

Good morning commissioners

It's good to see you here in Arrowtown. Firstly, because it gives all but the most pessimistic of us the impression we have some degree of self determination. And secondly when you step outside for a smoke at half time you will instantly understand why we value our sunlight so much.

Unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I may pause and refer to my notes from time to time. Other than that I won't keep you long. I've been advised by mister Hosie against describing anybody expressing an opinion contrary to my own as an idiot, which has cropped five minutes out of my evidence for a starter. Although I have bet him a 24 pack of speights that I can refer to someone as possibly being an idiot while giving my evidence without being censored by yourselves.

I stand to be one of the people most likely to be egregiously affected by this proposal My property is one of the lowest lying but most northerly in the medium density zone. It is

boundried by five other properties, the two to the west have floor levels 4 meters higher than my own, all are candidates for redevelopment, particularly the two older properties to my direct north . If that was to take place, to anything above the current 7 meters it would have a devastating effect on my property, and could potentially put structures 15 meters above my floor level on my western boundary and 12 meters to the north! I would get no direct sunlight on the living area of my home for at least 6 months of the year. It would be, for all intent and purpose, be uninhabitable in the winter. That is not conjecture, that is a fact. So as you can see I and all others similarly affected have every reason to be very concerned..

In New Zealand we are guaranteed the right to expect a reasonable amount of enjoyment from our own property. I would be deprived of that. Nobody has the right to do that

It is interesting to note, that under the latest changes to the RMA proposed by the minister, if that governed developments of this scale, it would be proven to have an excessive effect on a direct neighbor and not be allowed.

That segways nicely into the question of justification. Particularly as set out in the 32 report

The reasons for justifying this are pretty thread bare at best. Naturally leaning toward the argument for.

Lets just have a look from a more realistic perspective.

Affordability, No not going to happen. The need to adhere to the arrowtown design guide lines and the cost of development in general the desirability of the location excludes the possibility of lower value housing. I have contacted three leading development and building companies and asked for their opinion. All state that higher end development offers the best return. Which is what they are after, they would be idiots if they weren't. I would share that with you commissioners but apparently bribery is frowned on as well,

Four recently constructed town houses in Deven st sold for \$2.800,000. To \$3.100.000 each. Interestingly these were constructed on a site that previously had five long term affordable units. The two words you will never find together in the same sentence are philanthropic and developer.

Diversity. No not going to happen for a start a market would have to be created for this sort of development. It's not filling any need. The demographic most likely to invest in this sort of housing are wealthy retirees or overseas investors because they can. ?

. Lower emissions No not going to happen. There are very limited employment opportunities within a 10 km radius of Arrowtown Most of the population commute now, some by bus but the majority by private transport, a necessity for tradesmen of course. Someone who owns a million dollar unit is highly unlikely to travel by bus. He's not going to load the Galloways onto a bus for a round at Kelvin heights, can't see her indoors heading out for an afternoon of mahjong playing with the girlfriends on the bus.

## Infrastructure

I was forced to contribute twice by special general rate into upgrading the sewage system in Arrowtown, that bought me a ticket to go on ad nauseam about infrastructure if I want. You only have to be driven off your eggs benedict once while brunching alfresco in ramshaw lane, by the stench of the overwhelmed sewerage system to realise, there are inherent problems there already.. It is envisaged by some that infrastructure can be upgraded bit by bit as needed. No when it is overwhelmed it is overwhelmed, and needs to be upgraded to cater for up to the next point in expected growth. Good luck getting me to pay another special general rate to cover that.

## People want to live here

We shouldn't confuse want with necessity, Mr Hosie wants his hair back, Mr Todd wants to be playing a two handicap and I want to be going out with Claudia Shiffer. None of these things are going to happen. At least according to the restraining order. People want to live here because they can ski in the morning and play golf in the afternoon. That desire does not take precedence over my right to sunlight, and privacy as an existing land owner.

## The government is making us do it

No. The initial NPSUD variation was a country wide one size fits all scatter gun edict posted by the previous Government. We are on the 45 parallel at an elevation of 400 plus meters AMSL in the fork of a valley at the head of a bason surrounded by mountains on three sides. It was never going to be suitable here. It has now morphed into going for growth. Where councils are required to zone land for 30 years growth. The first thing you would expect, is that some determination would be made taking all contributing factors into account, as to what that growth was likely to be. That has not been done. There are a lot of numbers being bandied around basically taking a known percentage increasing it and applying it year on year. I cannot find any evidence that anyone is addressing the elephant in the room, asking the big question. What are all these people going to do? The need for housing is inextricably linked to people's ability to pay for it.

I'd like to take a moment to address that with a view to further calling into question this maniacal pursuit of endless development.

Since tourism took over from farming in the 70ies as the main source of revenue in this district. We have been a one pony circus. Growth in the tourism sector, not visitor growth. Has remained fairly static. We have the same number of bungee jumps, jet boats and Earnslaws we had twenty years ago.

There are some projections of a population rivaling Invercargil

Yet we don't produce anything here.

There is no agriculture, no mining, no forestry, no fishery, no harbor, no rail, no heavy industry, little light industry. We haven't got Fonterra an aluminum smelter or a large hospital and we are not the service center for a larger province

In fact we haven't produced as much as a carrot in this district in over forty years. Everything that is here, is imported here, up these two tired little roads..

To look at this from a slightly different perspective there are 7000 dwellings built under construction or slated to be built in the so-called southern corridor. There is one commercial golf course and one ski field on that side of the bridge. That means perhaps as many as 5000. Mortgage payers are going to migrate across the kawaraw bridge every morning to go where and do what? One thing they will have done is join the 6000 touted to be going into the ladies mile, those from shotover country and lake Hayes estate Arrowtown Gibbston etc. I pointed this out to one of our less enlightened counselors. The reply was, "a lot of people work from home, and that's why we are developing diversity". I think you will find that 10 out of 10 scaffolders don't work from home and they are not given to being diverse. they do what they do because thats what they can do.

Perhaps the most frightening way to look at what is going on here is. 292 building consents have been granted by the QLDC per quarter on average over the last ten years. That is 11680 new dwellings in the last ten years. Let's assume, seeing as there is quite a bit of assumption going on from government anyway. that half that number have \$500.000 dollar mortgages I dont think that is unrealistic. That is 2'920'000'000 dollars worth of dead debt. At least. Given that currently better than a third of the working population in the district are involved in construction or the support of it. and are being paid with borrowed money, more mortgages. and that the majority of people building houses are expecting a capital gain. Houses built 5years ago for \$800.000 are now selling for \$1.800.000 despite the increase in construction cost only going up by 15% with those previous owners having taken a considerable capital gain. That by its very description is a giant ponzi scheme. Its generating its own oxygen, That quite clearly cannot go on forever. There will be a major adjustment and there will be a lot of people with no chair to sit on when the music stops.

Removing natural existing constants to development is counter productive. If you want to solve the housing crisis, stop building houses. There is more than enough existing housing here now and development under way to cater for a viable population easily 30 years into the future.

Remedy sort,

The proposed variation costs more than its worth and causes more problems than its worth and fixes nothing. leave the existing building height restrictions in place in Arrowtown. Pursue low level intensification using existing legislation. If necessary.