

Good morning my name is Lucy Alborn, I'm representing submitter 761, Mr Mark Thompson, my partner.

We live in Peacock Street in postcode 8013 called Christchurch Central, which is not the CBD, it's an area of residential housing that starts at Kilmore St and stretches out to Mariehau.

Mark and I moved from Auckland three years ago to escape the hideous planning; we chose Christchurch primarily because of its post-earthquake plan. Our home has seen 3 plan change classifications in less than ten years, it was built under the Special Amenity overlay in 2014 and so its design was severely restricted so as to comply and fit in with the nature and character of the neighbourhood being workers' cottages, and bungalows. And we liked that.

Good planning should last, as Johnny O'Donnel of Nelson said:

*Design holds more power than we often credit. A well-designed city is a narrative in itself, an ongoing dialogue between its spaces and its residents. The way we design things says something back to us about who we are and what we value.*

*Good design has the power to captivate, drawing people to it, inviting them to stay, explore, and connect. A well-designed city is more than just liveable; it's lovable, exuding warmth and charm that make locals proud and visitors enamoured.*

Just last week a woman walking down our street was simply there admiring the houses and the diversity and how nice it all looks, she was admiring our street. Our sections are tiny about 300sqm, it's the considered design that makes it work.

In my written submission that you have, I make two points:

1. Choice and
2. The residents of Christchurch and their well-being.

1. Choice: in this PC14 conversation CCC pitched it as being about the ability to choose where one lives, high rise apartment, rural, townhouse, big white villa...whatever. The NPS-UD and PC14 in fact does not give you choice, it removes it by making all cities and suburbs the same mash up removing character, history and interest. I won't go into the detail in my submission as you have this, and I hope have read it, today I would like to reiterate this point:

If you look at Christchurch as a city and in the central city, you'll see it's lop sided. If the desire for the Council is to truly bring residents back into the city centre AND do what the Central Government wants (intensify) AND what the people of Christchurch want, then there is a way; within the s32 documents there is a glaring obvious opportunity (in my view).

In the research I've done for today, one of the largest concerns that both residents and planners have is the uncontrolled nature of the NPS-UD and therefore PC14, creating uncontrolled and sporadic enablement that has the potential to ruin neighbourhoods, people's lives and severely muck with our already shabby infrastructure.

I don't understand why CCC planners have not seriously enabled land on the South side of the city centre, especially when their own reports tell them that this is the best place to do it given it has the strongest alignment to accessibility and services such as transport, schools, parks, recreation, entertainment, shops, and other facilities.

**Excerpt from Section 32: Accessibility—Qualifying Matters Technical Report (Part 2—Qualifying Matters (Chapters 6,8,9...), Appendix 50), 19 July 2022**

The table below highlights those locations that have the highest scores in the density enabler model. Central City: Areas with the highest accessibility are "*around the south of the central city area*". from table on p 2



The area that I live in (north of the city centre) already has approx. 150 households per hectare, whereas on the South side of the city there are 7 hectares of land currently being used to sell cars all within 800m of the Christ Church Cathedral. There is also a whole lot of empty land being used as car parks.

There are 12 large car sales yards that could enable over 2,000 dwellings (ave100 sqm) assuming CCMUZ of 21m (6 storey) at 60% coverage, and obviously this could be doubled to 4,000 dwellings at 12 storeys.

Currently this area has very few trees so converting to residential will also enable trees and landscaping to enhance the city centre, and as an added bonus reduces the number of cars in the city, which meet all of the Gov't and Council's city planning objectives and satisfy the residents all at the same time.....and yet nothing continues to be done to drive these car yards out of the central city. BTW this was part of the original post-quake planning. This is currently an appalling waste of high utility land.

Furthermore, development of intensified residential homes in this area can be done in a much more integrated manner given the larger sites, and no current residential neighbours to impose on. Everyone is happy.

Surely one would think that this is the area to start to offer the high rise dwellings be it 6, 10, or 12 storey buildings and have a precinct of like for like. I think this would be a solution that ticks all of the various party's boxes, and I don't understand why this is not top of the list on the Council's agenda.

The northern residential central city has all the houses with no services, yet the southern side has all the services and amenity and no housing. I rest my case on this point.

The second point in my submission:

2. The residents of Christchurch and their well-being.

Where is the Social Impact Evaluation Report? How many times do we have to make the point that this is being blatantly ignored by Council. It's clear by this constant avoidance that Council do not intend and (it seems), have never intended on meeting their obligations under the RMA. Why not?

Their own s32 research report summary indicates there are significant issues that need consideration, and these are required as input into the development of PC14. PC14 cannot go ahead given such a significant evaluation report is absent to contribute to the proposed plan. Apparently, Aotearoa New Zealand is all about the people, someone should let the Christchurch City Planners know that.

Finally, I want to leave you with another thought as you make your recommendations.

Without asking you to suck eggs, the MDRS-UD and the subsequent PC14 is a manifestation of a so called strategy to tackle the affordable housing crisis, and that whilst not formed we DO have a change of government and a new lead party that has reflected on the Policy acknowledging it was poorly thought though and so there is the high likelihood that things will change.

I am cognisant that this is potentially out of scope for this hearing and indeed for Christchurch City Council but that doesn't mean that we should ignore this entirely when considering the intended outcome of why we are all in this room: housing affordability.

The Labor lead strategy it would seem is to use housing intensification to create a gross oversupply of homes, thereby deflating all house prices and therefore making them "more affordable."

I'd like to encourage this panel to recognise that there are 3 levers in play with respect to "affordability."

- 1) Household income
- 2) Availability of money and the cost of borrowing
- 3) The cost of building (materials, labour, land and compliance)

Nothing in PC14 tackles any of these levers, and so I'd suggest that the 'emperor has no clothes' and it is the residents of Christchurch that see that a plan (PC14) that attempts to deal with symptoms rather than root causes will not illicit a solution to the problem.

In Christchurch we have a lot of empty, slow selling, two bedroom shoe boxes right now, no one is buying them to live in. Even a year ago it was acknowledged we had an oversupply of two-bedroom town houses, did prices fall to become affordable? No.

*Mike Blackburn, author of the Canterbury Construction Report, told Stuff in September 2022 the market for townhouses was oversaturated.*

*“Even without this proposed plan change, we’ve been building big-time. A significant percentage of what’s being consented is already in this medium-density space. We’re over-supplied in this segment of the market.”*

*Vinny Holloway, a director of townhouse development company Brookfield, which has built homes at the rate of one every two days over the past year, said there was “plenty” of land available for medium-density housing in Christchurch.*

Source: [Housing intensification changes for Christchurch a year away | Stuff.co.nz](#)

This year Williams Corp have entered the Airbnb business and can't repay their investors, because their shoe boxes are not selling, another reality of today is that the banks are making **billions** of dollars profit.

This is because the because the banks are in charge of the money system.

I don't mean to teach you to suck eggs, I simply mean to bring a bigger picture issue to the foreground for the Panel's consideration.

Banks create the most money through lending, they choose where to lend money and lending money is highly profitable, that's how they create even more money. The banks make up money every time they lend, and in New Zealand they are more than happy to lend money for housing rather than business development. So a key reason that housing is unaffordable is because banks hold the reins on the market; they lend to builders of houses not to builders of businesses that actually produce goods and services; but housing, that produces....nothing. Nothing, except for debt and more money for the banks, and in turn making houses more unattainable and “unaffordable” due to the cost of servicing debt.

Meanwhile our wages remain low, and the cost of building continues to escalate, the land increases in price because of the profit that can be derived from it.

If the Government want to make housing more affordable, they need to deal with the root causes such as the bank's power over the cost of money, not open the door for uncontrolled housing development; that will just make developers and banks even richer and people even poorer.

Can I respectfully ask that the Panel consider these higher-level issues when making their recommendations on implementing PC14 and opening the flood gates even wider to greater inequality than we already have?

Thank you.

