PC29 Hearing Presentation

Kia ora. I'm Harry Pearson. I am a citizen, ratepayer, business owner and investor in Nelson, with a scientific, horticultural and engineering background. Having spent nearly 20 years working overseas, I moved to Nelson because as a keen horticulturalist and lover of the outdoors, I regard it as the best place in the world, to live in.

I request that PC 29 is amended based on my submission, and the following:

SUN. For most Nelson property owners, sun is the primary reason that they live in Nelson or have chosen to buy a home here. The truth is sunshine is great for people's mental health and wellbeing.

If you take away the sun, or reduce the amount of sun that a property gets, then you create a whole lot of issues, including:

1. Wiping out 100's of thousands of dollars of a property's value. All you need to do is compare the value of properties in Toi Toi and Washington Valley with similar sized houses and sections in Stoke which have more sunshine hours, and there will be 100's of thousands of dollars in difference. This is even though Washington Valley and Toi Toi are closer to the city centre and schools, and therefore should be more desirable to live in. As a property investor and residential landlord, I know this is a fact. I also lived many years on Toi Toi Street before I moved to Stoke, so know first-hand, how miserable it is in winter to not get the sun until 1000 am in the morning and then to lose it again at 3.00pm in the afternoon. Is this really what you want to subject more people to? As a tenant you might choose to move to a sunnier home if the place you live in loses its sun due to changes in Council regulations which lead to multi storey developments next door. However, as a property owner, it's not so easy and what many property owners will find is that the equity in their homes (I'm talking about their life savings here), is completely wiped out by the development next door. Not only that, if they are a landlord, then all of a sudden the desirability of their property dramatically decreases and so the number of people willing to rent it will be reduced, the rent has to be reduced in order to find a suitable tenant, the mortgage can no longer be paid due to the reduced rental income (despite expenses increasing) and so you end up with a forced sale or worst still, a mortgagee sale. So please, have a think about it, because I do not believe that those responsible for drafting up PC29 have thought of the **unintended consequences** on residents and property owners.
2. With our sunshine hours, Nelson could become NZ's #1 solar city, and we should be leading the way and showing the rest of the country that solar panel power production is not only feasible, but it is also good for people's 'back pockets' and it can take the stress off the national grid and therefore help alleviate spikes in power prices and the potential need for more industrial power plants. Also, as more and more people switch to electric vehicles then the benefits of home generated solar power increases immensely. However, what our Council is proposing here with PC29, is going to take away from homeowners and tenants, that ability to generate their own electricity and save on electricity bills. Reduced sunshine due to multi storey developments, will mean that the installation of solar panels will no longer be feasible for many homeowners. Even

the possibility that a multi storey building could go up on a neighbouring property, will mean that property owners will not be willing to take the risk of installing PV panels on their properties, especially if they could be made redundant due to shading.

3. Sustainability – growing your own fruit and vegetables. With the current climate crisis, we should all be doing whatever we can to reduce food miles. The easiest way to do this is to grow your own fruit and vegetables. Nelson has some of the country's best soils and sunshine hours, so it is easy to grow you own food. And yet this plan change proposes to take this away from residents. Even though people may have enjoyed growing their own fruit and vegetables for decades to decrease their living expenses, this can be taken away from them at any time by PC29. Why? Well, the simple fact is that to grow vegetables and fruit you **need** sunshine. Take away that sunshine and very little will grow. This is yet another 'unintended consequence' of PC29 and shows once again how this plan change in its current form will negatively impact Nelsonian's lives.

Mental and physical health. Have you compared the overall mental and physical health of people living in a NZ city with multiple apartment blocks and townhouses to those living in a more traditional NZ city, like Nelson, where most of the buildings are only 1 or 2 storeys' high? It is essential that you do this. This must be done before you accept what PC29 is proposing. NZ, and much of the world, already has a health crisis. Vitamin D is essential for good health and can most easily be obtained from sunshine - unfortunately PC29 can take away this natural source of Vitamin D. Also, mould and damp, which cause respiratory illnesses can be major issues in older homes, especially if they don't get much sunshine. My question to you is, why jeopardise people's health, by allowing developments that will have an overall negative affect on people's physical and mental health?!

Privacy. Who here would enjoy opening the windows of their home to look at a neighbour's window or wall? Would you enjoy going into your back yard to relax on a nice sunny afternoon with neighbours peering down at you from their windows or balconies? Would you like listening to your neighbour's music, parties and domestic arguments, instead of the sounds of bird life and nature, as that's what you are more likely hear when the trees have been chopped down and the apartments have gone up.

Instability and Views. Much of the Tahunanui hills are steep and unstable and people pay a significant premium to purchase a property here that has a view. There should be no MDZ or HDZ zoning in Tahunanui, as any such zoning can enable developers to block existing views that neighbouring properties have had for decades and cause people to lose a lot of money. Also, due to the instability of the land, any development can lead to major issues for neighbouring properties, including slips that can wipe them out. If developers want to build more than 2 storeys in Tahunanui it needs to be obligatory that they get resource and neighbours consent to ensure that property owners do not lose their hard-earned equity and to ensure that services, infrastructure and ground stability is sufficient for such developments.

Parking. Councils can no longer force property developers to provide parking, so some developers will cut costs and provide as many bedrooms as possible on a given bit of land so that they can sell the apartments or townhouses to some innocent first home buyer or landlord, who thinks that they, or their tenants, will not need parking, as it will be easy to park on the street. Well, unfortunately, that's NOT the case, especially in Nelson. Every other person purchasing an apartment or townhouse in that complex will be thinking the same, and then suddenly you end up with multiple family members all competing for the same street carpark, along with anyone else who comes to visit them. Not only this, but the streets also now become packed with parked cars, leaving cyclists, trucks and cars to compete on the road to get past them – it'll be the cyclists that end up in the hospital emergency dept. This is another example of the unintended consequences that PC29 can lead to

The vibe of Nelson. If people want to live in a busy, crowded city, with multistorey apartment blocks and lots of people, then there are plenty of cities around the world like this. Unfortunately, they are generally **expensive** to live in and **not healthy** places to bring up a family. This is just one reason why many people choose to live in Nelson – it's the vibe! Nelson is a small, friendly city with a wonderful beach. We can certainly influence the way that our city looks and feels, and currently there is a complimentary blend of historical and new builds representing various decades of building styles. A low-rise city is NOT a bad thing. PC29 threatens to take away Nelson's uniqueness and turn it into a bland and uninspiring city. Essentially, future development of our city needs to be design and community led, not developer led

PC29 is **not equitable**. It is a plan change that will reward developers working in silos with no combined vision or community input into how we want our city to look and feel. Homeowners, landlords and tenants will be unjustifiably punished. Most individuals cannot afford to build multi-story buildings – they're just too expensive. So, the only winners will be the developers – no-one else can afford to do what PC29 is proposing.

REr43a: SH6 Acoustic Control.

1. This has nothing to do with the aims of PC29 and should be removed as it is out of scope. In the NCC document 'How Plan Change 29 Could Affect You' it states that 'The main reason for proposed Plan Change 29 is to provide for more and flexible housing opportunities…'. What has acoustic controls got to do with this?
2. How many pages does PC29 and its appendices comprise? This acoustic control proposal was not openly presented to residents, but rather hidden away amongst this massive document that only few residents of Nelson have had the time and patience to wade through. I attended the public meetings in Stoke and Tahunanui, which were held to inform residents about the contents of PC29. There was absolutely NO mention of this proposal, even though the Tahunanui meeting was held adjacent to SH6. It is my belief that residents were intentionally not informed about this proposal. It was not even shown on any of the maps that residents were told were put into the plan change to inform us of ALL the proposed changes. When it was finally made public, not by Council, but by a couple of residents who came across it, just prior to the closing of submissions, most of us were too exhausted by the efforts that we had put into our earlier PC29

submission, that we no longer had the energy to make a submission about this unexpected proposal.

What is PC29 trying to achieve?!

1. Do we need more housing? If we do need more housing, has any town planner or Nelson City Council staff member asked any questions, or done any research, to see **what** sort of housing we need in Nelson?
2. The fact is that most tenants, and especially families, would prefer to live in a stand-alone house with a garage rather than an apartment or 'terraced house'. This is backed up by an article in the July 2024 Property Investor magazine (as attached), about Auckland properties, in which a property manager states that 'An investor can have a dated 3-bedroom house with carpets older than me and it gets rented overnight, but renters will go 'no we don't like this' to a brand new 3-bedroom terrace house without parking and lawn'. As a landlord, I have had similar experiences here in Nelson.
3. Ask any property management company or landlord, and they will tell you that there is NO shortage of rental accommodation for tenants who pay their rent on time, look after the properties that they rent, don't disturb the neighbours and have good references.
4. Who are we trying to attract to our city? We should focus on attracting people who are employed or that can contribute to our community, and having a housing plan that caters for these people, rather than trying to house everyone who sees Nelson as an attractive city to live in. Who we attract to our city is going to have a big impact on the vibe of our city, our sense of safety and our wellbeing.
5. If we encourage more people to move to Nelson, then we will need bigger schools, roads, hospitals, sewage and stormwater drains, more drinking water, etc - do we really want more of this? How will all this development be funded? When will this infrastructure be upgraded – will it be before we increase our population or after we reach a crisis point? We need to have a planned approach to infrastructure, not a reactive one.
6. Some people will argue that accommodation or housing is expensive in Nelson. Well, they're right, but there is a reason for this. It's largely the current cost of building – much of Nelson is a hilly city and this does make the cost of building much more expensive. Also, currently, the amount of time and the costs involved in getting Council consent is significant and if this was reduced through PC29, then more buildings would get built.
7. As an illustration of how poorly thought out PC29 is, it proposes that lower Tamaki Street, one of Nelson's steepest streets, and parts of Tosswill Road should be rated suitable for high density 6 storey buildings, despite the fact that the area is unstable and prone to slips, and also separated from the rest of the community and it's main services, such as schools and dairies, by a busy state highway.
8. Franklyn Village is our main multistorey accommodation complex in Nelson. Do we really want more of these? I know of many people who are afraid of walking near Franklyn Village in the daytime and they wouldn't want to go anywhere near it on foot at night. Is this how we want other parts of our city to become?

2nd Dwellings and Infill Housing

1. I support PC29 where it proposes to make it easier for property owners to build additional dwellings on their property. This is a way for us, as homeowners and property investors to provide the type of additional accommodation that is in demand, whether it's for permanent residents, students or visitors and holiday makers – Nelson needs all of these. By establishing an extra dwelling on your property, you are going to make it aesthetically pleasing and a quality build, to ensure that you can maximise your returns from it. I therefore think that developers and architects (who obviously have a conflict of interest), that talk about concerns of crappy buildings being erected in the back of people's properties, is generally unjustified. Unfortunately, current council regulations and costs make building additional dwellings too expensive for the average property owner. I totally support the parts of PC29 that will make this process cheaper and more efficient, if they do not have a negative impact on neighbouring properties (especially regarding light angles and privacy).

I am not opposed to the building of multistorey buildings, if they are built in the right places and have neighbours' consent, especially if they are not going to affect the amount sunlight that neighbouring properties get.

I would like to state that **I am in full support** of many of the submissions requesting a change to PC29, and especially those made by:

Steve Webster

Rodney Witte

Geoffrey Hayes

The Tahunanui Business and Citizens Association

What you can do as the Hearing Panel

Based on what I have presented to you in my submission, and here today, as the PC29 Hearing Panel, I would like to see you recommend to our Council, that at least the following changes are made to PC29:

1. The complete removal of MDZ and HDZ from plan change 29. If developers want to build higher than 2 storeys, then they can apply for resource consent, and this must include consultation with neighbours and their consent. If you do recommend any MDZ, this needs to be restricted to the inner city, a small area around the Stoke shopping centre and large-scale new developments.
2. In Tahunanui, MDZ and HDZ needs to be removed as the land is too unstable and the affect that buildings over 2 levels will have on neighbouring properties is too great.
3. The complete removal of REr43a, the SH6 Acoustic Control proposal, as this was not properly notified to ratepayers and residents and is not within the scope of PC29.