

Urban Intensification

Submitter Details

First name: David **Last name:** Harding-Shaw
Organisation: Arrowtown Village Association

On behalf of:

Preferred method of contact Email

Postal address: PO Box 140

Suburb:

City: Arrowtown

Country: New Zealand

Postcode: 9351

Email: treasurer@arrowtownvillage.nz

Daytime Phone: * 021472826

I could not Gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :
a. adversely affects the environment, and
b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.
Note to person making submission:

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

Would you like to speak at the hearing? *

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Additional requirements for hearing:

Consultation Document Submissions

Provision: Chapter 7 - Lower Density Suburban Residential

Oppose

I seek the following decision::

Withdrawl of the proposal, or removal of Arrowtown from the proposal.

My submission is::

The Arrowtown Village Association (AVA) works in an energetic, co-operative and organised way for the benefit of the village of Arrowtown. Since the association's incorporation (as the Arrowtown Residents Association) in 1999 by local ratepayers it has represented those who choose to live in or have other associations with our town.

The AVA is a charitable incorporated society representing the Arrowtown community. The Arrowtown/Kawarau QLDC ward councillors are ex officio committee members with voting rights. This is a valuable connection between our community and our local council ensuring Arrowtown values are heard and understood within council.

The proposed variation in respect to Urban Intensification (UI) under the Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) Proposed District Plan has generated high interest within the Arrowtown Community. The AVA has encouraged members to make individual submissions based on their personal opinions. Additionally, the AVA has undertaken a community survey to gain feedback in order to accurately gauge opinion and compose this submission on behalf of its members and the wider community.

This submission is focused on the proposed changes to both the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone within the Arrowtown urban boundaries. Particularly the increased proposals of density and height and the ramifications of these and the range of changes as per:

The variation is not in accordance with the requirements of the NPS-UD.

The provisions of the variation are not in accordance with the sound resource management placing principles.

The variation, if approved, would result in development that is fully in contrary to the district plan provisions relating to development in Arrowtown.

That the development establishment would have significant adverse effects in the terms of potential for domination of build form, shading, loss of access to sunshine, and loss of views.

That there is sufficient and inadequate infrastructure in Arrowtown to support the development that is enabled by the provisions of this variation.

This submission is hence opposing the changes, due to the negative effect it will have on the "Arrowtown Character" and its unique standing as a picturesque "village" within the Whakatipu Basin.

In relation to the village aspect, the AVA understands that the proposed changes to the PDP are based on Central Government guidance that it is mandatory for these changes apply to which states, "A relevant residential zone does **not** include: amongst other criteria, "a mainly urban area that the 2018 census recorded as having a resident population of less than 5000". Recent statistics confirm the Arrowtown township population is less than 3000... as such we strongly question the ability of QLDC to implement these requirements.

The QLDC Council Report 1 June 2023 point 10 states that "The QLDC HDCA identifies that the District has sufficient feasible, and reasonably expected to be realised, development capacity to provide for projected housing demand for the short, medium and long term." For this reason QLDC had no need to implement Policy 5 of the NPD-UD, and should not have.

Over many years the Arrowtown community has consulted on, and composed in-depth documents relating to the future of Arrowtown from the community viewpoint and desires. These include, but are not limited to, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines (2016) which are embedded in the QLDC Proposed District Plan (PDP) and the Shaping our Future (SOF) Arrowtown report (2017, revised with public consultation 2022) which has been noted by QLDC as a reference document.

The Christchurch City Council, with guidance from Central Government, voted not to implement any changes to the historic town of Akaroa due to its character and historic importance. The AVA consider Arrowtown to be in this same category as Akaroa and QLDC should remove it from the current QLDC PDP.

THE REASONS FOR MY SUBMISSION ARE:

Shaping Our Future, Arrowtown:

The AVA was in 2018 been appointed guardian of the Shaping Our Future (SOF) 2017 report. The SOF Arrowtown report was updated with full community input in 2022.

2022 SOF supporting extract:

This report is intended to provide 'decision makers' (from community groups to statutory bodies) with direction to guide their decision making and it is hoped, in particular, that QLDC staff will actively respect and utilise its content.

- SOF is a visioning document for Arrowtown compiled by an intensive community consultation process and the approval of QLDC.
- SOF is the most recent, **community driven**, vision for Arrowtown

- The Urban intensification proposal is deemed to be against the aspirations the Arrowtown community holds, as expressed by the vision statements and recommendations within the SOF report.

The AVA speaks for the association's members by reference to the SOF report and the community consultation from which it was finalised, irrespective of the views or interests of the individual committee members. The AVA has encouraged members and the wider community to make individual submissions based on their personal opinions.

The very special nature of Arrowtown, its unique character, its historical heritage, and its tourist potential all mean that careful monitoring, guardianship and management is required. All community driven documents highlight the desire to preserve, retain and enhance the authenticity of Arrowtown. The whole village which is cherished by the community and both New Zealand and International visitors.

The AVA feels this proposal is contrary to the spirit of the current District Plan Rules, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines and the community recommendations expressed in SOF Arrowtown.

SOF Arrowtown, has the core principles of

- Heritage
- Character
- Community
- Environment

The following statements and recommendations from SOF highlight that this PDP UI proposal is inappropriate.

ARROWTOWN COMMUNITY VISION 2050 AND BEYOND

- *A vibrant, diverse community that is pro-active in managing its future in a way that values and sustainably protects its heritage, **character**, lifestyle and the natural environment*

Heritage:

- *Arrowtown is a living, **ever-changing town that respects, retains and celebrates its heritage, character and amenities**. Heritage continues to be an economic driver for Arrowtown*
- ***QLDC rigorously uses its statutory documents** (District Plan and Arrowtown Design Guidelines), to ensure that the rich heritage status of Arrowtown continues to be maintained. This includes buildings, plantings, features and landscapes*
- *Designated Historic areas are protected by design controls developed by the **appropriate experts and administered/regulated by people with specialist knowledge of Arrowtown**.*

Character:

- *The character and amenities valued by Arrowtown residents and visitors today are carried forward into the future. The town's scale respects the natural landforms, and **new and old sit comfortably together***

This Character vision statement highlights that the AVA objection is that the increased building height and mass resulting from the proposed changes to the PDP will not sit comfortably within the Arrowtown residential zones. The changes would not meet the SOF Character vision as highlighted, with the scale and form being problematic, and is not a sympathetic blending of style for the existing zone/s.

Further relevant statements from the Character section of SOF:

- *Impediments to delivering the vision*
- *Inappropriate design proposals and poor application of the District Plan (and by default inappropriate changes to the DP).*
 - *Recommendations*

- *The District Plan is based on local community feedback regarding the preferred approach to future development.*

As a support to the SOF, the AVA also notes the Resource Management Act (RMA) requires an assessment of whether activity will result in any significant adverse effect on the environment,

Section 2 of the RMA defines environment as:

“Environment” includes –

(a) *Ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities; and*

(b) *All natural and physical resources; and*

(c) *Amenity values; and*

(d) *The social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matters stated in paragraphs (a) to(c) of this definition or which are affected by those matters:*

The SOF report statements highlighted in this submission illustrate that the effects on the environment due to this proposal are major.

Relevant points from SOF 2022 review include, but are not limited to:

- Arrowtown had a 2021 resident population of 2860 with an expected increase to 3120 by 2051. District Plan enabled dwelling capacity is a further 271 dwellings, but densification could increase this, subject to consents. (*this current capacity indicates less than one person per dwelling, as such the AVA questions the need for intensive in-fill as proposed under the PDP UI?*)
- The need to preserve the heritage, character, environment and meet the community needs of the village into the future.

ARROWTOWN COMMUNITY VISION 2050 AND BEYOND:

“Arrowtown remains a living village where people from all walks of life interact to form a community that preserves and protects the heritage, character and environment of the area”

Further extracts:

- Residents and visitors will see and experience a unique yet complementary blend of old and new, open space and thoughtful build design, low key infrastructure that blends with the natural environment, and a community centric approach to changing land use. The boundary that defines and constrains the village is key to preserving all of the things that the community and its visitors value.
- Managing the consequences of growth is recognised as Arrowtown’s greatest challenge. The issues surrounding density and growth are critical issues relating to Arrowtown’s future. The question of expansion vs increased density has been to the fore since the first Community Planning Workshop (Charette) held in 1994.
- At present Arrowtown has a controlled urban growth boundary which is essential for maintaining the nature and character of the village. This has been upheld by both the Environment and High Courts. There is potential for growth within the town boundaries through selective infilling and spot zoning.
- There are many concerns related to both increased expansion and increased density in Arrowtown.
- Arrowtown’s desirability as a place to live work and visit is quite finely balanced and would be easily eroded through insensitive expansion and/ or intensification.
- QLDC reflects the voice of the Arrowtown community in the formulation of planning rules and guidelines, and in all planning decisions affecting Character
- Ensure planning decisions uphold and reflect the community view (Character)
- The District Plan prioritises local community feedback regarding the preferred approach to future development.

The AVA on behalf of the Arrowtown community objects to the PDP UI proposal based on the SOF report.

ARROWTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES 2016

The Arrowtown Design Guidelines, ref QLDC PDP, are fundamental to promoting positive design outcomes within these zones.

The AVA wishes to reference section 4: "New town residential guidelines"

Section 4.1:

*It is essential that developments within the Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone (ARHMZ) respect and conserve this heritage character. **However, it is also important to ensure that elements of this character are seen in new developments in both the MDR and LDSR zones, so that they also contribute towards the unique character of Arrowtown.***

Section 4.1.1:

*Development in the MDR and LDSR zones that trigger the need for resource consent (or where this can be undertaken without the need for a resource consent), and other areas adjoining the ARHMZ should consider how they can incorporate these elements within their designs to ensure that they better reflect the character of Arrowtown. **All development should seek to ensure that they have positive effects on the character of the ARHMZ and Arrowtown in general.** It is essential that this is done when sites adjoin the ARHMZ to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on these elements.*

*By selecting elements that contribute to the heritage character of the ARHMZ and incorporating them into the MDR and LDSR zones visual linkage and cohesion can be achieved between the New Town and Arrowtown's core. **The Arrowtown identity can be extended throughout the Zones.** Elements that can be easily extended include:*

- Tall mature trees, hedges and an abundance of other vegetation on both private and public land.*
- Vegetation dominating over buildings.*
- Buildings composed of small forms - single storey and distinct.*
- Streets with narrow carriageways, grass shoulders, grass swales and wide grass verges, with evenly spaced street trees.*
- Simple, natural materials for paving, driveways and hard surfaces.*
- The spacious simple and uncluttered character.*
- The sometimes semi-wildness, the non-perfect.*

Section 4.1.2.1:

*Respect and enhance the character of the ARHMZ and **other Zones**, the streetscape, the vicinity, vistas i.e. the setting and context.*

Section 4.1.2.2:

Include some of the heritage character elements from the ARHMZ into the LDSR & MDRZ.

*a) The historic **character** of the ARHMZ **should not compromise or be compromised by developments in adjacent areas and vice versa.***

b) Where possible take steps to incorporate elements which contribute to the character of the ARHMZ into developments within the MDR and LDSR zones.

Section 4.4.1 GUIDELINES: REDEVELOPMENT, UPGRADE AND NEW SUBDIVISION WITHIN THE LDSR & MDR ZONES:

Section 4.4.1.1:

Strengthen the links to the character of the ARHMZ and Old Town in any new development or area of re-development

within the LDSR & MDR Zones.

d) Where possible, design houses to relate to the street and encourage neighbourhood interaction and safety in the streets.

e) Design houses with small visually distinct forms as opposed to one large building under a single roof.

Section 4.5.1.3:

Within the LDSR zone, new development/redevelopment should aim for a more spacious appearance with reduced domination by buildings.

Section 4.5.1.4:

The historic character of adjacent sites (and enjoyment of neighbours) should not be compromised. a) Consider and try not to compromise the historic character of neighbouring properties, the vicinity, and wider area i.e. the setting and context.

b) Consider and respect the **effects on neighbour's sun and views.**

Section 4.6:

It is very important that new buildings, within any of the Zones, do not begin to look just like contemporary housing elsewhere in the District.

Section 4.8 NEW CONSTRUCTION IN THE LDSR & MDR ZONES

The apparent bulk of buildings within these zones can be reduced by designing the building as a number of individual elements. In an additive approach, (identified in MDRZ & LDSRZ-Figure 6), the size of the individual elements needs to be small enough to be at human scale, however the size does not necessarily have to duplicate the diminutive scale of an Arrowtown cottage.

It is important that the form of each element is simple and that the form is clearly evident in the final building composition. **Single storeyed forms are far more compatible with the old Arrowtown identity and their use is encouraged, particularly abutting neighbours and the street.** However it is recognised that this may not be possible within the MDR zone where smaller sites are allowable.

Section 4.8.2 GUIDELINES: MDR AND LDSR ZONES, NEW CONSTRUCTION TO INTEGRATE WITH OLD ARROWTOWN'S IDENTITY

Section 4.8.2.1:

Design new construction so that it shares key features with the characteristic dwellings of Arrowtown's old residential area

Section 4.8.2.2:

Preferably build single storey houses as they are more appropriate to Arrowtown.

Section 4.9 SPACIOUSNESS AND SIMPLICITY:

The typical residential pattern for early Arrowtown was low density.... Even with the considerable increase in density, a sense of spaciousness remains. The streets are a major contributor. **This feeling of space or low density is extremely important to the character It is important that development within the MDR and LDSR zones create a similar sense of spaciousness and apparent low density.**

Section 4.9.1.2:

New developments within the MDR and LDSR zones should reflect the sense of spaciousness and simplicity seen within the ARHMZ. a) Utilise simple, uncluttered arrangements of trees, hedges and grassed areas in the street and private sections. This simplicity and sense of spaciousness comes primarily from:

- Carefully siting buildings and **manipulating their shape and form so that they appear small scale and unobtrusive when viewed from the street.**

Section 4.13.1 GUIDELINES: VIEWS/VISTAS:

Section 4.13.1.1:

Preserve key views and consider all vistas.

a) Identify all views and view corridors across private and public land and seek to retain these views (with key view corridors identified within the respective neighbourhood plans set out in Section 2).

*b) **If the values of the ARHMZ and other Zones are to be retained, key views, identified on the neighbourhood maps should be protected. Other views should be retained where possible.** Key views are identified within the respective Neighbourhood Plans set out in Section 2 of this Guidance.*

Section 4.27.1.1:

*Within the ARHMZ new buildings should be designed so that each primary element is independent structurally and in terms of construction. **Buildings within the MDR and LDSR zones should also have the appearance that this is the case**, especially where these zones immediately adjoin or adjacent to the ARHMZ.*

a) A complex of buildings should be designed to be built as a number of small independent structures, not as a single complicated object 'dressed' with a variety of claddings.

The AVA submits all of the above extracts, from the ADG which is an accepted document within the current QLDC PDP, **clearly indicate the proposed changes should not be allowed to occur.**

SUMMARY:

The AVA, on behalf of its members and the wider community, request that the proposed PDP Urban Intensification changes be removed from the current QLDC PDP. Although QLDC indicates these changes are a central government requirement, the uniqueness of the Arrowtown village, confirmed by community generated documents, deems the village to be excluded.



FORM 6: FURTHER SUBMISSION

IN SUPPORT OF, OR IN OPPOSITION TO,
SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED PLAN CHANGE,
VARIATION OR PROPOSED POLICY STATEMENT



Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



TO // Queenstown Lakes District Council

Name of further submitter David Harding-Shaw on behalf of the Arrowtown Village Association



FURTHER SUBMISSION // In support of or opposition to a submission on:

Variation to Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan - Urban Intensification

I AM [state whether you are]

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

[in this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category]



A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the general public's interest; or

[in this case, also specify the grounds for saying that you come within this category]

The Arrowtown Village Association (AVA) is an incorporated society representing the interests of the residents of Arrowtown.

The local authority for the relevant area.



I wish

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

I will



I will not* consider presenting a joint case with others presenting similar submissions.

* Select one

When a person or group makes a submission or further submission on a District Plan or Plan Change this is public information.

Please note that by making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses will be made publicly available under the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you as well as to QLDC.

There are limited circumstances when your submission or your contact details can be kept confidential. If you consider you have compelling reasons why your submission or your contact details should be kept confidential, please contact the Senior District Plan Administrator on 03 441 0499 to discuss.



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.	Original submission details You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.	Support or oppose Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.	Reason Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.	Decision sought from Council State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.
OS9.7	Max Perkins, maxxperkins@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The AVA was in 2018 appointed guardian of the Shaping Our Future (SOF) 2017 report. The SOF Arrowtown report was updated with full community input in 2022. Extract: SOF is a visioning document for Arrowtown compiled by an intensive community consultation process and the approval of QLDC. SOF is the most recent, community driven, vision for Arrowtown Urban Intensification. The Urban intensification proposal is deemed to be against the aspirations the Arrowtown community holds, as expressed by the vision statements and recommendations within the SOF report. The following statements and recommendations from SOF highlight that this PDP UI proposal is inappropriate. ARROWTOWN COMMUNITY VISION 2050 AND BEYOND: Residents and visitors will see and experience a unique yet complementary blend of old and new, open space and thoughtful build design, low key infrastructure that blends with the natural environment	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS139	Sian Taylor sian@teamgreenarchitects.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Over many years the Arrowtown community has consulted on, and composed in-depth documents relating to the future of Arrowtown from the community viewpoint and desires. These include, but are not limited to, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines (2016) which are embedded in the QLDC Proposed District Plan (PDP). The Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016, ref QLDC PDP, are fundamental to promoting positive design outcomes within these zones. The AVA wishes to reference section 4: "New town residential guidelines" Section 4.1: It is essential that developments within the Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone (ARHMZ) respect and conserve this heritage character. However, it is also important to ensure that elements of this character are seen in new developments in both the MDR and LDSR zones, so that they also contribute towards the unique character of Arrowtown.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS389.11	Ella Hardman ella@southernland.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The QLDC Council Report 1 June 2023 point 10 states that "The QLDC HDCA identifies that the District has sufficient feasible, and reasonably expected to be realised, development capacity to provide for projected housing demand for the short, medium and long term." For this reason QLDC had no need to implement Policy 5 of the NPD-UD, and should not have.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS468.2	ella Hardman ella@southernland.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.1.2.2 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: Include some of the heritage character elements from the ARHMZ into the LDSR & MDRZ. a) The historic character of the ARHMZ should not compromise or be compromised by developments in adjacent areas and vice versa.	part of the original submission to be disallowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.	Original submission details You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.	Support or oppose Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.	Reason Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.	Decision sought from Council State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.
OS389.10	Ella Hardman ella@southernland.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.5.1.4 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: The historic character of adjacent sites (and enjoyment of neighbours) should not be compromised. a) Consider and try not to compromise the historic character of neighbouring properties, the vicinity, and wider area i.e. the setting and context. b) Consider and respect the effects on neighbour's sun and views. Increased height limits will impact on this.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS498.6	Pavla Mertlik pavlamertlik@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.4.1.1 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: Strengthen the links to the character of the ARHMZ and Old Town in any new development or area of re-development Urban Intensification within the LDSR & MDR Zones. d) Where possible, design houses to relate to the street and encourage neighbourhood interaction and safety in the streets. e) Design houses with small visually distinct forms as opposed to one large building under a single roof.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS659.13	Scott Edgar scott@edgarplanning.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.5.1.3 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: Within the LDSR zone, new development/redevelopment should aim for a more spacious appearance with reduced domination by buildings. This is at odds with the new proposed height limits.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS727.1	Matt Feary matt@rms.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.5.1.4 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: The historic character of adjacent sites (and enjoyment of neighbours) should not be compromised. a) Consider and try not to compromise the historic character of neighbouring properties, the vicinity, and wider area i.e. the setting and context. The elements agreed to in this submission impact on areas other than those specifically mentioned by the submitter.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS468.6	Ella Hardman ella@southernland.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	One of the stated aims of the bill that introduced the NPS-UD was to address issues relating to housing affordability. Given the high level of land values in Arrowtown, the intended outcomes will not be achieved through intensification of this town. There are other areas in the district where this could be better achieved.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS139.5	Sian Taylor sian@teamgreenarchitects.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Reference Section 4.9 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: SPACIOUSNESS AND SIMPLICITY: The typical residential pattern for early Arrowtown was low density.... Even with the considerable increase in density, a sense of spaciousness remains. The streets are a major contributor. This feeling of space or low density is extremely important to the character It is important that development within the MDR and LDSR zones create a similar sense of spaciousness and apparent low density.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS711.8	Nicola Blennerhassett nic@piwakawaka.net	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	We agree with the submission opposing the increase in height to 11 +1M. However we do not agree with the suggestion to adjust this to 10M in Arrowtown.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS711.	Nicola Blennerhassett nic@piwakawaka.net	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Regarding the proposed height increase, Reference Section 4.5.1.4 of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines: The historic character of adjacent sites (and enjoyment of neighbours) should not be compromised. b) Consider and respect the effects on neighbour's sun and views.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS840.4.7.G	Alex Dunn alex@southernplanning.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Over many years the Arrowtown community has consulted on, and composed in-depth documents relating to the future of Arrowtown from the community viewpoint and desires. These include, but are not limited to, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines (2016) which are embedded in the QLDC Proposed District Plan (PDP), Reference Section 4.1.1: Development in the MDR and LDSR zones that trigger the need for resource consent (or where this can be undertaken without the need for a resource consent), and other areas adjoining the ARHMZ should consider how they can incorporate these elements within their designs to ensure that they better reflect the character of Arrowtown. All development should seek to ensure that they have positive effects on the character of the ARHMZ and Arrowtown in general. It is essential that this is done when sites adjoin the ARHMZ to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on these elements. By selecting elements that contribute to the heritage character of the ARHMZ and incorporating them into the MDR and LDSR zones visual linkage and cohesion can be achieved between the New Town and Arrowtown's core. The Arrowtown identity can be extended throughout the Zones. Elements that can be easily extended include: Tall mature trees, hedges and an abundance of other vegetation on both private and public land. Vegetation dominating over buildings. Buildings composed of small forms - single storey and distinct.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS522.2	Wendy Baker wendy5boundary@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Heritage continues to be an economic driver for Arrowtown. QLDC rigorously uses its statutory documents (District Plan and Arrowtown Design Guidelines), to ensure that the rich heritage status of Arrowtown continues to be maintained. This includes buildings, plantings, features and landscapes Designated Historic areas are protected by design controls developed by the appropriate experts and administered/regulated by people with specialist knowledge of Arrowtown.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS1253.4	John Edmonds john@jea.co.nz	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Recession planes are in place to protect neighbours amenity of sunlight and views. Increasing this is at odds with the Resource Management Act (RMA) which requires an assessment of whether activity will result in any significant adverse effect on the environment, Section 2 of the RMA defines environment as: "Environment" includes – (a) Ecosystems and their constituent parts, including people and communities; and (b) All natural and physical resources; and (c) Amenity values; and (d) The social, economic, aesthetic, and cultural conditions which affect the matters stated in paragraphs (a) to (c) of this definition or which are affected by those matters. While the submission primarily deals with a specific area, the suggested changes impact on other areas where they are not appropriate.	part of the original submission as it applies to Arrowtown to be disallowed
OS56.1	Charles Fraser arrowhound2020@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The submission seeks to reopen debate about the urban boundary in place for Arrowtown. Excerpt from ARROWTOWN COMMUNITY VISION 2050 AND BEYOND: "Arrowtown remains a living village where people from all walks of life interact to form a community that preserves and protects the heritage, character and environment of the area" Further extracts: Residents and visitors will see and experience a unique yet complementary blend of old and new, open space and thoughtful build design, low key infrastructure that blends with the natural environment, and a community centric approach to changing land use. The boundary that defines and constrains the village is key to preserving all of the things that the community and its visitors value. Managing the consequences of growth is recognised as Arrowtown's greatest challenge. The issues surrounding density and growth are critical issues relating to Arrowtown's future. The question of expansion vs increased density has been to the fore since the first Community Planning Workshop (Charette) held in 1994. At present Arrowtown has a controlled urban growth boundary which is essential for maintaining the nature and character of the village. This has been upheld by both the Environment and High Courts.	part of the original submission to be disallowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.	Original submission details You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.	Support or oppose Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.	Reason Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.	Decision sought from Council State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.
OS56.2	Charles Fraser arrowhound2020@gmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oppose	A consistent message in Shaping our Future as a guidance document for the Arrowtown community has been maintaining the existing urban growth boundary. This is both in the original document 2017, and the revision in 2022.	part of the original submission to be disallowed
OS56	Charles Fraser arrowhound2020@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	We agree with the submitters reason to oppose the intensification in Arrowtown, with the exception of the two initial points in the submission which we have already opposed.	part of the original submission to be allowed
OS7	Dean Carroll deancarroll17@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change, or consultation should occur with-in each town to allow the residents to decide what is appropriate in their	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS36.1	Marco Dingemans dingemans.marco@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Over many years the Arrowtown community has consulted on, and composed in-depth documents relating to the future of Arrowtown from the community viewpoint and desires. These include, but are not limited to, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines (2016) which are embedded in the QLDC Proposed District Plan (PDP) and the Shaping our Future (SOF) Arrowtown report (2017, revised with public consultation 2022) which has been noted by QLDC as a reference document.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS45.1	Belinda Fraser beefoxed@yahoo.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The very special nature of Arrowtown, its unique character, its historical heritage, and its tourist potential all mean that careful monitoring, guardianship and management is required. All community driven documents highlight the desire to preserve, retain and enhance the authenticity of Arrowtown. The whole village which is cherished by the community and both New Zealand and International visitors. The AVA feels this proposal is contrary to the spirit of the current District Plan Rules, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines and the community recommendations expressed in SOF Arrowtown. However, we oppose the suggestion to again discuss the urban growth boundary.	part of the original submission to be allowed
OS97	Mark and Michelle Mckone josh_mckone@hotmail.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The AVA understands that the proposed changes to the PDP are based on Central Government guidance that it is mandatory for these changes apply to which states, "A relevant residential zone does not include: amongst other criteria, "a mainly urban area that the 2018 census recorded as having a resident population of less than 5000". Recent statistics confirm the Arrowtown township population is less than 3000.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS106	Anne Margaret Gormack agormack@xtra.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Of the 1,267 submissions on this issue 527 were from Arrowtown. This means that 41% of the submissions came from 7% of the population, At the last Census Arrowtown had a population of 2,814, meaning that 18% of our community submitted on this issue. This is an issue Arrowtown feels strongly about, and is engaged about. 91% of the submissions are opposed to the plan.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS186	Jean Elva OCallaghan camcally.jo@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Supporting extract from Shaping Our Future: A vibrant, diverse community that is pro-active in managing its future in a way that values and sustainably protects its heritage, character, lifestyle and the natural environment Heritage: Arrowtown is a living, ever-changing town that respects, retains and celebrates its heritage, character and amenities.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS210.2	Dave Hanan dave.hanan2017@outlook.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The Urban intensification proposal is deemed to be against the aspirations the Arrowtown community holds, as expressed by the vision statements and recommendations within the SOF report.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS464.5	Marc ter Beek marcterbeek@hotmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	This is in keeping with the Arrowtown Shaping Our Future document, which was updated with full community input in 2022. SOF has been noted by QLDC as a reference document.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS507.6	Peter Dunne peterdunne81@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	Supporting extract from Shaping Our Future: A vibrant, diverse community that is pro-active in managing its future in a way that values and sustainably protects its heritage, character, lifestyle and the natural environment Heritage: Arrowtown is a living, ever-changing town that respects, retains and celebrates its heritage, character and amenities.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS613.2	Tony Dawson tonyd@perigon.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of WLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS677.1	Roger Boyd rogerboyd@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The AVA understands that the proposed changes to the PDP are based on Central Government guidance that it is mandatory for these changes apply to which states, "A relevant residential zone does not include: amongst other criteria, "a mainly urban area that the 2018 census recorded as having a resident population of less than 5000". 2018 Census data confirm the Arrowtown township population is less than 3000.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS679.2	Richard Tapper 28 Portree Drive, Lower Shotover, Queenstown.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The Christchurch City Council, with guidance from Central Government, voted not to implement any changes to the historic town of Akaroa due to its character and historic importance. The AVA consider Arrowtown to be in this same category as Akaroa and QLDC should remove it from the current QLDC PDP.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS686.4	Rachel Winstone rachelwinstone@hotmail.com	<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The AVA understands that the proposed changes to the PDP are based on Central Government guidance that it is mandatory for these changes apply to which states, "A relevant residential zone does not include: amongst other criteria, "a mainly urban area that the 2018 census recorded as having a resident population of less than 5000". 2018 Census data confirm the Arrowtown township population is less than 3000.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS797.2	Graeme Todd graeme@toddandwalker.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The QLDC Council Report 1 June 2023 point 10 states that "The QLDC HDCA identifies that the District has sufficient feasible, and reasonably expected to be realised, development capacity to provide for projected housing demand for the short, medium and long term." For this reason QLDC had no need to implement Policy 5 of the NPD-UD, and should not have.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.	Original submission details You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.	Support or oppose Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.	Reason Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.	Decision sought from Council State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.
OS822.9	Brett Giddens brett@townplanning.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	It makes sense that unique areas have protections in place to maintain this uniqueness. At present Arrowtown has a controlled urban growth boundary which is essential for maintaining the nature and character of the village. This has been upheld by both the Environment and High Courts.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS823.3	Benjamin King king.ben.j@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS879.3	Jane Lush jane.b.lush@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS543.2	Darryll Rogers, darryllrogers@outlook.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.	Original submission details You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.	Support or oppose Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.	Reason Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.	Decision sought from Council State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.
OS1212.2	Jim Bohm jim.bohm.wanaka@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS1079.5	Marie Gardiner marieb Gilbert@gmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The Christchurch City Council, with guidance from Central Government, voted not to implement any changes to the historic town of Akaroa due to its character and historic importance. The AVA consider Arrowtown to be in this same category as Akaroa and QLDC should remove it from the current QLDC PDP.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS1069.5	Carolyn Beggs beggsy@xtra.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The intent of the plan is as follows: "The NPS-UD is designed to improve the responsiveness and competitiveness of land and development markets. In particular, it requires local authorities to open up more development capacity, so more homes can be built in response to demand. The NPS-UD provides direction to make sure capacity is provided in accessible places, helping New Zealanders build homes in the places they want – close to jobs, community services, public transport, and other amenities our communities enjoy." As noted in this submission, most of the work in this district is outside of Arrowtown making it more logical to add intensification closer to those points of work to minimise the impact on an already stretched roading network.	all of the original submission to be allowed
OS1064.1	Fiona Rowley fi_rowley@hotmail.com	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The Christchurch City Council, with guidance from Central Government, voted not to implement any changes to the historic town of Akaroa due to its character and historic importance. The AVA consider Arrowtown to be in this same category as Akaroa and QLDC should remove it from the current QLDC PDP.	all of the original submission to be allowed



I SUPPORT (OR OPPOSE) // The submission of:

The specific submission(s) that this further submission relates to are as follows:

Original submission point number <small>You MUST include the original submission number and particular submission points that you support OR oppose.</small>	Original submission details <small>You MUST include the name, address, AND the submission number of the original submission and serve notice on the original submitter.</small>	Support or oppose <small>Tick whether you support OR oppose the original submission.</small>	Reason <small>Give reasons why you support or oppose the original submission.</small>	Decision sought from Council <small>State whether you seek all or part of the original submission to be allowed or disallowed.</small>
OS941.2	Anna-Marie Chin anna-marie@amchina rchitects.co.nz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose	The NPS UD only states Queenstown is a Tier 2 environment, not the wider district as has been noted in other areas such as Napier-Hastings. There is mention of QLDC and ORC as the Local Authorities for Queenstown but it does not mention other towns in the area (specifically Wanaka, Arrowtown, Albert Town or Hawea). These are towns in their own right, and should be excluded from the plan change.	all of the original submission to be allowed
		<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose		

**NOTE // To person making further submission****A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- > it is frivolous or vexatious:
- > it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- > it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- > it contains offensive language:
- > it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

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

Electronic address for service of submitter [email] treasurer@arrowtownvillage.nz

Telephone/mobile 021472826

Postal Address including post code: [or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act]

PO Box 140, Arrowtown, 9302

Contact person [name and designation, if applicable] David Harding-Shaw, Treasurer

**SIGNATURE**

** Signature [or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter]

Date Jun 14, 2024

** A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

