

# DENIS LAWRENCE HARWOOD

161 Hereford Street, P O Box 2923, Christchurch

Phone: (03) 366 7305 Fax: (03) 366 0954

5<sup>th</sup> May 2006

To: Christchurch City Council  
[ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:ccc-plan@ccc.govt.nz)

From: D L Harwood

Subject: **Christchurch City Council Development Contributions Policy – Submissions**

I am the registered proprietor of the following properties:

- 264 Fitzgerald Avenue (sometimes called 1 Heywood Terrace)
- 102 Springfield Road

Both sites are large and have old dwellings thereon.

I have been contemplating developing the Springfield Road site.

I have been taking steps to develop the site on the corner of Fitzgerald Avenue and Heywood Terrace.

Those steps included the completion on architectural plans, costings, overall financial viability, possible resource consent procedures and related issues.

The site is ready for development. It is a large area on an elevated dominant corner location on one of the foremost streets (avenues) in the city. The dwelling is dilapidated.

My architects have completed drawings for good quality higher density townhouses/ apartments.

The location is in the area of the city that the Council is spending considerable money on street enhancement. Such a project would complement those works.

As is the case with several of our group's development projects, this project is now on hold. It is a most frustrating impediment to constructive development.

My group has considerable and proven expertise in property investment and development. We feel I can record (with modesty) that we have "runs on the board". We want to accelerate our property development phase.

Unfortunately the Council's own Development Contribution Policy is impeding our endeavours.

A property developer must know exactly what costs are going to be incurred at the financial feasibility stage. Increases in contributions therefore must be lucid and fixed. Without that clarity a developer cannot progress to the next stage.

In addition it is unreasonable and financially unrealistic to expect developers to provide increased contributions at the outset. For many the interest costs become unsustainable thereby hindering the prospect of the project proceeding.

Rather, we see no reason why any reasonable contribution could not be paid at the conclusion of the development project. That would enable such reasonable contribution to be paid from sales, rather than debt (in some cases). What's more, the Council would obviously retain "security" for such payment before final signing-off.

The benefits of the developments my companies and I are involved in accrue to the vendors (developers) but also the Council and its citizens.

These submissions emphasise the practical ramifications of the Council's proposal. They also emphasise the likelihood of legal ramifications if, what appears to be a flawed agenda, proceeds.