Submission opposing Private Plan Change 2, Arrowtown South

Submitter	Georgina Riegen
Address for service	99 McDonnell Road, Arrowtown 9302
Email and phone	theriegens@gmail.com, 027 383 2249
Plan change	Private Plan Change 2, Arrowtown South (Arrowsouth Properties Limited)
Position	Oppose in full
I wish to be heard	No
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

I live at 99 McDonnell Road, Arrowtown. My husband and I bought our home three years ago and our property previously looked out over a rural section at 116 McDonnell Road, which is now being developed into housing. I oppose Private Plan Change 2 (PPC2) in full. I ask Council to decline it.

Part of what makes Arrowtown such a special place is that it is a small and unique town with a clearly defined boundary and strong historical character. If the boundary is moved each time someone requests it, this directly threatens the integrity of the boundary and sets a dangerous precedent. I am concerned that expanding Arrowtown's existing boundary will fundamentally change the fabric of the village into more of a township and have overall negative effects on the village.

PPC2 would rezone the open space land along McDonnell Road to Suburban Residential, with a 450 m² minimum lot size. It would also move the Urban Growth Boundary south. The applicant says this allows up to 44 sections. The references below are to the applicant's own documents on the Council website.

1. The open space was kept on purpose

The Environment Court confirmed the Arrowtown South open space and the boundary through Plan Changes 29, 30 and 39. It did so to protect the defined edge of the town. PPC2 undoes that. The applicant's landscape report says the change will be "obvious and inevitable" (Appendix L, p 5). It is only inevitable if Council approves it. Nothing changes on this land unless Council says yes.

2. The landscape effects are understated

The report rates the effects “low-moderate” (p 37). It also admits that development of this land “is contrary to policy 4.2.1.3” (p 41). It says the zone requires the pastoral landscape to be kept as private open space, then says that open space “does not significantly contribute to the overall amenity values” (p 34). Both cannot be right. The ratings depend on planting that has not grown. Lighting is barely considered (p 31). The report was reviewed in house, not independently.

3. Forty four is not the limit

The Request says its concept plan “is not intended to act as a formal Structure Plan” (p 19). The infrastructure assessment is sized for 61 lots (p 45). The original Request assessed 59 lots at a 300 m² minimum. The Request accepts that “it is possible that the UGB shifts further south than proposed” (p 43). It says the development “will eventually provide a connection point to the land to the south” (p 42). Council is being asked to move the boundary for 44 lots, while the applicant’s documents plan for more.

4. The services have not been shown to work

The applicant’s own wastewater modelling says “the risk of uncontrolled overflows is considered high”, even before any development. It says “upgrades are required before the development can be approved” (Appendix O). The water supply modelling shows storage of about 1,450 m³ against 2,662 m³ of peak day demand, and says peak day pumping breaches sustainable intake by 2027. The stormwater basins leave less than one litre per second of margin. Funding “will be determined in consultation with QLDC”. There are no costings.

5. The land and the hazards are not understood

The applicant’s geotechnical report found “uncontrolled fill” across the site (Appendix Q, p 2). Nobody has assessed what is in it, and there is no preliminary site investigation for contamination. The GNS Science liquefaction map (Report 2018/67) shows the McDonnell Road corridor as Domain B1, where damaging liquefaction is possible. The same report says slope instability in a large earthquake “is possible” (p 4). It tests earthquakes of magnitude 6.5 only. GNS and the AF8 programme put the chance of an Alpine Fault earthquake in the next 50 years at 75 percent. These matters are deferred, not resolved.

6. McDonnell Road and its access

There is no road layout to assess. The transport assessment says “there is no structure plan to determine a future subdivision or road layout at this time” (Appendix N, section 4.1.1). A new access would need road widening and earthworks on the trail. Only one intersection was modelled, using 2010 trip rates.

As someone who works from home, I regularly witness the daily traffic along McDonnell Road. The frequent excess speed of road users is especially concerning to me as a parent to a young child. There are many young families and pet owners who live along McDonnell Road and we worry it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident along our road due to the high number of speeding and distracted drivers. It is a common occurrence to see drivers using their mobile phones while driving down the road or driving well in excess of the 40km/h speed limit (we will often hear vehicles hit the speedbump outside our house at speed). Additional vehicles along the road as a result of further development would further exacerbate this issue.

We have also seen the creek that runs through the site overflow following periods of heavy rain, with surface flooding spilling onto McDonnell Road at the point the speed limit increases to 80km/h.

For the three years we have lived at 99 McDonnell Road, we have enjoyed walking through the reserve at Arrow South and up onto Advance Terrace. There will often be people walking their dogs, children riding their bikes, and others enjoying the trail and greenspace.

7. The ecology has not been assessed

The only ecological report looks at existing plantings, not at the site's wildlife (Appendix R). It was done in May, in a qualitative way, and says "some may have been overlooked" (p 6). Lizards are mentioned once, in a quoted objective (p 10). There is no herpetology assessment, so skinks have not been looked for. Southern grass skinks are At Risk and protected.

8. This will not fix housing or make Arrowtown affordable

The applicant's housing reviewer says the proposal "is unlikely to contribute over the short term due to lead times" and is "modest in scale" (Appendix J, p 2). It says Arrowtown "is not identified as a Priority Development Area" (p 9). It also says "Property values are high by national and district standards" (p 15). I found no affordability analysis. Sections of 450 m² in Arrowtown will sell at Arrowtown prices. The open space, once built on, cannot be replaced.

What I ask for

I ask that Council decline PPC2 in full. If Council does not, I ask that it commission independent landscape, economic and three waters reviews before it decides. The applicant should also provide the ecology, contamination and natural hazard assessments the Request lacks. It is for the applicant to show the land is suitable. It is not for neighbours to do that work.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.

Signed:  Date: 13/11/2026