

We the SPT own the last house on the left on Riro St. Adjacent to the river. There are 8 properties on our street. We all purchased in this area because it is a quiet oasis in the middle of the city. It is low density, has wide berms, open gardens, lots of trees. We purchased here because of it's historic heritage values.

About 50% of the owners support the HHA proposal in general concept.

Of those that object there are two threads to their objection.

1. They believe that by having the HHA impact their property, the capital value is reduced.
2. There will be cost, complexity & time involved in obtaining a RC for virtually anything the landowner does to their property.

I submit that the 1<sup>st</sup> reason for objection (loss in value) is no valid reason to negate the HHA designation. Any suggestion that values will be eroded is subjective and speculative. I actually think values will be enhanced due to the rarity of such amenity values in the inner city.

The second reason for objection is however very real and very justified. I accept that there must be some regulatory process and supervisory procedures to ensure all owners protect the intent of the HHA overlay. As a result, by necessity, the landowners will be put to the inconvenience of having to obtain consents for work to be done to their property. However as the HHA overlay and the processes and procedures to protect the integrity of the overlay, is for the benefit of all citizens of the city, so too should all citizens carry the cost of this process. These costs should not be levied solely on that small group of citizens who for the greater good will be heavily burdened by restrictions placed on their respective property rights.

I submit that where a RC is required solely due to the HHA rules then there should be no fees, processing costs or monitoring charges levied on the landowner.