

Oral Submission Summary:

Creation of the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA.

Cathy McBride

1. My opinion is that **any planned HHA areas should be restricted/contained in an entire block** (ie not with other non-HHA properties abutting the section boundaries) – otherwise possible multiple 3-level houses will destroy whatever heritage look you are trying to preserve anyway. And at what cost? – a cost only to the HHA affected homeowners! For example, on neighboring properties to ours – on one side (a corner site) and to the rear of our property (20 Marshall) – it is proposed owners would likely be free to build 3x 3 level dwellings on their sites and without Resource Consent – what does that do to preserving the so-called 'heritage' look for 23 Oxford Street? Clearly, multi stories will be overbearingly visible over our little cottage and the remainder of the street.
2. This **proposed HHA is inconsistent** I believe – in that it includes two small segments of two streets (Oxford East and Marshall). The lack of consistency is evidenced in a walk along the streets by a mish-mash of 'looks' and varying degrees of changes/additions to buildings and a mixture of fencing.
3. Our cottage has a **completely different and 'plain' look and is not what is described as a Railway Cottage. It is not original** - has had roofing changes, a tin garage, and an 'ugly' addition to the front which has destroyed any historic front elevation so-called resemblance to a railway cottage – making it very low in the standings of a historical heritage 'look' in my view. In fact, if you walk down the street, you could hardly say that the homes are consistent as is the case in the likes of Hayes Paddock or Frankton Railway areas
4. **I don't think this area is attractive to anyone who doesn't live there.** Do we really think segments of the population of Hamilton or visitors to the city will head down Oxford St and Marshall St and seek to look at the 'lovely heritage area'?
5. My son and his partner have an @ 18mths old puppy, Juno – who is a large dog breed and still growing. Hence, a taller fence is required so she is kept within the boundaries of the section to comply with the Animal Control Act. **Construction of a front-facing 1.2m fence would be the limit in the HHA and would certainly not contain Juno.** It has been suggested that they fence off only from the front of the house to the side boundaries.... We don't agree with this dictation of our living our normal life.
6. There is an unsavoury and intimidating element frequently wandering the streets in the area (and onto the property even) including roaming dogs – and in the hope of **keeping their property safe, the ability to construct a higher fence will further restrict the free access to the property.**
7. Development aspirations would be restrained – by cost and bureaucracy - in that we as owners would be required to pay to ask permission to do anything on the property including building a fence or change the windows out to more secure and 'healthy-home' windows.
8. We need to **upgrade the windows** to properly sealed double glazing – to make the home a healthy draft free, and easy-burglar-free home - and to comply with rental standards if we ever decide to temporarily rent it out in the future. I suspect the outcome may ~~be~~ possibly include not being able to use the standard product they can afford, but instead use a specially-made product so it 'fits' within the Councils 'heritage' style? I've previously worked for a group building company, so I know how anything non-standard bumps the price up exponentially – so this would be an additional financial burden for them.

9. If this HHA proposal is approved – we may as well say the council is **disadvantaging the young first home buyers**. The well-healed don't buy old and run-down little cottages within/on the boundary of Fairfield that are drafty and requiring payment of **Resource Consent and Heritage Architect** fees to better the property. They, instead, buy fancy homes in wealthy newer suburbs so won't be affected. All the while a non HHA abutting next-door neighbour pays nothing in RC fees or anything else apart from a building consent perhaps for the betterment of their property.
10. If anything, if this proposal goes through, then the least the HCC should do is pay the Heritage Architect fees and waive their own RC fees. The homeowner will have enough **extra cost burden and loss of decision making** to stomach without the extra fees. As ratepayers, we expect peace of mind to be able to construct and deconstruct within the rules we made the decision to purchase.
11. Imposing this HHA on a property with what I believe is “essentially a false historic heritage” will also **affect resale** as it is effectively a “**post-purchase covenant** being imposed by a 3rd party not involved in the actual purchase process” – this will not only **lower the value** and along with the inability of a potential buyer to autonomously carry out what they might want to do to improve or put their own flavour on the property **without incurring extra costs**, but also would greatly **reduce the number of interested buyers due to the HHA restrictions** – also affecting value due to **reduced competition**.
12. On the other hand, those living in an HHA with their developments, renovations, additions etc, already completed may be quite happy as it won't affect them.
13. Furthermore, as I have already raised in point 1, **similar homes in a poor state of repair side by side or backing onto each other with one being in a HHA and the other not in a HHA will have far different outcomes to try and sell - and in eventual profitability**. The non-HHA will easily sell to a developer who plans to knock down and rebuild and put on maybe 2 duplexes or 3x 3 storied towers or whatever, but the other home within the HHA cannot have the same outcome – instead is only able to be sold to the person **willing and able to spend \$\$ renovating** – when this is the only option, they will only want to pay a minimal price especially if they know they are up for much greater costs to make improvements – ie RC fees, Heritage Architect fees, and more expensive costs for maintaining the heritage 'look' at the behest of the council
14. It seems to me that this HHA is being proposed to mitigate the Governments Urban Development policy – where, without resource consent, landowners will be able to build multiple homes of varying heights on their lands – we feel like, but don't want to be, the sacrificial lamb.

I SEEK THE FOLLOWING DECISION FROM THE HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL:

I object to the proposed creation of the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street “Railway Cottages” HHA and request that it be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D in the HCC ODP as the effects for me and my son (and his family: partner and dog) are significant and not acceptable – causing severe financial, safety and stress impacts.

In addition, I support the Whyte/Dorrell submission (due for presentation on Wednesday) in that the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street “Railway Cottages” HHA is not representative of the two historical heritage themes (“railway workers suburbs (1930s-1950s)” and “establishment of an early service town (pre-1930s)” as stated.