BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

IN THE MATTER of the Resource

Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 7

(Arrowtown Design

Guidelines)

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD JOHN KNOTT ON BEHALF OF QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

ARROWTOWN DESIGN GUIDELINES

12 October 2016



J G A Winchester / S J Scott Telephone: +64-3-968 4018 Facsimile: +64-3-379 5023

Email: sarah.scott@simpsongrierson.com

PO Box 874 SOLICITORS

CHRISTCHURCH 8140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	SCOPE	3
3.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
4.	WORKABILITY	4
5.	ARROWTOWN HISTORIC MANAGEMENT TRANSITION OVERLAY.	10
6.	LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE	11

Appendix 1

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My full name is Richard John Knott. I am a Heritage Specialist, Urban Designer and Town Planner. I run my own heritage, urban design and master planning practice, Richard Knott Limited.
- 1.2 I am a Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, UK, a Chartered Town Planner (Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute, UK) and Member of the Institute of Highway Engineers, UK. I have worked in these areas for over 27 years.
- 1.3 I hold a Post Graduate Diploma in Building Conservation (2002), a Master of Arts in Urban Design (1995), a post graduate Bachelor of Planning (1989) and a Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Town and Country Planning (1988). In July of this year, I attended the 'Fundamentals of Heritage Conservation' at the University of Southern California.
- 1.4 I am a Making Good Decisions Certificate Holder (2010 and 2013) and am an Independent Planning Commissioner for Auckland Council, Hamilton City Council and Whangarei District Council, often sitting on Hearings Panels where specialist heritage or urban design expertise is required.
- 1.5 I have held various senior heritage and urban design positions in New Zealand and the UK. This includes Group Manager Urban Design at Manukau City Council, where I was responsible for the leadership of heritage and urban design matters, and Conservation Officer at the Borough of Poole, UK where I led heritage matters. Prior to establishing my own practice in 2014, I was an Associate Director at AECOM NZ Ltd and ran their Design and Planning business for New Zealand.
- 1.6 I have many years' experience of assessing the character of areas and in the development of design guidance. My dissertation for my Master of Arts in Urban Design included a study of area character analysis, pulling upon the work of Gordon Cullen, Kevin Lynch, Donald Insall and others in the context of the UK's Conservation Area

legislation. My interest in character analysis has remained and in my roles as local authority (built environment) Conservation Officer, heritage specialist and urban designer, I have undertaken the character assessment of a significant number of high profile areas. I have also recently contributed to the forthcoming book 'Characterising Places' (Richard Guise and James Webb).

- 1.7 My understanding of the character of areas has enabled me to develop a number of successful design guide documents. As well as providing support to the review and preparation of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines, I have also:
 - (a) developed an architectural, materials and signage guide for Pokeno:
 - (b) overseen design guidance for new development for Beachlands, Auckland; and
 - (c) led the production of 'A Design Code', Poole, UK and a number of other design guidance documents.
- In relation to the Proposed District Plan (PDP), in February 2015 I assisted Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) with the identification of appropriate boundaries for the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone in Arrowtown and since September 2015 I have been assisting with the revision/update of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. I have also provided Evidence to the Panel in relation to the Heritage provisions and submissions regarding scheduled buildings.
- 1.9 I have now been engaged by the Council to provide evidence in relation to the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016.
- 1.10 Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

- **1.11** The key documents I have used, or referred to, in forming my view while preparing this brief of evidence are:
 - (a) Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2006 (**Guidelines 2006**);
 - (b) Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 (ADG 2016);
 - (c) Section 32 report for the ADG 2016;
 - (d) Section 42A Hearing Report Chapter 8 Medium Density Residential; and
 - (e) Section 42A Hearing Report Chapter 7 Low Density Residential.
- **1.12 Appendix 1** to this evidence is a memorandum I prepared in October 2015 for QLDC, regarding potential content/structure for the ADG 2016 (based upon a review of Guidelines 2006).

2. SCOPE

- **2.1** My evidence covers the following matters:
 - (a) workability of the Old and New Town Chapter in the ADG 2016;
 - (b) the Arrowtown Historic Management Transition Overlay under redrafted Rule 8.4.11.1 that is proposed in response to submissions on the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ), with a matter of discretion being consistency with Arrowtown's character, utilising the ADG 2016 as a guide; and
 - (c) the different approach in the Low Density Residential Zone (LDRZ) to submissions seeking that development be sympathetic to its surroundings.²
- 2.2 When I refer to the MDRZ and LDRZ, I am referring to these zones as far as they are located within Arrowtown, not to the wider zones as they apply across the District.

¹ Section 42A Hearing Report Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential Zone dated 14 September 2016 at paragraph 10.10 - 10.11.

² Section 42A Hearing Report Chapter 7 - Low Density Residential Zone dated 14 September 2016 at paragraphs 9.70 to 9.71.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 3.1 I consider that the ADG 2016 represents a logical, easy to follow document, which enables designers to bring forward developments which are sympathetic to the character of Arrowtown.
- 3.2 I do not agree that the ARHMZ, MDRZ and LDRZ should each have their own separate guidelines.
- 3.3 I recommend that alterations, as set out in the S42A report of Mr Bryce, be made to Section 4.8 of the ADG 2016 to clarify that it is not the intention that development in the MDRZ and the LDRZ replicate the development seen within the ARHMZ. Rather the intention is that development instead reflects the shape and form of buildings seen in the ARHMZ.
- 3.4 Given the potential for a development within the MDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ, I consider that it would be beneficial for all developments within that part of the MDRZ closest to the boundary with the ARHMZ to be considered against the ADG 2016. I therefore support the approach outlined in the S42A Hearing Report for Chapter 8 Medium Density Residential Development.
- 3.5 As the potential for a development within the LDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ is low, I do not believe that it is necessary to introduce a transition overlay area within the LDRZ in Arrowtown. I therefore support the approach outlined in the S42A Hearing Report for Chapter 7 Low Density Residential Development.

4. WORKABILITY

Development of the ADG 2016

4.1 In February 2015 I assisted the Council with the identification of appropriate boundaries for the proposed MDRZ in Arrowtown. Whilst my brief at that time focused on providing advice regarding the

boundaries of the proposed new zone, the Guidelines 2006 were important background information.

As a result I wrote a report entitled 'Proposed Medium Density Housing Zone, Arrowtown Review of Proposed Boundaries' (4th February 2015), which was attached to the MDRZ Section 32 report. In the report's conclusions I stated:

There remains a very important role for the Design Guide to influence the detailed design of new development within the area. It is a very well thought through and very thorough document. However, it is very long. I recommend that consideration be given to producing a 'slimmer' more accessible version of the Design Guide to encourage greater use by people developing in the area.

- 4.3 In September 2015 I was asked to assist with the revision of the Guidelines 2006. As is clear from my previous comment, whilst I believe that the Guidelines 2006 are very comprehensive, compared to other design guides I had worked with, their complex structure and sheer length means that the document appears inaccessible. There is the potential for this complexity to impact negatively on the guidelines' use and effectiveness, as users may not be able to easily locate the required information or perhaps even put off working their way through the document as it appears so large and complex.
- In addition, I was concerned that the existing structure did not readily allow the incorporation of guidance for the new MDRZ, which has a direct boundary with the ARHMZ. In view of this I felt it appropriate that some of the advice regarding the design of development within the Old Town (zoned ARHMZ in the PDP) apply to developments within the MDRZ, given their potential to have a greater impact upon the character and setting of the ARHMZ than would have been the case were the same land developed under the old low density (New Town) rules.
- 4.5 I prepared a document setting out my thoughts on a potential revised structure for the document and sent this to the Council on 5 October

2016. This document influenced the final review of the Guidelines 2006 and is attached as **Appendix 1**. The intention was to bring forward a 'slimmed' document which still included the excellent design background and advice included within the Guidelines 2006, but which reduced duplication and overall made the document more readily accessible and readable.

- 4.6 The final approach and structure for the ADG 2016 effected by myself and Nigel Bryce in our review/update of the Guidelines 2006 and subsequently notified by the Council in Variation 1, has been influenced by my suggestions and comments.
- 4.7 Significantly the previously discrete sections and guidance for 'Precinct C, Old Town Residential' and 'New Town' have been combined to form the '4. Old Town and New Town Residential Area Guidelines' in the ADG 2016.
- **4.8** I assisted in the development of the ADG 2016 by:
 - (a) producing the initial draft text for ADG 2016;
 - (b) preparing new drawings where needed for the MDRZ;
 - (c) providing advice on which of the 2006 illustrations should be retained; and
 - (d) providing some feedback on the 'desktop published document' as it came together.
- 4.9 Mr Bryce was responsible for subsequent text updates and brought the final document together as included in Variation 1.

Workability

- 4.10 Having now reassessed the ADG 2016, I believe that it has more than overcome the shortcomings of the Guidelines 2006 for the following reasons:
 - (a) the overall document is over 20% shorter (it is now 182 pages rather than over 230 pages);

- (b) its structure is now more readily accessible and understandable;
- (c) there is less duplication;
- (d) combining the 'Old Town' and 'New Town' Guidelines has allowed the advice for the proposed MDRZ to be simply integrated into the ADG 2016, and read within the context of the requirements for the other zones; and
- (e) the use of colour to highlight different provisions to confirm which area they relate to and in particular whether they apply to the ARHMZ, proposed MDRZ and LDRZ or are general guidelines that apply to all zones. This allows users of the ADG 2016 to very easily identify relevant requirements.

Philip Blakely (28)

4.11 I respond to Philip Blakely (28) in the section below as he raises a number of concerns with the ADG 2016.

Old Town and New Town Guidelines combined

- I note that Mr Blakely raises concerns regarding the Old Town and New Town Guidelines being combined in the ADG 2016. He believes that this has resulted in the weakening of the Old Town guidelines and creates confusion in how they have been reorganised. He suggests that it creates the perception that the cottage styles and forms of the Old Town are to be used in the New Town when the intention is to encourage some of the characteristics of the Old Town into the New Town, but not slavishly adhere to cottage styles. He seeks that the document is reorganised to separate out the Old Town residential zone (as per the Guidelines 2006) and have separate guidelines for MDRZ and LDRZ.
- 4.13 I recognise that Mr Blakely has very significant experience of working with the Guidelines 2006 and was also part of the team which originally developed these.

- 4.14 With respect to Mr Blakeley's involvement in the development of the Guidelines 2006, as a 'new user' of the Guidelines 2006 in 2015, I found them difficult to access and use. In particular splitting the Old Town and New Town guidance meant that I was drawn to just read that section which was relevant to that geographic part of Arrowtown that I was interested in. I therefore failed to understand the context offered by the guidance and advice of the Guidelines 2006, which related to the wider area.
- 4.15 In addition, when I did endeavour to review the remainder of the Guidelines 2006 I found significant duplication.
- 4.16 I consider that to avoid confusion, if Mr Blakely's suggested approach was followed, it would be necessary to split the ADG 2016. Old Town and New Town Residential Guidelines' into three sections:
 - (a) Old Town (ARHMZ);
 - (b) MDRZ; and
 - (c) LDRZ.
- 4.17 However, I believe that this would introduce significant additional duplication and also mean that it would be even easier for the user to focus only on the advice relevant to 'their' zone and not understand the context of the wider information within the ADG 2016, including the purpose and scope of the guidelines, the Heritage and Character of Arrowtown and the requirements for the other zones. A good understanding of all of this other information will allow a designer to better understand the context of the requirements for the ARHMZ, MDRZ and LDRZ, why they differ, and also allow better informed decisions to be made regarding their options for the design of their site.

Purported effect that Cottage styles are to be used in the New Town

4.18 I have also considered Mr Blakely's submission regarding the fact that the ADG 2016 could give the impression that the cottage styles and forms of the Old Town are to be used in the New Town, when the

intention is to encourage some of the characteristics of the Old Town into the New Town but not slavishly adhere to cottage styles.

4.19 Guideline 4.7.2 clearly indicates that:

The scale of new construction within the ARHMZ must reflect that of traditional cottages and sheds. Within the proposed MDR and LDR zones there is greater scope to move away from this, but careful attention must be given to the proposed buildings to ensure that they do not become out of scale with the general character of Arrowtown.

- 4.20 I consider that this clearly confirms that it is the intention to only encourage some of the characteristics of the Old Town cottage style within the MDRZ and LDRZ.
- 4.21 In order to ensure that this is reflected in the subsequent guidelines, Mr Bryce and I have looked closely at the wording of Section 4.8 and the illustrations and guidelines in this.
- 4.22 Together we have developed some alterations to the introductory paragraph to Section 4.8 and to Guideline 4.8.2.3. to emphasise that the intention is that new buildings within the proposed MDRZ and LDRZ reflect the shape and form of the cottages within the ARHMZ, rather than imitate those building forms seen in the ARHMZ. These proposed alterations are fully detailed in Mr Bryce's S42A report.
- 4.23 I believe that as it stands the ADG 2016 represents a logical, easy to follow document which ensures that users gain a wider understanding of the design and layout matters relevant to the whole of Arrowtown. They are then able to use this understanding to inform the design of their own scheme in accordance with the relevant guidelines.
- 4.24 The proposed alterations to Section 4.8, and the Guidelines within it, further clarifies that it is the intention to only encourage some of the characteristics of the Old Town cottage style within the MDRZ and LDRZ, rather than replicate this style throughout the area.

4.25 Enabling this approach is particularly important for development within the MDRZ, given its potential to have a greater impact upon the character and setting of the adjoining ARHMZ.

5. ARROWTOWN HISTORIC MANAGEMENT TRANSITION OVERLAY

Medium Density Residential Zone

- 5.1 I have considered the matters regarding the Arrowtown MDRZ discussed in the MDRZ s42A report³ and considered the implications of this in relation to the ADG 2016.
- Notified (and redraft) Objective 8.2.2 and its associated policies match very closely with the requirements of the ADG 2016 as they relate to respecting an area's urban design, character, heritage and identity through buildings addressing the street, street activation, mitigation of building mass and parking dominance, integration of landscaping and integration of amenity and natural features into a development.
- As stated in the MDRZ s42A report, the notified MDRZ chapter references the Arrowtown Design Guidelines within the Zone Purpose (8.1) and they are included as a matter of restricted discretion within notified Rule 84.1.1, where consent is sought for the construction of two or more dwellings in Arrowtown.⁴
- 5.4 However, I do note that in the notified chapter, the development of a single dwelling within Arrowtown can be a permitted activity, which means designers do not have to comply with the ADG 2016 nor assess their designs against it. Whilst the ADG 2016 will remain a matter which designers can informally follow, there is no requirement that they do so.
- 5.5 In addition, the potential for a development within the MDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ is increased by the:

³ Section 42A Hearing Report; Chapter 8 - Medium Density Residential dated 14 September 2016 at paragraphs 10.3 to 10.13.

⁴ MDRZ section 42A report at paragraph 10.9.

- reduced lot size within the MDRZ (when compared to the LDRZ), which is likely to encourage a higher number of two storey dwellings;
- (b) the greater potential number of buildings along the boundary with the ARHMZ due to the reduced lot size; and
- (c) the length of the boundary of the MDRZ with the ARHZ.
- Given the potential for a development within the MDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ, I consider that it would be beneficial for all developments within that part of the MDRZ closest to the boundary with the ARHMZ to be considered against the ADG 2016.
- I therefore support the recommendation in the s42A report for the Residential Medium Density chapter, of a 'transition overlay area' where the development of a single dwelling will mirror the activity status of larger developments and become a restricted discretionary activity. This is provided for through redraft Rule 8.4.11.1 of the recommended Medium Density Residential chapter.⁵

6. LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE

- 6.1 I have considered the matters regarding the Arrowtown LDRZ discussed in the LDRZ s42A report⁶ and considered the implications of this in relation to the ADG 2016.
- I note that due to issues relating to topography and some of the LDRZ and ARHMZ boundaries being along streets, it is not recommended that a 'transition overlay area' be introduced within the LDRZ along this boundary (and no such overlay is recommended in the s42A report for the MDRZ chapter).
- 6.3 This will mean that any new house on a lot greater than 450m² will be a permitted activity and as such there is no requirement that

⁵ Section 42A Hearing Report; Chapter 8 – Medium Density Residential dated 14 September, Appendix 1, page

⁶ Section 42A Hearing Report; Chapter 7 - Low Density Residential dated 14 September 2016 at paragraphs 9.67 to 9.71.

designers assess their designs against the ADG 2016. Although, they can informally do so if they wish.

- I have considered those locations where the LDRZ has a boundary with the ARHMZ.
- Whilst I concluded above that where the MDRZ has a boundary with the ARHMZ there is the potential for development within this immediate area to have an impact upon the character and setting of the ARHMZ, I believe that the potential for a development within the LDRZ to have a similar impact is less, due to:
 - (a) the location of some boundaries along streets;
 - (b) the topography of other areas; and
 - (c) the permitted lot size within the LDRZ
- As the potential for a development within the LDRZ to have a negative impact upon the setting of the ARHMZ is low, I do not believe that it is necessary to introduce a transition overlay area within the LDRZ in Arrowtown. I therefore support the approach outlined in the S42A Hearing Report Chapter 7 Low Density Residential Development.

Richard Knott

12 October 2016

APPENDIX 1

1. Arrowtown Design Guidelines

Existing Structure

Contents	Precinct A: The River	Precinct B: Town Centre	Precinct C: Old Town Residential	New Town	Appendices
- Purpose of the guidelines	Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	
Area covered by the guidelinesThe planning framework					Appendix 1.
 Scope of the guidelines Application of the guidelines 					Plant List
Key guiding principlesThe guideline format					Fence and Gate List
Historic overviewArrowtown's heritage					Wall and Retaining Wall List
character					Paving Materials List
					Appendix 2.
					ICOMOS NZ Charter
					Appendix 3.
					Town Centre building elevations Buckingham Street
		Description of Character	Neighbourhoods:	Neighbourhoods:	
			(including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc)	(including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc)	
			- Neighbourhood 1; Above	- Neighbourhood 7; Manse	
			Arrow Lane	Road	
			Neighbourhood 2; Soldiers HillNeighbourhood 3; Avenue	 Neighbourhood 8; Devon Street 	
			- Neighbourhood 5, Avenue - Neighbourhood 4; Central	- Neighbourhood 9; Adamsons	
			Terrace -(Hertford Street to	- Neighbourhood 10;	
			Stafford Street Ridge)	Adamsons Ridge	
			- Neighbourhood 5; Stafford	- Neighbourhood 11; Fairways	
			Street - Neighbourhood 6; Nairn -	l Dennison - Neighbourhood 12;	
			Criterion Streets	McDonnells Road	
			(The Neighbourhoods Described)	- Neighbourhood 13; Chartres	
				Green	
				 Neighbourhood 14; Bush Creek Industrial 	
				- Neighbourhood 15; Japp	
				Street	
				- Neighbourhood 16; Butel	
	Guidelines:	Guidelines:	Guidelines:	Park Guidelines:	
	- Development of the river	- Conserve heritage character	- Conserve heritage character	- Linking the new town with	
	environment	o Character	o Character	Arrowtown's heritage core	
	- River vegetation	- Apply best practice heritage	- Apply best practice heritage	- Views and vistas	
	- Vehicles and parking	conservation - Views and vistas	conservation	Reserves and parkwaysPrivate boundaries with	
	WalkwaysRiver reserves adjacent to	- Views and vistas - Streetscape	Views / vistasChurches and church grounds	reserves and parkland	
	residential Arrowtown	Buckingham Street	- Pedestrian networks	- The streetscape.	
	- Utilities, signs and structures	o The Lanes	 Spaciousness and simplicity 	 Street lights and exterior 	
		o Ramshaw Street	- Existing vegetation	lighting	
		Arrow LanePublic open spaces, linkages	- Settlement pattern: street layout, lot size and pattern	 The private section: site planning and design 	
		and courtyards	- The streetscape	- parking and design	
		o Marshall Park	· ·	- Paving surfaces and materials	

o Buckingham Green	- Street lights and exterior	- Fences, walls and gates.	
o Library Green	lighting	- Planting general.	
Athenaeum Reserve	- The private section site	- Redevelopment, upgrade, and	
o Post Office Garden	planning and design	new subdivision	
- Surfaces: paving, drainage,	- Property boundaries: hedges,	- Utilities, signs and structures	
kerbs	fences, walls, and gates	- Buildings: New construction	
- Existing vegetation	- Parking, driveways and garages	- New Town development	
- Parking	- Paving surfaces / materials	checklist	
- Fences and walls	- Vegetation: plant materials	Circulat	
 Vegetation: plant materials 	- Utilities, signs and structures		
- Street furniture	- Existing buildings and new		
- Street lighting & exterior	construction		
lighting	- The cottage and shed building		
- Sculptures, works of art,	types		
artefacts, memorabilia.	o Form: Scale and		
- Signage	composition (larger		
- Existing buildings	floor areas)		
 New construction general 	- Openings		
- The false front shop building	- Construction and materials		
type	- Colour		
 The false front and its 	 Possible variations 		
ornament	- Old town residential -		
- The shed.	development information list		
 Openings -all building types 	 Old town residential- 		
 Construction and materials 	development checklist		
- Colour			
 Town centre - development 			
information list.			
 Town centre assessment 			
checklist			

Arrowtown Design Guidelines: Option 1- Create Shortened Arrowtown Design Guidelines

Contents	Precinct A: The River	Precinct B: Town Centre	Precinct C: Old Town Residential	New Town	Appendices
- Purpose of the guidelines	Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	Introduction	Appendices
- Purpose of the guidelines - Area covered by the guidelines - The planning framework - Scope of the guidelines - Application of the guidelines - Key guiding principles - The guideline format - Historic overview - Arrowtown's heritage character	Y	Consider removing this section	Introduction	Integrate into Guidelines Retain in Appendix	Appendix 1. Plant List Fence and Gate List Wall and Retaining Wall List Paving Materials List Appendix 2. ICOMOS NZ Charter Appendix 3.
,		3			Town Centre building elevations Buckingham Street
Update and Retain		Description of Character	Neighbourhoods: (including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc) - Neighbourhood 1; Above Arrow Lane - Neighbourhood 2; Soldiers Hill - Neighbourhood 3; Avenue - Neighbourhood 4; Central Terrace -(Hertford Street to Stafford Street Ridge) - Neighbourhood 5; Stafford Street - Neighbourhood 6; Nairn - Criterion Streets (The Neighbourhoods Described)	Neighbourhoods: (including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc) - Neighbourhood 7; Manse Road - Neighbourhood 8; Devon Street - Neighbourhood 9; Adamsons - Neighbourhood 10; Adamsons Ridge - Neighbourhood 11; Fairways I Dennison - Neighbourhood 12; McDonnells Road - Neighbourhood 13; Chartres Green - Neighbourhood 14; Bush Creek Industrial - Neighbourhood 15; Japp Street - Neighbourhood 16; Butel	Important information: provide summary chapter with brief description of Town Centre, Old Town Residential and New Town. Also describe Medium Density Area Move more detailed description of Town Centre and Neighbourhoods to Appendix
	Guidelines: - Development of the river environment - River vegetation - Vehicles and parking - Walkways - River reserves adjacent to residential Arrowtown - Utilities, signs and structures	Guidelines: - Conserve heritage character O Character - Apply best practice heritage conservation - Views and vistas - Streetscape O Buckingham Street O The Lanes O Ramshaw Street O Arrow Lane - Public open spaces, linkages and courtyards O Marshall Park	Guidelines: - Conserve heritage character	Guidelines: - Linking the new town with Arrowtown's heritage core - Views and vistas - Reserves and parkways - Private boundaries with reserves and parkland - The streetscape. - Street lights and exterior lighting - The private section: site planning and design - parking and driveways - Paving surfaces and materials	Combine into one single set of guidelines with additional guidance for medium density residential area
		3			

Arrowtown Design Guidelines: Option 2 - Create Arrowtown Residential Design Guidelines and separate Arrowtown Town Centre Design Guidelines

Contents	Precinct A: The River	Precinct B: Town Centre	Precinct C: Old Town Residential	New Town	Appendices
 Purpose of the guidelines Area covered by the guidelines The planning framework Scope of the guidelines Application of the guidelines Key guiding principles The guideline format Historic overview Arrowtown's heritage character 	Remove 'The River' as not required as covered by Reserve Management Plan	Remove 'Town Centre' and create independent 'Arrowtown Town Centre' Design Guidelines	Introduction	Integrate into Guidelines Retain in Appendix	Appendix 1. Plant List Fence and Gate List Wall and Retaining Wall List Paving Materials List Appendix 2. IGOMOS NZ Charter Appendix 3. Town Centre building elevations
Update and Retain		Description of Character	Neighbourhoods: (including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc) - Neighbourhood 1; Above Arrow Lane - Neighbourhood 2; Soldiers Hill - Neighbourhood 3; Avenue - Neighbourhood 4; Central Terrace -(Hertford Street to Stafford Street Ridge) - Neighbourhood 5; Stafford Street - Neighbourhood 6; Nairn - Criterion Streets (The Neighbourhoods Described)	Neighbourhoods: (including Neighbourhood Descriptions, views, threats etc) - Neighbourhood 7; Manse Road - Neighbourhood 8; Devon Street - Neighbourhood 9; Adamsons - Neighbourhood 10; Adamsons Ridge - Neighbourhood 11; Fairways I Dennison - Neighbourhood 12; McDonnells Road - Neighbourhood 13; Chartres Green - Neighbourhood 14; Bush Creek Industrial - Neighbourhood 15; Japp Street - Neighbourhood 16; Butel	Important information: provide summary chapter with brief description of Old Town Residential and New Town. Also describe Medium Density Area Move more detailed description of Town Centre and Neighbourhoods to Appendix
	Guidelines: - Development of the river environment - River vegetation - Vehicles and parking - Walkways - River reserves adjacent to residential Arrowtown - Utilities, signs and structures	Guidelines: - Conserve heritage character - Apply best practice heritage conservation - Views and vistas - Streetscape - Buckingham Street - The Lanes - Ramshaw Street - Arrow Lane - Public open spaces, linkages and courtyards - Marshall Park	Guidelines: - Conserve heritage character - Apply best practice heritage conservation - Views / vistas - Churches and church grounds - Pedestrian networks - Spaciousness and simplicity - Existing vegetation - Settlement pattern: street layout, lot size and pattern - The streetscape	Guidelines: - Linking the new town with Arrowtown's heritage core - Views and vistas - Reserves and parkways - Private boundaries with reserves and parkland - The streetscape Street lights and exterior lighting - The private section: site planning and design - parking and driveways - Paving surfaces and materials	Combine into one single set of guidelines with additional guidance for medium density residential area

o Buckingham Green	- Street lights and exterior - Fences, walls and gates.
o Library Green	lighting - Planting general.
o Athenaeum Reserve	- The private section site - Redevelopment, upgrade, and
o Post Office Garden 🕻	planning and design new subdivision
- Surfaces: paving, drainage,	- Property boundaries: hedges, - Utilities, signs and structures
kerbs	fences, walls, and gates - Buildings: New construction
 Existing vegetation 	- Parking, driveways and garages - New Town development 2
- Parking	- Paving surfaces / materials checklist
- Fences and walls	- Vegetation: plant materials
 Vegetation: plant materials 	- Utilities, signs and structures
- Street furniture	- Existing buildings and new
 Street lighting & exterior 	construction
lighting	- The cottage and shed building
- Sculptures, works of art,	types
artefacts, memorabilia. 🕻	o Form: Scale and
- Signage	composition (larger
- Existing buildings	floor areas)
 New construction general 	- Openings 2
 The false front shop building 	- Construction and materials
type	- Colour
 The false front and its 	- Possible variations 2
ornament	- Old town residential -
- The shed.	development information list
 Openings -all building types 	- Old town residential-
 Construction and materials 	development checklist
- Colour	
- Town centre - development ⊱	
information list.	
- Town centre assessment	
checklist	3
7	Limin de la constitución de la c

Recommendations

- Whilst there are benefits to creating a single Design Guideline for Arrowtown, the advice for the Town Centre is extensive and could potentially 'overpower' the residential Guidelines
- Option 2 should therefore be taken forward and two guideline documents produced
 - o The Arrowtown Town Centre Design Guidelines
 - o The Arrowtown Residential Design Guidelines

Suggested Contents; Arrowtown Residential Design Guidelines

Introduction	Arrowtown's Heritage and Character	Guidelines	Appendices	
 Purpose of the guidelines Area covered by the guidelines The planning framework Scope of the guidelines Application of the guidelines Key guiding principles The guideline format 	 Historic overview Arrowtown's heritage character Arrowtown's Precincts Arrowtown's Neighbourhoods (summary) 	- Conserve heritage character	Appendix 1. Neighbourhood Descriptions - Neighbourhood 1; Above Arrow Lane - Neighbourhood 2; Soldiers Hill - Neighbourhood 3; Avenue - Neighbourhood 4; Central Terrace - (Hertford Street to Stafford Street Ridge) - Neighbourhood 5; Stafford Street - Neighbourhood 6; Nairn - Criterion Streets - Neighbourhood 7; Manse Road - Neighbourhood 8; Devon Street - Neighbourhood 9; Adamsons - Neighbourhood 10; Adamsons Ridge - Neighbourhood 11; Fairways I Dennison - Neighbourhood 12; McDonnells Road - Neighbourhood 13; Chartres Green - Neighbourhood 14; Bush Creek Industrial - Neighbourhood 15; Japp Street - Neighbourhood 16; Butel Park Appendix 2 - Residential -development information list - Residential-development checklist Appendix 3 ICOMOS NZ Charter	