

My name is Diana Holden. Along with my husband Blake and our sons Mitchell and Alex, we've lived at 5 Pritchard Place in Arrowtown for over 20 years. I'm here to speak to my submission in opposition to any changes to the existing planning rules, and to urge the panel to reject the recommendations of the S42A report. Since submitting my original comments, when development next door at 4 Pritchard Place had just begun, two large, two-storey homes have now been completed. The effects of this build have only deepened my concern.

We chose to live in Arrowtown for its unique character and close-knit community. Growth here has, until now, reflected respect for this place, where neighbours talk with each other, and changes to homes are made with consideration for sunlight, privacy, and visual cohesion. Nearly every home on our street has been upgraded, yet all have stayed in keeping with the area. That changed with the recent development at number 4.

We now live with the daily consequences of what urban intensification looks like under current rules. Two large homes have replaced what once was a two story, single dwelling surrounded by native and fruit trees, with setbacks, gardens, and street presence that blended into the character of the neighbourhood. These new buildings cover nearly the entire section, lack meaningful garden space, and offer limited off-street parking. They're not designed with families in mind and will not result in a wider variety of homes that meet the needs of different households.

The development features 10 toilets between two homes, raising legitimate concerns about the impact on Wakatipu's already stressed sewage infrastructure. And while these homes comply with the current two-storey limit, their height, scale, and bulk are overwhelming. They block sun, erode privacy, and dominate the surrounding properties in a way that feels out of scale and out of character. The new development at number 4 feels completely out of place - like a Boeing landing on a runway built for Cessnas. It dwarfs everything around it, disrupts the rhythm of the neighbourhood, and makes everything else feel small and overshadowed. Arrowtown's character works because everything fits together - this doesn't fit at all.

What's even more troubling is imagining what could have been built under the proposed S42A changes. If this is what was possible under current rules, it is deeply concerning to consider the impact of increased height limits and reduced setbacks. This development was **strategically created** to be able to ignore key elements of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines, and it clearly shows how damaging on character that is. That raises a serious question: If these guidelines aren't enforced now, what happens when rules are loosened further?

The impacts extend beyond buildings. For nearly two years, our street became a construction zone. Contractors regularly blocked access by parking in the middle of the road and setting up work sites on the street due to lack of on-site space. Deliveries, building waste, portable toilets all spilled into public areas. There were constant disruptions from noise, music, and conversations that travelled across the street, amplified by the height of the build. At one point, every room in our home was visible from the scaffolding.

There was no accountability, and limited channels for recourse. We called noise control on weekends, public holidays and evenings. Neighbours lost sun, privacy, and peace. Now, some no longer open their curtains due to being overlooked. Backyards are no longer private. These are real, lasting impacts. We have suffered significant mental stress during this development.

The type of housing allowed under S42A is clear from what we've seen: high-end, multi-bedroom houses with multiple ensuites, marketed as luxury investment properties. There's no garden, no space for a family to plant a tree or kick a ball. These are assets, not homes. This model of development prioritises profit - not people or place.

Changing the rules further will benefit developers looking to maximise returns, not the average family in need of a home. And that is at odds with the very objective the Variation changes claim to support.

I urge the panel to consider this: Arrowtown **IS** different. It is a place defined by its community, scale, and history and its special character. Intensification may have a role in our district, and I support smart growth where it fits. But Arrowtown's identity **IS** its character and once lost, it cannot be reclaimed.

Please listen to the people who live here. The people who know this place deeply. Don't let short-term planning override long-term wellbeing. Leave the current rules in place and put greater weight on the Arrowtown Design Guidelines.

I point back to the original PDP 2016 clause 8.2.6.1 - which reads *Notwithstanding the higher density of development anticipated in the zone, development is of a form that is sympathetic to the character of Arrowtown, including its building design and form, scale, layout, and materials in accordance with the Arrowtown Design Guidelines 2016.*

It's disheartening that nearly 10 years later, the Arrowtown Design Guidelines - a guide and document we are so lucky to have - only has to be adhered to occasionally, and can be skipped around if needed. What do the next 10 years look like?

If the guidelines aren't being upheld now, what confidence can we have that they'll be respected with even more permissive rules? If Arrowtown's protections don't matter here, where do they matter?

I strongly believe that there should be **NO CHANGE** to the current district plan rules, that the S42A should be opposed, and that future development in Arrowtown must be supported by qualifying matters that reflect the original intentions of the Arrowtown Design Guidelines. Let's honour the public process and community vision that created them.

Thank you for your time.















