

Submitter Details

First Name: **Judith**
 Last Name: **Hanan**
 Organisation: **N/A**
 On behalf of: **N/A**
 Street: **69 McDonnell Road**
 Suburb:
 City: **Arrowtown**
 Country:
 PostCode: **9302**
 Mobile: **+44(0)7894223994**
 eMail: **jmhanan@gmail.com**

Trade competition and adverse effects:

- ☒ I could ☒ I could not
 gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
☒ I am ☒ I am not
 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.

Wishes to be heard:

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Submission

Consultation Document Submissions

Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 > 1 Introduction > 1.1 Purpose of the ADG

- ☒ Support
- ☐ Oppose
- ☒ Other - Please clearly indicate your position in your submission below

The reasons for my support or opposition are

extra houses ("supply") ought not be considered without proper relationship to the overall infrastructure in a far broader sense than schools, sewage, lighting, traffic and rates (etc) for not only the contiguous area but the overall district. The plans for the district still finally economically turn on tourism and if there is little than dull conformity of buildings offered, the the advantage of difference is lost. Its wrong use was evident in the Retirement village proposal of Anderson & Monk. You can not ignore the fact that there must firstly be a passage of a change of use from rural to residential. Minimal supplies of supposedly affordable houses within a group of substantially non-complying houses is simply "sleight of hand stuff ". The fiction that the houses are affordable using a building cost valuation is utterly wrong because of what is known as "drag" the costlier houses nearby effectively dragging up any sale price over building cost. In a way this is just the old rule of "location,location,location" that ultimately determines price so that within a short time on resale the cost price is overtaken by the richness of the nearby and adjacent properties. All these developments in this rural area terminate the very thing needed to be protected. The scenic beauty of the area setting off the mountain backdrop. They are merely money making schemes devoid of long term sensitivity and sensibility. The actual developers (profiteers) are fairly wealthy and ingenious and are using their ingenuity to further their monetary ambitions which may have marketing attractiveness but is at the expense of the common good. The wide number of appeals against the rurality of the District scheme seeking to get this zoning changed about Arrowtown to residential type zones is culmulatively to do away with it when this is the very quality that sustains the appeal of the district. Let one get approval and the precedent is made. Instead we have spotty houses all over the hills some crammed behind greenery trees like mock apologies for their intrusion into yesterdays fields. It is argued that the income returns from rurality- utterly wrong. The needs of the community will need food, which will also need to be supported by rural land use. Otherwise food will have to be trucked in from elsewhere - more heavy trucks on roads that can barely keep pace with the current population. Do you therefore propose to cover the basin with even more roads and more cars? Such a short sighted, appalling view. I am ashamed that it's been allowed to get this far! Once a site is suburbanised it can't be got back. You even approved a Retirement Village which actually goes against the LAW and is an abuse of the Special Housing Act. The current District plan is good. May it be kept this way and not succumb to the waves of attacks from capital gainers. Also, as digital usability expert - one that's worked in international organizations and other governments on consultations using digital, this is one the worst consultations I have ever used. I have designed consultation systems for the UK Government. Frankly,would surprised that anyone will finish this and comment on it as it needs to section by section. There so many sections it makes it impossible for anyone from time and usability to fill out properly - or is that you what you intended? I would argue that you actually undermined the public right to comment by the very bad design you offered up and will be making views known as you have defeated by this, the right of people to have their say. APPALLING.

I seek that the following

Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016 > 2 Heritage and Character > 2.1 Historic Overview

- ☒ Support
- ☐ Oppose
- ☒ Other - Please clearly indicate your position in your submission below

The reasons for my support or opposition are

We must keep the historic nature of Arrowtown

I seek that the following

I cannot believe that such rampant development has been allowed and is being continued to being allowed. You're killing the golden goose- why everyone comes to Arrowtown is the beauty of the hills which you are destroying by infilling all the land - land that everyone comes for- with buildings. You've allowed greed to destroy the very thing that keeps the money coming in. Disgusting behavior.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.