

BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER A variation to the QLDC Proposed
District Plan – Urban intensification

BY **FRIENDS OF ARROWTOWN VILLAGE**
Various submitters

SPEAKING NOTES OF MARK HOSIE

Dated: 30 July 2025

Introduction

- [1] My name is Mark Hosie and I am the convenor of the group called Friends of Arrowtown Village (**FOAV**).
- [2] The history and formation of the group is covered in my evidence and the number of members are supported by the appendices to my evidence numbered **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 2**.
- [3] Since submitting my evidence on behalf of the FOAV there have been considerably more people join the group and I now present you with updated appendices showing the current numbers:
 - (a) Appendix 1. FOAV Submitter Members **258**
 - (b) Appendix 2: FOAV Members in total (includes Submitters) **643**
- [4] Before the filing of my evidence, I had already spent a lot of time reading submissions as well as having email, telephone and face to face discussions with people who were concerned about the Variation and how it was going to affect them.
- [5] Since the filing of my evidence, the number of submitters who have joined our group has increased by about 100 and is still mounting.
- [6] I made a point of reading each of the 258 submissions in full and have spent numerous hours, as I am sure the panel has, reading and analysing many of the overwhelming number of submissions that were made opposing the variation applying to Arrowtown. There was a diverse range of submissions which is reflective of the diverse range of people who make up our community. They all have one thing in common though, they are all against the Variation and almost all of them are of the opinion that the Variation should never have been applied to Arrowtown in the first place, that it should be withdrawn and the status quo remain. Some were quite emotive but in reading them you get the feeling of the deep sense of connection a lot of the community have with the place they live in, their understanding of the attributes of the village and their willingness to protect the jewel that it is. You also get a sense of the helplessness they feel when confronted by a process such as this,

without any real consultation, which is attempting to thrust major changes on their habitat by people who don't seem to understand what the village is about at all and what makes it so special to both those that reside within it and the hundreds of thousands of visitors that visit the town each year .

- [7] I decided to summarise all of the main points from our 258 submitter members that they felt are so important for them to specifically mention and what they see as the positives of living in Arrowtown. These points are listed below.

SUBMISSION POINTS SUMMARY	
Sunlight	72%
Character	72%
Amenity	51%
Infrastructure	51%
Views	49%
Arrowtown Design Guidelines	42%
History & Heritage	40%
Spatial Plan	30%
Lack of Consultation	25%
Traffic & Parking	18%

- [9] Although this is a snapshot of the submissions of our 258 submitter members it is pretty reflective of the around 560 submissions opposing the variation being applied to Arrowtown.
- [10] As you can see by the table above the most important item to these submitters is access to sunlight, especially in winter. Any increase in building height will further diminish the access to sunlight. Each metre of vertical increase in height equals almost 800mm of extra shadow on the ground. The difference between a 7M high building form and a 9M high building form equals a shadow that is almost 1.6M longer. This extra length casts an 11.718M long shadow which hits a typical neighbours house at almost roof height denying any sun entering the house in winter. Even the shading impact of the 7M house allowed under the existing rules is a massive impact on neighbours.

- [11] The effect from the 9M high building, as proposed by the s 42A report will be devastating for a neighbour. Please refer to attached **Appendix 4**.
- [12] A lot of people in the room will have no concept of what the 10.121M long shadow cast by a 7M high building or the 11.718M shadow cast by a 9M high building looks like in real terms. I will point out how long this is to the room for those that aren't able to envisage what that looks like.
- [13] In **Appendix 5** one of our architects has produced a drawing showing that a 3 storey building is easily enabled under the 8 + 1 scenario recommended in the s 42A report. Please refer to attached **Appendix 5**.
- [14] On both drawings they have shown in outline the 5x5 recommended building form from the ADG to demonstrate how far the existing rules and the s 42A recommendations are from ADG.
- [15] Underpinning a lot of the submission points on sunlight there were comments such as, warmth, reduces permafrost, Health and Safety, economic benefits from burning less fuel, less pollution from burning less fuel, mental health, loss of ability to grow vegetables, shrubs and flowers etc. In short, sunlight is identified as a very important amenity that will be drastically reduced if the height is increased.
- [16] As evidenced by the concern over the recent development at 4 Pritchard Place and the current building work in Cornwall Street, the existing 7M high is imposing enough to cause concern for immediate neighbours.
- [17] I also did a summary of the 258 submitter members submissions to see what decision they had requested in their submissions. The results are as follows:

NUMBER OF DECISIONS REQUESTED = 476 DECISIONS FROM 258 SUBMISSIONS	
Reject LDSRZ Proposal	127
Reject MDRZ Proposal	153

Exclude Arrowtown Entirely from Variation	196
Total Decisions Requested to Exclude Arrowtown in Part or Full	476

- [18] In short, out of 258 submissions 476 decisions were requested to reject parts of the Variation, with most asking for the Variation to be rejected entirely for Arrowtown.
- [19] Again, although this is a snapshot of the submissions of our 258 submitter members it is pretty reflective of the around 560 submissions opposing the variation being applied to Arrowtown.
- [20] From the outset of this process we have consistently used an image of the scaffolding we erected in Adamson Drive to demonstrate what the proposed height increases looked like. Superimposed on the scaffold image was the word WHY in large letters. This word epitomises what the Arrowtown community are saying about this proposed intensification. They are all asking...
- (a) **WHY:** did the QLDC propose to apply the intensification to a historic, character village such as Arrowtown?
 - (b) **WHY:** did the QLDC determine Arrowtown was a suburb of Queenstown and effectively try to take away our village's identity and point of difference?
 - (c) **WHY:** did the QLDC hide behind the line "the government made us do it" when it was obvious as a tier 2 council they had discretion on where and how to apply the legislation?
 - (d) **WHY:** did the QLDC think it was ok to propose to take away sunlight, privacy, views and all the amenity values that make this village a great place to live in?
 - (e) **WHY:** didn't the QLDC engage in meaningful consultation with the community?

- (f) **WHY:** are we having to spend our own money to fight our own council who are using our rates money to fight us when a willingness to engage in consultation would have avoided this cost and produced a better outcome?
- (g) **WHY:** hasn't the QLDC adhered to the ADG?
- (h) **WHY:** hasn't the QLDC adhered to the Spatial Plan?
- (i) **WHY:** hasn't the QLDC adhered to the Shaping Our Future Guidelines?
- (j) **WHY:** are some of our Councillors saying that "Arrowtown needs to do its bit" when they have neglected to engage with the community before notifying the Variation?
- (k) **WHY:** are some of our Councillors saying that "Arrowtown needs to do its bit" when Arrowtown has already done more for affordable and community housing than any other community in the basin as shown in Appendix 3 of my evidence?
- (l) **WHY:** are the QLDC suggesting, as per their s 42A report, that going from a 4 storey proposal down to a 3 storey proposal would be palatable when their own report states 2 storeys is typical of Arrowtown and the majority of submissions support a 2 storey maximum and the status quo to remain?

The list could go on.

[21] To date we have not had any meaningful answers to these questions.

[22] Maybe the answer lies in the Council Report produced for the June 1st 2023 Council meeting where it says, on page 60, Paragraph 30, and I quote, *".....Furthermore, the NPS-UD stipulates that a plan change/variation to implement Policy 5 must be notified by August 2022, and central government is aware that QLDC has not met that time frame. Any further delay to notification may increase the risk of central government requiring QLDC to implement the MDRS (explained at paragraph 24 above)"*

- [23] The public notice of the decision to notify the Variation was issued on the 24th August 2023, over a year later than it should have been and obviously under some pressure from central government. This indicates a rushed process was being followed without any meaningful consultation or assessment of the implications of the “blanket” approach to the application of the Variation across the basin.
- [24] In my conversations with some councillors, soon after the variation was notified, they admitted they did not fully understand the implications of the Variation and were still getting their heads around it.
- [25] It is my belief and the belief of many of our community that a lot of the councillors in their heart of hearts know they made a mistake in applying the variation to Arrowtown but none of them have had the intestinal fortitude to do the right thing and table a motion to withdraw Arrowtown from the Variation. They have chosen to continually ignore the community and go down a track of trying to justify their ill-informed decision making.
- [26] The council's 42A report has summarised submissions for Arrowtown in Appendix 1 of the report. Whilst I acknowledge the enormity of the task of summarising the submissions due to the number, I suggest that the summary is but a small cross section of what the submitters are saying and you would have to read all of the submissions to see that the 560 plus submissions on behalf of Arrowtown are all singing off the same song sheet.
- [27] Although, as described in my evidence, the Council's 42A report has gone some way towards alleviating some of the concerns expressed by the submitters, it still effectively recommends adjustment to height rules that would allow 3 story buildings to be built where the majority of submitters have been quite clear in stating that, the status quo should remain, the variation should not have been applied to Arrowtown in the first place and that the variation should be withdrawn for Arrowtown. We have had 3 architects independently advising us that the 8 + 1 enables 3 stories to be built.

- [28] The s 42A report contains some encouraging recommendations such as, re-introducing the recession planes and set backs and the suggestions that the Arrowtown Design Guidelines are more strictly adhered to, but it hasn't addressed the main concerns of the vast majority of the Arrowtown Community. We have consistently been advising loud and clear that sunlight is the single most important amenity we have in this mountain village and any increase in height whether it be 2m or 5m, regardless of how many stories can be built at those heights, is unacceptable. In short sunlight is identified as a very important amenity that will be drastically reduced and in some cases, lost entirely, if the building height is increased. This is evidenced by the concerns expressed by close neighbours of 4 Pritchard Place and the current building works on Cornwall Street.
- [29] The submissions on behalf of Arrowtown have overwhelmingly asked for the Variation as it applies to Arrowtown to be withdrawn entirely and the status quo remain. The community has spent countless hours contributing to the Arrowtown Design Guidelines, The Shaping Our Future and the Spatial Plan and simply are asking that the council gives these documents and the community the respect they deserve.
- [30] As one supporter put it to me, it is tantamount to theft when someone who wants to live here can steal your sunlight, views and amenity, which are some of the reasons you chose to live here, and take it all and use it for themselves.
- [31] Some people have suggested that the motivation for the people of Arrowtown to oppose the variation is to protect or increase the value of their properties. This is absolute nonsense as, if the Variation was to go ahead, property values would do doubt increase. The real reason why the Arrowtown community opposes the Variation is that we care about protecting the heritage, character and amenity of the village we have chosen to live in. Not one of the hundreds of people I have spoken with have mentioned money or financial gain. It is a fact that many of the people who have joined our group, Architects, Lawyers, Accountants, Planners, Real Estate Agents, Builders, Plumbers, Electricians, Engineers, property owners, etc., all who could have benefited financially from the Variation, are all vehemently opposed to it.

[32] There has also been the suggestion from several quarters that we are NIMBYs and resistant to change. I think those accusations deserve addressing:

- (a) **1: NIMBYism.** The acronym NIMBY is normally used in a derogatory fashion as a blanket term for someone who is resistant to having changes made their own backyard. This term is too easily applied without any thought being given to analysing the effects of the change that is being proposed and whether the alleged “NIMBY” has got valid reasons for resisting the proposed changes.
- (b) **2: Resistant to Change:** Again, it is easy to tag people in a derogatory manner with the mantle that they are resistant to change. What you will find is that most people analyse the proposed change that is put before them and decide whether it is a change for the better or worse and then respond accordingly. They will not normally put their time and energy into resisting a change without valid reasons.

Conclusion

[33] You may well ask why I have chosen to spend the many hundreds of hours I have co-ordinating the community on the issue of the proposed intensification. I have asked myself this and I put it down to my parents instilling in me from a very young age the belief that if you see an injustice being done don't stand back and do nothing if you have an opportunity to correct that injustice.

[34] I, and the vast majority of the Arrowtown community, believe there has been a severe injustice done by the QLDC attempting to apply the Variation to Arrowtown for all the reasons outlined in our submissions and evidence.

[35] We trust that the panel has read and understood all of the submissions and evidence that has been tendered on behalf of the Arrowtown community and have gained an insight into the deep sense of connection and sense of responsibility all of us have for Arrowtown. I don't underestimate the enormity of your job as you are tasked with

covering the whole of the QLDC territory but I respectfully suggest the panel re reads and absorbs the many excellent submissions that were put in on behalf of Arrowtown when reviewing the Arrowtown component. I have taken the liberty of suggesting a few that I think deserve a revisit whilst you are making your deliberations.

Suggested Arrowtown Submission #s for Review			
345	747	939	1052
376	867	950	1069
447	873	954	1174
675	898	1037	1223
739	902	1042	1230

- [36] We have told you how we feel about the place we live in and what is important to us as a community. The decisions that are made from here, by people who don't have to live with the consequences, will shape our community forever. The effects will be irreversible.
- [37] I would like to thank and acknowledge the tremendous and unwavering support we have had from our experts, lay presenters, advisors and our community.
- [38] Thank you to the panel for the opportunity to present today on behalf of the Friends of Arrowtown Village.

Dated: 30 July 2025

.....
Mark Hosie – Coordinator Friends of Arrowtown Village