QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

MY SUBMISSION

Specific provisions Specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to.	**Support or oppose** Whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended.	**Reasons for your views** Provide what you would like amended and reasons for your view	**Decision sought from Council** Provide precise details on what decision you are seeking.
Proposed rezoning of approximately 7.55 ha from the Arrowtown South Special Zone to the Suburban Residential Zone, including the site-specific provisions and proposed zoning framework.	Oppose in its current form.	The land is currently subject to a bespoke Arrowtown South Special Zone framework. The plan change would replace that framework with a general suburban residential zoning capable of enabling a materially more intensive and permanent development outcome. The application should demonstrate why the existing site-specific framework is no longer appropriate and why the proposed framework is superior in planning, landscape, transport and community terms. Physical capacity to accommodate housing is not, by itself, sufficient justification for rezoning.	Decline the plan change in its current form. Alternatively, retain the Arrowtown South Special Zone or adopt an equivalent site-specific framework that limits development to a scale, form and intensity appropriate to this sensitive Arrowtown South location.
Proposed residential density, development capacity and 450 m² minimum-lot concept.	Oppose; amend to reduce density.	The relevant effect is the cumulative outcome enabled across the site, not whether an individual 450 m² lot is acceptable in isolation. Numerous smaller lots may produce greater building coverage, dwelling and garage dominance, hard surfaces, fencing, lighting, vehicle movements and reduced space for meaningful landscaping. This risks an overly urban outcome and an abrupt transition to established neighbouring properties.	Reduce the residential capacity enabled by the plan change. Require larger minimum allotments and a lower-density transition along boundaries adjoining established residential properties. Ensure assessment is based on the full realistic capacity enabled by the provisions, not only the current indicative layout.
Transport effects, vehicle access and effects on the surrounding residential road network.	Oppose unless comprehensively resolved.	The rezoning may generate substantial additional resident, visitor, delivery, service and trades traffic. The assessment must address the full realistic development capacity, cumulative effects, road and intersection safety, pedestrian and cycling safety, and the amenity consequences of directing additional movements through a small established residential area. Technical road capacity alone does not establish that effects on residential safety and amenity are acceptable.	Require a robust integrated transport assessment of the maximum realistic development enabled, including cumulative and peak-period effects. Do not enable the proposed density unless safe and appropriately scaled access can be provided without materially degrading the safety or amenity of existing residential streets. If access is constrained, reduce the enabled density accordingly.
Resident and visitor parking associated with smaller allotments and higher residential density.	Oppose; amend.	Smaller sites provide less flexibility to accommodate dwellings, garages, outdoor living, landscaping, multiple resident vehicles and visitors. Unmet demand may be displaced to neighbouring streets, affecting safety, sightlines, pedestrian movement and residential amenity. The new development should not rely on existing residential roads to absorb its parking demand.	Include effective provisions requiring the development to accommodate reasonable resident and visitor parking demand within the site, together with safe service and delivery access, without creating material overspill parking on surrounding streets.
Landscape, visual character, built form, open-space outcomes and the southern Arrowtown setting.	Oppose; amend.	The site occupies an important location within Arrowtown South. The cumulative appearance of dwellings, roofs, garages, driveways, fences, retaining structures, lighting and hard surfaces must be assessed. Compliance with individual dimensional standards would not necessarily avoid an urban form inconsistent with the site's	Retain meaningful open space and landscape structure. Strengthen controls for building coverage, height, bulk, setbacks, landscaping, fencing, retaining structures and lighting. Require a coherent landscape-led design and an appropriate visual transition from established Arrowtown to the site.

MY SUBMISSION			
Specific provisions Specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to.	**Support or oppose** Whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended.	**Reasons for your views** Provide what you would like amended and reasons for your view	**Decision sought from Council** Provide precise details on what decision you are seeking.
		landscape context or the open-space character reflected in the existing special-zone framework.	
Interface with adjoining established residential properties, including privacy and amenity.	Oppose; amend.	Higher density beside existing homes may cause overlooking, loss of privacy and outlook, building dominance, vehicle and activity noise, headlights and increased exterior lighting. These effects are amplified where several smaller properties adjoin one existing property. As a neighbouring property owner, I will be directly affected by the development envelope enabled at this interface.	Require a lower-density edge, larger lots, increased building setbacks and substantial landscaped buffers along boundaries adjoining established residential properties. Include controls that protect privacy, outlook and amenity and avoid visually dominant development at those boundaries.
Overall integration, infrastructure, pedestrian connections, usable open space and community effects.	Oppose in its current form.	The proposal should be assessed as a permanent extension of Arrowtown, not simply as subdivision of one landholding. Additional housing capacity must be matched by appropriate infrastructure, safe walking and cycling connections, usable open space, landscaping and a high-quality neighbourhood design. The objective should be integrated development suited to this location, not maximisation of residential yield.	Require a comprehensive, site-specific structure and implementation framework securing infrastructure, connectivity, open space and landscape outcomes before additional development capacity is enabled. Make any approval conditional on enforceable provisions delivering those outcomes.