

Amy Bowbyes for QLDC – Summary Statement for Arrowtown

Introduction

1. My evidence addresses the matters raised in submissions on the UIV as it directly relates to Arrowtown, and is supported by heritage / character evidence prepared by Richard Knott and economic evidence prepared by Susan Fairgray, for QLDC.
2. A large number of submissions were received on the notified UIV as it relates to Arrowtown. Nearly all submissions received are in opposition, with particular opposition to the notified changes to permitted building heights.

Summary of the notified UIV as it relates to Arrowtown

3. The approach to Arrowtown in the notified UIV is summarised as follows:
 - (a) The notified UIV applies to the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zone (**LDSRZ**), Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) and Local Shopping Centre Zone (**LSCZ**) in Arrowtown;
 - (b) The Arrowtown Town Centre Zone (**ATCZ**) and Arrowtown Residential Historic Management Zone (**ARHMZ**) are excluded from the scope of the notified UIV due to matters relating to historic heritage;
 - (c) No mapping changes are proposed in the notified UIV, meaning that the location and extent of existing PDP zones in Arrowtown are not proposed to change;
 - (d) The notified UIV proposes amendments to the provisions of the LDSRZ, MDRZ and LSCZ throughout the urban environment, which includes Arrowtown; and
 - (e) The notified amendments to the LDSRZ, MDRZ and LSCZ did not introduce new Arrowtown-specific provisions, however it retained specific controls over parts of the MDRZ (via the existing ARHMZ Transition Overlay) and matters of discretion in the LDSRZ and MDRZ that require consideration of the Arrowtown Design Guideline 2016 (**ADG**).

Summary of recommendations in my s42A Report on Arrowtown

4. My s42A Report summarises the existing PDP policy framework that applies to the LDSRZ, MDRZ and LSCZ in Arrowtown, including a summary of the existing PDP provisions that acknowledge Arrowtown's character.
5. My s42A Report also describes the role of the ADG, which is only engaged when specified in a PDP provision. The ADG does not apply to permitted activities, rather it works in conjunction with the standards (including permitted activity standards) that apply to the LDSRZ and MDRZ at Arrowtown.
6. After careful consideration of the s32 Report as it applies to Arrowtown, the submissions made against the Arrowtown provisions, and Mr Knott and Ms Fairgray's evidence, in my s42A Report I recommend the following changes:

MDRZ provisions:

- (a) That notified Rule 8.5.1 (for Arrowtown only) be amended to enable a permitted building height of 8m plus an additional 1m for pitched roof forms only, which would enable 2 storey development (rather than 3 as in the notified version). I recommend that the non-complying activity status for breaches be retained;
- (b) That notified Rule 8.5.7 (for Arrowtown only) be amended to apply the following recession planes and retain the current restricted discretionary activity status and matters of discretion for breaches:
 - (i) Southern boundary 2.5m and 35 degrees;
 - (ii) Northern boundary 2.5m and 55 degrees;
 - (iii) Western and eastern boundaries 2.5m and 45 degrees.

LDSRZ provisions:

- (a) That notified Rule 7.5.1 (for Arrowtown only) be amended to enable a permitted building height of 6.5m and a restricted discretionary building height band of 6.5m – 8m. I recommend that the non-complying activity status for buildings exceeding 8m be retained. I recommend the following matters of discretion for the restricted discretionary height band:

- (i) consistency with Arrowtown's character, as described within the ADG;
- (ii) any sunlight, shading or privacy effects created by the proposal on adjacent sites and/or their occupants; and
- (iii) external appearance, location and visual dominance of the building(s) as viewed from the street(s) and adjacent properties.

7. My s42A Report does not recommend changes to the LSCZ provisions.
8. In my view, the amendments recommended in my s42A Report would better recognise Arrowtown's character and would more effectively and efficiently implement the Arrowtown-specific PDP Objectives and Policies in the MDRZ and LDSRZ. The amendments in my s42A are supported by evidence provided by Mr Knott and Ms Fairgray.

Summary of recommendations in my Rebuttal Evidence

9. No planning evidence was received from submitters on Arrowtown. I have read Mr Hosie's evidence which represents the Friends of Arrowtown (1076, 1272 and others). Mr Blakely has prepared landscape evidence for Friends of Arrowtown, which I have briefly responded to in my Rebuttal Evidence. In my opinion, retention of views of ONL/Fs from Arrowtown is not an appropriate reason to constrain development opportunity to the degree supported by Mr Blakely within the LDSRZ, MDRZ and LSCZ at Arrowtown. In my view, the s42A recommended provisions for Arrowtown strike an appropriate balance between enabling additional development opportunities in Arrowtown and limiting impact on Arrowtown's established character.
10. Ms Lutz has provided heritage / character evidence for Friends of Arrowtown (1076, 1272 and others), which Mr Knott has responded to in his Rebuttal Evidence.
11. My Rebuttal Evidence does not contain any additional recommendations to the provisions recommended in my s42A Report on Arrowtown.

Amy Bowbyes

28 July 2025