

**My submission is that:**

- I support the demolition of 320 The Terrace, but
- only approve a change of Inner Residential Area to Institutional Precinct if the amendments described at the end of this document are made to the proposed plan change.

**Reasons for my submission:**

Due to recent experience with Victoria University with regards the design and management of Te Puni Village, I have a justifiable concern with relying on the University's goodwill to not construct student accommodation on the site. And I have a justifiable concern with relying on the University to design student accommodation that is acceptable- or even attempts to be acceptable- to its neighbours.

- 1) Ironically, in the summary paragraph 1.4, at page 4 of the "Private Plan Application" the following is stated as a reason for demolishing the residential building currently at 320 The Terrace: **"The District Plan does not anticipate or provide for a building of this height, bulk, location, design, and intensity of residential use..."** That reason to demolish the current building at 320 The Terrace could just as easily apply to Te Puni Village. Although Te Puni is not in contention here, it has created a precedent and with that, a justifiable concern for the University's neighbours to not allow the University carte blanche in design and construction that comes with a change of Institutional Precinct to Institutional Precinct.
- 2) Unfortunately with the design of the University's Te Puni Hostel, I learnt that the University is more than willing to disregard the concerns of its neighbours. With the design of Te Puni the University relied on its Institutional Precinct status to design an exceptionally tall building that is aesthetically pedestrian, and creates nuisance noise that is amplified and reverberated to the detriment of its neighbours.
- 3) The second unfortunate lesson I learnt with the construction of Te Puni Village was that the University, and its subcontractors, do not have sufficient practices and resource to enforce effective management of student living in densely populated buildings.
- 4) As a property owner in close proximity to the University, I cannot risk further devaluation of my property by permitting the University to design buildings without regard for neighbours' concerns. My property valuation is already potentially decreased by student nuisance noise that is amplified by the large, flat façade of Te Puni Village.
- 5) As a resident in the area, my family and I have suffered a loss of quality of life over the last five years due to the poorly controlled, densely populated student accommodation of Te Puni Village. I cannot risk permitting the University to operate further, densely populated accommodation in our neighbourhood on the 320 The Terrace site.

**I seek the following three decisions from the Council:**

- Only accept the newly proposed Rule 9.3.2 if it is amended to stress that “restricted discretionary” activity must not apply to student accommodation. The aim of this amendment would be to prohibit the construction of student accommodation on the site.
- Add a new Rule 9.4 to iterate that the construction of student accommodation on the site is a Prohibited activity.
- WCC to further inform and advise residents of the area, not only those adjoining and adjacent to 320 The Terrace, of the full, potential impact of the University’s proposed changes to the District Plan.