCulloch	29/503/1	Entire Plan Change	Extend Boundary to include land bordering the Hills golf course.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Lisa Miles	29/504/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	<p>That the submission be rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Lisa Miles	29/504/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Lisa Miles	29/504/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can be assessed without the Policy.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary. The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Lisa Miles	29/504/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same process. Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Lisa Miles	29/504/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	<p>guidelines' and what are not.</p> <p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Lisa Miles	29/504/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept it.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan Change has been accepted to the extent that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary follows the extent of existing development in the Township. • No changes are recommended the boundary.
Ministry of Education	29/505/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>Proceed with Plan Change. By defining, consolidating and limiting further growth in Arrowtown the urban growth boundary enables better planning for the future education needs of the community. The level of growth allowed for within the boundary is likely to be within the capacity of Arrowtown primary school.</p> <p>Further submissions opposing submission:</p>	<p>That the submission be accepted, and the further submissions rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<i>Adamson Family Ltd and R Monk (30/505/1/1)</i> <i>Mt Soho Trust (30/505/1/2)</i>	
Rebecca Monk	29/506/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Rebecca Monk	29/506/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape. • Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Rebecca Monk	29/506/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			be assessed without the Policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary. The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Rebecca Monk	29/506/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same process. Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant guidelines' and what are not.
Rebecca Monk	29/506/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Rebecca Monk	29/506/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept it.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan Change has been accepted to the extent that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary follows the extent of existing development in the Township. • No changes are recommended to the Plan Change apart from additional wording to reflect the recommendations in this report.
Sam Monk	29/507/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Sam Monk	29/507/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape. • Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Sam Monk	29/507/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can be assessed without the Policy.	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary. • The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Sam Monk	29/507/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. • The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same process. • Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant guidelines' and what are not.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Sam Monk	29/507/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Sam Monk	29/507/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept it.	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan Change has been accepted to the extent that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary follows the extent of existing development in the Township. • No changes are recommended to the Plan Change apart from additional wording to reflect the recommendations in this report.
Cicely Morrison	29/508/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with Plan Change 29.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/1	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Amend the boundary to include land at the southern end of Arrowtown along the edges of McDonnell Road, the northern edge of the Arrowtown Golf Club and Centennial Ave.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/2	Policy 7.12.2	Delete the Policy as it duplicates Objective 1 of Section 4.9 of the Plan.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is concerned with preserving or enhancing Arrowtown's setting within the landscape. • Objective 1 of Section 4.9 is a District Wide Policy, seeking the maintenance of the quality of the natural environment and landscape values. Policy 7.12.2 is consistent with this Objective. It does not duplicate the Objective; rather, it captures the intent of the District Wide objective and identifies it as a specific Policy direction for Arrowtown.
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/3	Policy 7.12.3	Delete as the proposed Policy is unnecessary. Cumulative effects can be assessed without the Policy.	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy was originally imposed to enable assessment of developments within an expanded urban boundary.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The outcome of this Plan Change is that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary is to be located around the extent of existing development in Arrowtown. The Policy is not necessary in the absence of any areas identified for further expansion of Arrowtown.
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/4	Policy 7.13.1	Replace reference to 'Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006' with 'any relevant design guidelines'.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Arrowtown Design Guidelines have been specifically developed as a guide for new development in Arrowtown and to ensure that it is designed to be consistent with existing and identified values of Arrowtown. The Design Guidelines were developed through a consultative process and any amendments or further standards will also likely follow the same process. Referring to specific Design Guidelines removes any uncertainty over what are 'relevant guidelines' and what are not.
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/5	Policy 7.13.2	Amend to clarify meaning of designed urban edge to account for the presence and contribution of the Arrowtown Golf Club to create a landscaped gateway to the southern edge of the town.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Mt Soho Trust	29/509/6	Entire Plan Change	Amend Plan Change to address concerns then accept it.	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan Change has been accepted to the extent that the Arrowtown Urban Boundary follows the extent of existing development in the Township. No changes are recommended to the Plan Change apart from additional wording to reflect the recommendations in this report.
Leanne Newman	29/510/1	Entire Plan Change	Controlled growth should be allowed up to the natural boundaries, namely the area bounded by the three golf courses, including MacDonnell Road and Centennial Avenue.	<p>That the submission be rejected, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Richard Newman	29/511/1	Entire Plan Change	Extend the boundary to the Arrowtown Golf Course and on land on the northern side of McDonnell Road. Develop controls for this area on building set back, height restrictions and section size.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Richard Newman	29/511/2	Entire Plan Change	Put rules in place to protect the entrances to Arrowtown and the special features of the surrounding area.	That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placing the Arrowtown Urban Boundary around the extent of existing development will protect the entrances to the town as there can be no expansion beyond that boundary without a full assessment through either the Plan Change or Resource Consent process.
NZ Historic Places Trust	29/512/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt Plan Change.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Maurice Orr	29/513/1	Entire Plan Change	The Rural urban edge should have a setback of 20m from the road at the southern end.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing Rural Zone rules require, as a Zone Standard, that all buildings be set back a minimum of 20 metres from road boundaries. Plan Change 29 is concerned with the location of the Arrowtown Urban Boundary. No rules are included as part of the plan change.
Madeleine Paine	29/514/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change – do not want	That the submission be accepted for the following

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			Arrowtown to lose its small village charm by extending the boundary.	<p>reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Jonathan Palmer	29/515/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust	29/516/1	Jopp Street Boundary	Include Lot 2 DP 300390 within the Urban Growth Boundary for Arrowtown and add a new Policy to Section 4.9 Urban Growth, Objective 7 so that the Council can give effect to the mix of uses reflected in the Arrowtown Plan (2003).	<p>That the submission be rejected and the future submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>Further submitter in opposition to submission:</p> <p><i>Ervin 'Strauss' Steck (29/516/1/1)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including the Jopp Street enclave within the urban boundary will detract from the present clear distinction between urban and rural at the Arrowtown Boundary.
Queenstown Lakes District Council	29/517/1	Jopp Street Boundary	<p>Include Lot 2 DP 300390 and Part Lot 1 DP300390 (described in the Arrowtown Plan as the Jopp St enclave) within the Arrowtown urban growth boundary. Add a new policy to section 4.9 Urban Growth, Objective 7 so the Council can give effect to the mix of activities planned for the site, namely as a site for affordable housing development.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to this submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/517/1/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/517/1/2)</i> <i>Ervin Strauss Steck (29/517/1/3)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected and the future submissions be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. Including the Jopp Street enclave within the urban boundary will detract from the present clear distinction between urban and rural at the Arrowtown Boundary.
Queenstown Lakes District Council	29/517/2	Entire Plan Change	<p>Make any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the submission.</p> <p>Further submitters in opposition to this submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/517/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/517/2/2)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected and the further submissions accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have not recommended that the Jopp Street enclave be included within the urban boundary. No amendments to the District Plan are necessary.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Chris and Pam Read	29/518/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change in favour of the Arrowtown South Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Sebastian Reuss	29/519/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with the Plan Change and contain Arrowtown's growth within the existing boundaries.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Peter Roberts	29/520/1	Entire Plan Change	Proceed with the Plan Change as notified.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Belinda Robertson	29/521/1	Entire Plan Change	Plan Change opposed but no reasons stated.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
L W and E P Rogerson	29/522/1	Entire Plan Change	Include the proposed extension along McDonnell Road as far as the Golf Course.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Sian Sanford	29/523/1	Entire Plan Change	Include Arrowtown South in the boundary.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p>

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Tom and Diana Sidey	29/524/1	Entire Plan Change	Extend the growth boundary to the Arrowtown Golf Course and make natural boundary with the three golf courses.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Don Spary	29/525/1	Entire Plan Change	Withdraw the Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Ervin 'Strauss' Steck	29/526/1	Entire Plan Change	Abandon Plan Change 29 to recognise and support the existing District Plan in relation to clause 7.4.1 and to foster objectives 1 & 22 of Clause 7.1.2.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not considered appropriate to include for additional land within the Arrowtown Urban Boundary. Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown.
Ervin 'Strauss' Steck	29/526/2	Entire Plan Change	Relieve development pressure and foster a progressive future by postponing any boundary decision until Plan Change 39 is investigated.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Mervyn Strang	29/527/1	Entire Plan Change	Enlarge Arrowtown beyond the boundary proposed in Plan Change 29.	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Ken and Carol Swinney	29/528/1	Entire Plan Change	Assess the merits of and make additional provision for a planned or deferred approach outside the proposed boundary to cater for phased future growth, especially in McDonnell Road (east) and/or Jopp Street.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Peter Taylor	29/529/1	Entire Plan Change	Confirm that the proposed boundary changes will allow designed urban edge rules.	<p>That the submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No rules are included as part of the Plan Change.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
Peter Taylor	29/529/2	Entire Plan Change	Consideration be given to revisiting and revising existing rules on building setback requirements to meet requirements for new urban boundaries.	That the submission be rejected for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan Change 29 does not rezone any land. Accordingly no rules are included in the Plan Change. No new boundary is created for Arrowtown. The urban boundary is to be drawn around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
The Boxer Hill Trust	29/530/1	Entire Plan Change	Reject the Plan Change in its entirety. Further submissions opposing this submission: <i>James Bennie (29/530/1/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/530/1/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/530/1/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/530/1/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/530/1/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/530/1/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/530/1/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/530/1/8)</i>	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
The Boxer Hill Trust	29/530/2	Entire Plan Change	If the Plan Change is not rejected, include provisions that would enable future growth and development on the submitter's land. Further submissions opposing this submission: <i>James Bennie (29/530/2/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/530/2/2)</i>	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. Expansion of urban development as sought will

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>Valerie Couper (29/530/2/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/530/2/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/530/2/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/530/2/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/530/2/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/530/2/8)</i></p>	<p>result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.</p>
The Boxer Hill Trust	29/530/3	Entire Plan Change	<p>Include the submitter's properties within the urban growth boundary on the relevant planning maps and include provisions (objectives, policies and rules) to enable future growth and development within that area.</p> <p>Further submissions opposing this submission:</p> <p><i>James Bennie (29/530/3/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/530/3/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/530/3/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/530/3/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/530/3/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/530/3/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/530/3/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/530/3/8)</i></p>	<p>That the submission be rejected, and the further submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
The Boxer Hill Trust	29/530/4	Entire Plan Change	<p>Make all consequential relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>Further submissions opposing this submission:</p>	<p>That the submission be rejected and the further submissions accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The earlier submissions of the Boxer Hill Trust have not been accepted. No changes to the District Plan are recommended as a result of this submission.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p><i>James Bennie (29/530/4/1)</i> <i>Mia Bennie (29/530/4/2)</i> <i>Valerie Couper (29/530/4/3)</i> <i>Grant Dalbeth (29/530/4/4)</i> <i>Margaret Maclachlan (29/530/4/5)</i> <i>Gillian Roberts (29/530/4/6)</i> <i>Peter Roberts (29/530/4/7)</i> <i>Joanna Saxby (29/530/4/8)</i></p>	
Matthew and Bronwyn Thomas	29/531/1	Entire Plan Change	Protect the character of Arrowtown.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Matthew and Bronwyn Thomas	29/531/2	Entire Plan Change	Consider and give due weight to what is clearly a majority view of the Arrowtown community.	<p>That the submission be accepted in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource Management decisions require an evidential approach to the assessment of actual or potential adverse effects, rather than reliance on public opinion. • Having considered the evidence presented at the hearing we are of the view that that an urban boundary is a sound method of achieving the

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				sustainable management of Arrowtown's resources, and that the urban boundary is best located around the existing extent of urban development in Arrowtown.
Matthew and Bronwyn Thomas	29/531/3	Southern Boundary of Arrowtown	Do not support suggestion that Jopp St enclave (where affordable housing is to be developed) be included within the boundary. Such housing will not be close to households' places of work and residences will not be integrated into the community.	That the submission be accepted for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Including the Jopp Street enclave within the urban boundary will detract from the present clear distinction between urban and rural at the Arrowtown Boundary.
A W Thomson	29/532/1	Entire Plan Change	Allow growth on the north side of McDonnell Road only.	That the submission be rejected , and the further submissions accepted , for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
Michael Tierney	29/533/1	Entire Plan Change	Amend the boundary to extend along	That the submission be rejected , and the further

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			McDonnell Road.	<p>submissions accepted, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apart from one exception, Arrowtown is presently compact and well contained within the landscape. Urban expansion will conflict with existing District Plan provisions. • Urban expansion will not be in keeping with the existing landscape character of the areas surrounding Arrowtown. • Expansion of urban development as sought will result in poor connectivity with the remainder of Arrowtown and encourage increased dependence on cars.
L T Toschach	29/534/1	Entire Plan Change	Maintain growth within the proposed Arrowtown Boundary.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Joe Vescio	29/535/1	Entire Plan Change	<p>That the Arrowtown Growth Boundary not proceed in its current form without further investigation into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The necessity for pre-determining growth boundaries • Lack of detailed analysis of existing opportunities and constraints (eg 	<p>That the submission and further submission be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown.

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
			<p>infrastructure, demographics, community and support services, social and economic impact assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to investigate opportunities for housing choice within existing zoned areas. • Whether growth can be accommodated within existing under-utilised land • Whether the proposed growth boundary is sustainable from environmental, social and economic perspectives. <p>Further submission supporting this submission:</p> <p><i>Murray Keene (29/535/1/1)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. • Some growth can be accommodated within the existing zoned area of Arrowtown.
Philip Winstone	30/536/1	Entire Plan Change	Adopt Plan Change.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.
Sandra Zuschlag	30/537/1	Entire Plan Change.	Keep Arrowtown the size it is now.	<p>That the submission be accepted for the following reasons:</p>

Submitter name and position on Plan Change 29	Submission Point	Part of Plan Change to which submission relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and reasons (to be read in context of Commissioners' recommendation report).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing an Urban Boundary around the existing urban area of Arrowtown is the most effective means to manage demand and growth in Arrowtown. • Arrowtown as it presently exists is nestled well into the landscape and further expansion will adversely affect the character and amenity of the surrounding area.