Kaye Parker, holiday home owner, Submitter Short Term Holiday Accommodation Kaye.parker@holidayhomesqueenstown.co.nz; 027 627 7448

Although Short Term Visitor accommodation holiday homes have received bad press in Queenstown and in some cities around the world, it is the usual story, an amazing small business opportunity for many 'every day' people who operate well run holiday homes or in-home stays marred by the few bad operators and no or little consequences for those bad operators by the authorities in charge.

I have owned and managed a holiday home on Queenstown Hill for 3 years now. I bought it for the sole purpose of running short term visitor accommodation. It is a 4 bedroom 3.5 bathroom upmarket home. I would not have purchased it for an everyday rental as the cumulative effect of everyday living and rental damage and the rental return would not justify it as a viable investment. I have another two homes, our own and a cottage in Arrowtown just coming onto the short term visitor accommodation market. I will run and oversee all three.

My 2017 financial report for my Queenstown Hill property shows I spent \$77,980 directly in the local Queenstown economy keeping this holiday home. That figure does not include Body Corp, interest, rates, depreciation and travel expenses. My biggest costs are cleaning, home maintenance which includes gardening and spa pool cleaning and the large number of consumables I purchase to keep it to a high standard all spent locally helping to keep jobs and the economy going.

I would ask the Commissioners here to take note of this example and the Deloittes Economic effects of Airbnb in Queenstown and also note that that is only Airbnb. Holiday Houses and Bookabach now HomeAway are huge guest booking engines in Queenstown. It would be conservative to double Deloittes Economic effects of Airbnb in Queenstown – i.e. 1426 FTE jobs and \$178m in GRP.

This town has always been a holiday home town. I have lived in the same house in Kelvin Heights between Peninsula Road and Willow Place for 20 years and less than half our surrounding neighbours are or ever have been permanent residents.

I do understand and sympathise with people in new subdivisions like Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover country where they have been built with locals in mind with schools and other facilities nearby or in the subdivision. These areas could be zoned as standalone home visitor accommodation free areas, still allowing people who buy there to generate income by renting out rooms or separate accommodation on their property to help cover their mortgages.

My main issues with the council's proposed changes to short term visitor accommodation is:

- The lack of realism that this town would not have been able to accommodate the number of visitors that now come here if it relied just on hotel and motel accommodation. Even with all the new hotels planned, it wouldn't and couldn't meet the visitor numbers we now.
- The lack of understanding that a new online booking system worldwide allows not just the mostly overseas owned hotel chains or people with huge assets, but everyday locals, the chance to earn extra money or run a full-time business from their biggest asset – their home.
- 3. The hotel and motel industry has largely stayed the same business model since the early 1960's and they are putting considerable pressure on council to protect their business against this great growing sector of everyday people. They should be looking at ways to innovate and reinvent themselves. I liken it to the days of the horse and cart and the unstoppable changes that the car made in the early 20th century.
- 4. There is a lack of understanding that consumer demand thanks to these new online booking systems has changed customer/consumer preference to allow us to stay in other people's homes with far more facilities and usually at a per person better rate than hotels. It has also allowed groups of families and friends to spend time together and the growing trend, with home ownership at an historic 50 year low, to rent different types of

properties for their holidays that they would never expect to be able to afford to own.

My two main issues in the proposed changes are:

Proposed change: Low density areas will not be allowed to be used

Recommended: Keep the ability to apply for resource resource consent for low density areas in the Sunshine Bay to Goldfields area.

To restrict visitors in the town zone from Goldfields to Fernhill is short sighted. Visitors want to be near town and our downtown businesses need them to run profitable businesses. This is where the majority of holiday homes are already and where visitor demand for these will only increase. I recommend that the status quo – from Sunshine Bay to Goldfields be kept to allow homes in low density areas to apply for resource consent for visitor accommodation in the future.

Current: standalone holiday homes the historic minimum 3 day stays for standalone homes.

Proposed change: Delete the minimum 3 day stay for standalone homes

This is a historic requirement imposed by the council over 10 years ago to satisfy the hotel and motel associations who were nervous that the then new AIRBNB accommodation model would take business from them.

I have no problem paying commercial rates of 80% more than normal rates for up to 365 days of the year, BUT my resource consent requires minimum of 3-day stays.

Yet all visitor accommodation providers who have a self-contained flat of any number of bedrooms and bathrooms within their primary home structure or a separate holiday flat on the same property only pay 25% more rates and have no minimum stays.

A much fairer and equitable system would be to wipe the minimum 3 day stays for standalone homes. I am happy to continue to pay commercial rates but believe we should be on the **same level playing field as all**

*standalone holiday home has a minimum 3 day stay and the people up the road's 3 bedroom 2 bathroom self-contained flat in their home has no restrictions on the minimum number of days the flat can be rented.