

Hello, my name is Ian Ruddenklau and I am a permanent resident of Queenstown living in my residence on St Georges Avenue, in St Andrews Park.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak, and I am also speaking on behalf of David and Lyn Weir who reside at their residence on Highview Terrace.

We are totally opposed to the proposed changes from low density to medium density residential on Highview Terrace and St Georges Avenue. In fact, in the big picture, I am opposed to these changes from Park Street in Queenstown all along the South side of Queenstown Hill to Frankton.

Now my late wife's family bought this area, now known as St Andrews Park in the 1930's. They eked out a living by milking cows and selling strawberries and home made ice-cream to locals and visitors who would walk out from Queenstown. There was one smallish house on the property which in later years we would holiday in with our young family. When the area was sold in about 2001 and developed, my late wife and I bought a section to maintain our ties to the land, and also because of the wonderful views and the hope it would be a great community to retire in. After about 15 years we finally got together enough finances to build. We built our home to the existing 7 metre height rule and never expected that there would ever be a proposal to change these rules to allow 11 metre high buildings being built in front of us. This will really impact our views, it just isn't fair.

I would like to talk about 3 of the 4 key features of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)

The three I would like to talk about in relation to my submission is about the council creating

Well functioning urban environments

Housing Affordability

Intensification

The first one states, and I quote, "**Well functioning urban developments:** Ensuring that urban areas are designed to support a good quality of life for residents".

Now I would like to ask, how can allowing three storied houses and apartments, crammed into an existing aesthetically pleasing wonderful residential area would create a "well functioning urban environment with a good quality of life". For the existing residents it would have exactly the opposite effect.

In our neighbourhood we already have a well functioning urban environment with good community spirit. We have residents that contribute to the overall wellbeing of the Wakatipu population by being involved in clubs like the photography club, the croquet club, pickle ball, the bridge club, music and other activities. Activities that are vital to keep people connected, develop comradeship, friendship, exercise, and a sense of belonging.

Now disturbing this sort of environment by allowing three storied 11 metre high buildings and a lot of them, will make us angry, claustrophobic, devalue our hard earned investment, and destroy our wonderful views that we have worked so hard all our lives to be lucky enough to enjoy. It just goes against all logic and common sense.

The second key feature states, and again I quote **“Housing affordability: Making it easier and more affordable to build new homes”**

Most of the area I am concerned about on Queenstown Hill is sloping and in some cases steep with bedrock. As I have learnt the hard way, no one can build an affordable house in this environment. It is just so much more expensive building on sloping sections compared to flat sections. Because of the capital investment involved these apartments or houses that are built, won't be rented to working families climbing the property ladder, they will be turned into short term visitor accommodation, “just Air B&B it” the consultants commonly say. So instead of receiving a \$1000.00 a week for rent they will be looking for \$1000.00 a night. Herein, in my opinion, is the main cause of house unaffordability in the Wakatipu area. If the short term visitor accommodation issue was addressed and visitors had to stay where they are supposed to, in commercial premises, rental housing would become affordable overnight.

The third key feature **“Intensification : Enabling higher density development in appropriate locations”**

Again this location is just not appropriate. We have narrow steep streets that are already congested and slippery in the winter time, and as I have said, very expensive building costs. There is a house that is built diagonally from me with six small ensuite bedrooms. The owner rented this out per bedroom with a result that there were usually 7 and sometimes 8 cars parked on our narrow street. If this became the norm with intensification, it would drive out the very people who make up the fabric of our community. So how could anyone think that this is an appropriate location.

So in summary, based on my opinion and most other residents I talk to, this area is totally unsuitable for any aspect of the National Policy Statement On Urban Development. I think the Council has made a mistake in recommending this area as suitable for fulfilling the Governments policy for urban intensification. I would really hope that you accept our submissions to oppose the proposed changes from low density residential to medium density.

Thank you for your consideration.

