

The Hearing Panel
Plan Change 29

GP Investments Limited

My name is Scott Gibbons. Managing Director of Gibbons Holdings Ltd.

GPI or GP Investments Limited is a part of Gibbons Holdings Limited (GHL) and have a wide range of property interests in Nelson

It is due to these wide property interests that GHL (and GPI) has in Nelson that submissions were made on Plan Change 29, spanning the proposed new provisions that involve the:

- Residential Zone;
- Inner City;
- Industrial Zone; and
- Suburban Commercial Zone.

Furthermore, the submissions made by GPI also span a wide range of topics, but have focused on the hazards (geotechnical and flooding) and the change in zoning between Vanguard and St Vincent Street. Given the hearing of the hazards topic has been delayed until the 17th of September, I will not address that topic in detail here, although it is also impossible to present a balanced statement without acknowledging all of the broader parts of PC29.

The Removal of Schedule J

Schedule J (currently containing The Warehouse and Countdown Supermarket) represents a very out of date planning tool that was imposed to strictly control retailing and also ensure all parking demands are provided for on site. We strongly support removal of this schedule.

The Upzoning of the Valley

This up-zoning represents a significant change to the City. There are a number of short-term and longer-term consequences of this change in land use which we have highlighted in our submissions.

Most importantly, this change will cause additional conflicts between the long established industrial and commercial activities and new residential activities that PC29 is designed to enable. We have invested considerably into this valley area, and so too have a number of our tenants, many of whom have no reason to move given they serve business areas such as Port

Nelson. Likewise, PC29 does not propose to encourage relocation of those businesses out of the City as it does not provide a new alternative to relocate to. If anything, the multiple new hazard overlays will deter industrial and commercial activities to move out of the valley and therefore elect to stay where they are. Change will therefore be VERY slow, and long term. While also a topic for the hazards hearing, redevelopment within the valley will also be impacted by the final new rules. My gut feeling is that the hazard rules will significantly hinder redevelopment to the point that it will be either too difficult, too expensive, and also run the risk of having financial barriers due to insurance problems.

Through our submissions we have sought to ensure the planning framework anticipates the land use conflicts that will arise, and provide protection to the long established business activities that exist within that environment. Unfortunately, even with the appropriate window glazing etc, this will not stop the complaints from those who either did not understand the nature of industrial activities next door or in close proximity, or will attempt to impose their influence through making complaints once they start living in the area.

Mark Lile will also address those matters in his supplementary evidence.

Consent for Alterations, Additions and New Buildings (ICr.37B)

Another consequence of the change of zoning and change to the associated Inner City Rules is that the City Fringe, as proposed by PC29, gets treated the same when it comes to requiring resource consent for new buildings. Mark Lile picked up on this and covered this off within our submissions, and raised this in the expert conferencing process.

Based on the JWS process that was agreed, and then also further addressed in the s42A addendum report, I can see that the Council's planners and consultants have genuinely attempted to amend ICr.37B in recognition of the different 'environment' and design/amenity sensitivity between St Vincent St and Vanguard Street.

Our long term interest is to ensure we are able to efficiently help our tenants with their changing needs as time goes by. We are not opposed to improving the environment over the long term, however we would strongly oppose rules that allow high levels of subjectivity over the design merits. The rules need to be succinct and focused, and specifically provide for the '*non-notification and no written approvals*' pathway. Mark Lile is addressing that further in his supplementary evidence.

Conclusion

GP Investments Limited (and Gibbons Holdings Limited) has a wide range of property interest in Nelson and also has significant interests in Nelson's future. We are a family that cares deeply for our community which are proudly a part of, and one we support where we can.

Overall, we support PC29, as Nelson does need to provide for growth. As it stands currently, a majority of the growth is being lost to Tasman. Too little has been done for too long to correct this shift.

Our support for the changes to the Inner City planning framework is finely balanced. We do have serious concerns about the land use conflicts that will arise, and also the likely impact that the new hazard overlaps will have on redevelopment opportunities.

Thank you again for this opportunity to speak to you directly, and for the processes you have put in place in an attempt to ensure the issues are ironed out prior to the hearing.

I am happy to answer any questions.

Scott Gibbons