

From: [Roy Champtaloup](#)
To: [DP Hearings](#)
Subject: Re: Urban Intensification Variation - Submitter 1313
Date: Tuesday, 5 August 2025 7:34:45 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Hi Lynley

Thanks for coordinating my phone conference.

Herewith my notes as requested.

Cheers

Roy

Roy Champtaloup ... Verbal Submission Opposing the QLDC's insane proposal of "urban intensification" of Arrowtown.

Good afternoon commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to verbally express my very serious concerns about the QLDC's proposed urban intensification for Arrowtown.

I respectfully ask that you all ensure that common sense prevails, and that you recommend to the QLDC that it removes the proposed variation, in its entirety, immediately.

For the life of me, I just don't understand why anyone would be advocating for, or even supporting, the totally unnecessary destruction of our beautiful town. I say unnecessary because the variation is not assisting or contributing to any "affordable housing" as per the National Policy Statement. And 'urban intensification' is just not needed or appropriate in Arrowtown.

There is already enough housing planned for the next 30 years on the QLDC District Plan so one would wonder what the intensification is trying to achieve.

I say destruction because the proposed new height allowances would effectively ruin the look & feel & charm of the town... forever. It would be irreversible.

My interpretation of

the Section 42A report that has been tabled by the council recommends 9m in the medium density zone and up to 8m in the low density. Please correct me if I'm wrong. Albeit not as ridiculous as a 12 metres height, it is still a very bad idea. The heights should stay as they currently are ... 6.5 metres in the low density and 7 metres in the medium density. Additionally the Arrowtown Design Guidelines should be more strictly enforced.

My understanding is that council did not have to apply for a variation to the existing Arrowtown plan, and in fact could have removed this from the get go.

It is most regrettable that this didn't happen, and we locals & property owners now find ourselves having to fight to protect what's most valuable about our town. ... its' extraordinarily special and unique, historic charm and beauty.

By way of background and on a personal note, I first visited Arrowtown in August, 1977, 48 years ago, when I was a first year student at Canterbury University. I have a vivid memory of being absolutely blown away by the crazy uniqueness and beauty of the Buckingham St buildings and shop frontages during a very heavy snowfall, late one afternoon. It was like a Hollywood movie set with a bunch of facades. That was when I fell in love with Arrowtown.

It has been a regular holiday fixture for us until 8 years ago, when my wife & I bought 1 Kent St and decided to call it home. During the purchase process, we were surprised to learn that our property, a 1277 metre corner site is actually a 5 unit site, ie 1 dwelling per 250 metres. The density designation was increased on the south side of Kent St back around that time.

We love our modest small 1950s original home and the trees and garden. We have no intention of subdividing or developing the site. Obviously the property would be of way more value if one could build up 12 metres, or even 9 metres.

The same logic applies to a neighbouring property on our boundary that we have subsequently bought. When combined with 1 Kent St this potentially gives us an 8 unit site, overlooking the rugby field. We have no intention of developing either.

But. My point is. If there was a new 12 metre high building allowance, or even 9 metre, and a keen developer ended up owning our property, or one similar, the implications for our neighbours and the locals doesn't even bear

thinking about. Our neighbours would lose much of their precious sunlight, particularly in winter due to the low daylight indicators. They would also lose their views and their privacy. Additionally there would be real potential for an eyesore, the proverbial blot on the landscape.

The same logic applies to all Arrowtown properties in the median density zone.

In fact, this has already just happened to a lesser degree at 1&2/4 Pritchard Place. An Auckland developer has built 2 new townhouses to maximum height, on a relatively small plot of land. They have significantly impacted the neighbours sun, views, space and privacy. If the developer had been permitted to go up to 12 or 9 metres the negative impact on the neighbouring area would be even more devastating.

I am not agin urban intensification per se. I understand the severe housing shortage situation in Queenstown and the need for more housing in the general area.

But, I have seen first hand, over the last 20 years how the Auckland Unitary Plan, with its massive high density and high height allowances has ruined many once beautiful suburbs. I concede Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, with the biggest housing crisis and something has to give for the sake of progress. I get that.

But, Arrowtown is not Auckland.. or Queenstown or Five Mile. It has been voted New Zealand's Most Beautiful Town, twice, 2020 & 2023.

And like Akaroa, it has rich priceless history, and enormous heritage, charm, and special character appeal. But unlike Akaroa, the inappropriate 'urban intensification' proposals were not nipped in the bud, when they could have, and should have been.

Further to my written submission a year or so ago, and for clarity, my key concern remains the proposed increase of building height to 12 meters. Or even 9 meters. This provides the potential for 3 or 2.5 story low rise apartment blocks.

A developers dream opportunity that will undoubtedly push land & property prices up even further.

There is absolutely no argument from anyone that higher buildings will ruin the visual appeal of Arrowtown and be disastrous for any adjoining properties... due to significantly reduced sunlight, space, privacy and views.

This kind of urban intensification is totally inappropriate and unacceptable for Arrowtown given its extraordinarily unique character.

More importantly, as I mentioned at the beginning, it unnecessary.

Pursuing this variation just doesn't make sense. It's not justified.

In conclusion, I am again respectfully asking that you commissioners, who are in an absolute pivotal position, strongly recommend to QLDC that they remove the proposed variation in its entirety, now. For all the right reasons.

This is QLDC's opportunity to listen to the people. And do the right thing by the people, for the people, and most importantly, for Arrowtown.

I look forward to answering any queries or comments you may have.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak.

On 5 Aug 2025, at 7:12 AM, DP Hearings <DP.Hearings@qldc.govt.nz> wrote:

Good Afternoon Roy

Thank you for attending today's hearing by Phone.

If you happen to have a copy of your speaking notes (digitally), we would appreciate a copy if possible.

Many thanks and thank you for speaking today.

Warm Regards

Lynley Scott | P&D Technical Officer |
Planning & Development
Kaiwhakatauirā Whakanikoniko Matua

Queenstown Lakes District Council
DD: +64 3 443 0121 | P: +64 3 441
0499

