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Question 7:

I have concerns that Zone descriptions will be vague and not supported by clear rules. Existing or new residents need more protection and certainty. Council currently allow developers to work around restrictions by eg: Not providing car parks – cars clogging street parking; Recession plane departures – shading neighbours; Lax enforcing of Airbnbs – clogging street parking. Therefore, clarity and protection are essential.

The impact of Zones is unclear – would existing residents be consulted and what latitude would Councils have?

Question 8:

I have concerns that inappropriate areas would be identified for intensification. The proposal to have 60 residential units p hectare would be too much for that part of Central Christchurch not in the CBD. Rules were recently changes to allow 50 p hectare and that has caused problems in Central Christchurch Residential Zone eg: Increased parking on streets; Proliferation of Airbnbs and resulting decrease in the number of permanent residents; Light pollution from larger apartment blocks. Also, it is not appropriate to have such a wide area be subject to intensification ie 800m from frequent public transport stops – there would hardly be any areas that would not qualify!

There is no demand in Christchurch for high rise residential as a result of our earthquake experience, indeed the new District plan limits buildings to 28 metres.

Therefore Option 1 (Descriptive approach) is favoured for the reasons above.

Question 11:

I do not support the relaxation of recession plane rules. It is important that intensification does not degrade living standards eg: The enjoyment of sun is vital to the wellbeing of residents, both physically and mentally, and whether in the suburbs or inner city.
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