

Feedback from brochure – Meadow Park Special Zone

Meadow Park Special Zone			
J & R Graves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose any proposal to reduce the setback from 160m along Malaghan Road. • This was a condition of the developments resource consent and provides the area with a rural aspect instead of low density residential. Trees planted in setback will in time screen the bulk of development. • Oppose any increase in the number of sections. The bought their property due to low number of residents, do not want to live in a built up area. • Covenants prevent further subdivision. • Wish for Butel Park to remain as it was intended. 	23/05/12	Letter
Mr John Potts	Supports reducing the setback from Malaghan Road so it is consistent on both sides of Manse Road.	17/4/2012	Phone & letter
Mr Peter Taylor	<p>Seeks rezoning of land east of Manse Road for comprehensive intensive residential subdivision to make the most of scarce land available for housing within Arrowtown.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The defined Entrance to Arrowtown in the immediate vicinity of the MPSZ has altered as a consequence of the intensive development consented to in the areas / blocks of land referred to above 2. There remains within the MPSZ areas of undeveloped land inclusive of our own that are ideal for completion of intensive residential development 3. Such development is a logical extension to satisfy the requirement for a population base that is growing and requires access to land for such development within proximity to the Town Centre and its amenities 4. The MPSZ proposed if developed would also provide a greater catchment to enable the amenities created in the Millbrook Special Zone to be more fully utilised 5. The current demands on the Environment and proposals to minimise environmental impact (Global) as a condition to consider for future development also underlines the logic of provisioning a more intensive development of residential use within the MPSZ as the ability for residents within this area to take full advantage of amenities provided via the existing Townscape as well as on offer from Millbrook resort are unmatched from any other part of the Arrowtown Township. Indeed it is possible for residents within the MPSZ to utilise such amenity without needing to travel in a motor vehicle to do so and if in fact motor vehicle travel is necessitated the amount of travel required is an absolute minimum. 6. In order to maximise the available land mass available for intensive Residential use consideration to revising the existing Setback needs to be undertaken 7. It is our view that that the existing Setback in place could be reduced to 30- 50 metres without sacrificing much at all 	26/04/2012	Phone & email

	<p>in terms of loss of visual amenity or impacting dramatically on an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) which in our case is the Feehly Hill</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The impact of such a reduction to the Setback if consented to would be mitigated via appropriate 2- 3 metre berms and if required Planting professionally undertaken ex an appropriate Landscape Plan submitted to Council for approval to be undertaken along the Roadside boundaries. 9. The result of such a change would be the freeing up of much needed Land in a part of the Arrowtown Township that is desperately needed for Residential accommodation and to offset known and expected residential accommodation growth 10. Further we consider that in order to maximise the space available for Residential use that the Setback be altered /amended to a Building Line Restriction (BLR) only 11. Accordingly any consent for intense Residential use would be welcomed and considered an appropriate use of a scarce land resource suitable for such development 12. Further and in order to accommodate an identified need and requirement within the Wakitipu Basin we propose that our Block of Land lends itself well to the development of a Retirement Village and a Community Health Centre Housing a full suite of Medical Service Providers (Doctors , Nursing , Physiotherapy , Massage etc....) 13. In fact the model we are considering basing the development on is similar to what has been achieved in Wanaka utilising a similar concept 14. We believe that elderly Arrowtown residents as well as those older citizens residing in the wider Wakatipu basin deserve the opportunity to be able to continue to reside in an environment and area that they have generally tended to reside in for a good percentage of their lives without having to confront the daunting and unsettling prospect of having to not only leave family friends and loved ones but having to uplift themselves from an area that they have chosen to live in simply because there is no available alternative able to accommodate their needs as they age 15. Those responsible for consenting development and availability of land for development are duty bound to ensure that all considerations are taken into account when determining areas available for development to ensure that the most vulnerable in any community and specifically on this occasion the elderly have their needs and aspirations met. 16. Accordingly we ask Council consider the development of a Residential Retirement Village as one of the uses possible for the MPSZ subject to further submissions and planning detail 		
M & B Dingle	Concerned about any reduction of the Malaghan Road setback	04/05/12	Email

	requirement for the western side of Manse Road. strongly object to further subdivision of that land, and understand that the existing legal covenants would prevent it.		
Ms Kristi Howley	Seeks that the Council take responsibility for requiring the Arrow Irrigation Company to take proper safety measures to ensure their water race is not a public danger. At present any measures to make the water race safe are limited and not to a suitable standard. If Butel Park is to be a proper residential zone then the water race must be addressed.	21/5/12	Email
Mr Hamish Taylor	Purchased our section and paid a premium price due to the conditions applicable at the time and would be reluctant to see major changes to them Would have no objection to 'granny flats' provided they are part of the major building on the site and not a separate structure Would not like to see any changes to the Visual Amenity line or the Building Line Restrictions as indicated in 12.7.5.1 Would like to retain protection of kanuka along top of ridge Not in favour of commercial activities such as motels or other accommodation. No objection to home stays or bed and breakfast accommodation. Current rules should in large part be retained as they define the existing character of the area.	17/05/2012	Letter
A & G Begley	Oppose any proposal to reduce the setback from 160m along Malaghan Road. This was a condition of the developments resource consent and provides the area with a rural aspect instead of low density residential. Trees planted in setback will in time screen the bulk of development. Oppose any increase in the number of sections. They bought their property due to low number of residents, do not want to live in a built up area. Covenants prevent further subdivision. Wish for Butel Park to remain as it was intended.	25/05/2012	Email
R & T Grubb	As above	25/05/2012	Email
J. Vescio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been essentially developed and hence many of the provisions of the Meadow Park zone are now redundant. They cause unnecessary complication and confusion as to applicability. It is obvious that the Zone objectives and controls have not achieved what the original intent may have been as certainly the area is not: <i>"a comprehensively designed and integrated development that enhances the eastern edge / entrance to Arrowtown"</i> or a <i>"...a comprehensively designed and integrated development that integrates into Arrowtown's urban fabric"</i>. Accordingly, it may be appropriate to simplify the control of development on the land, by subsuming the area into the general residential controls. The zone provided for up to 100 dwellings, however substantially less has been provided. The site provides valuable residential zoned land, which is capable of accommodating additional housing. The infrastructure is 	23/07/12	Email

	<p>already in place to accommodate greater density with minimal impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further housing is stifled by virtue of private covenants, and Council should explore implementing a mechanism, whereby private covenants are automatically extinguished or of no effect where they restrict attainment of Council policies. • Further, the 160m setback for the OS-MR(W) is both excessive and inconsistent with the eastern side of Malaghans Road (OS-MR(E)) . The difference between 160m and 100m with appropriate landscaping would be indistinguishable in terms of any mitigating effects of built form, particularly within a sub-urban setting. • The OS-HL activity areas should be retrained as they serve a proper planning purpose, however the balance of the land should be simply zoned residential, with specific standards employed to control the impact of the built form and land use. • There is nothing unique to the area that warrants its own earthworks controls and the general controls applying throughout the district should apply. • Whilst I have no comment on restricting wilding plantings, there should be no restrictions on owners augmenting and enhancing the landscaping within their own sites. • New houses should simply be a permitted activity. Any new building is already subject to a more rigorous assessment by the Home Owners Committee and their appointed review architect. 		
--	--	--	--