I support some of the broad intentions, but oppose particular provisions.

Comments on specific questions

Q2. Redefining amenity rights.
I disagree that the current definition of amenity has effectively just been defending the status quo. It is defending the rights of current property owners to not lose amenity on their largest investment. The suggestion (Question 11 below) that height limits could be removed would potentially ruin my enjoyment of my house, which has a large garden which I spend a lot of time on. If that was shaded by a tall building on my boundary, it would ruin this property for me. Amenity is not just a planning concept, it’s my way of life here.

Q8. Where to allow higher density.
The “prescriptive” approach for higher density, covering all areas within 800 of public transport routes, seems way too much for Christchurch. I live in the Beckenham Loop, a very quiet suburb with detached houses and many families with small children. It’s not an obvious candidate for relaxed rules and high density housing, yet is within 800 m of two bus routes. Only a local body, like the Christchurch City Council, can work out where higher density is appropriate and effective, and where it would not be. I urge you to follow the “descriptive” approach so the CCC can work out where best to allow higher density.

Q11. Height and height-to-boundary rules.
I can understand the wish to make it easier for higher density developments, although I think the 2017 new District Plan in Christchurch already allows that with relaxed rules which have not yet had time to feed through to houses on the ground. But I completely disagree about height, and height to boundary, being among the rules that could be relaxed or removed. Being shaded by a tall building next door would have a huge impact on my property, whereas other rules could be relaxed and only affect the neighbour (eg how much outdoor space they had, or car parking areas).
I feel very strongly that height and height to boundary rules are essential and must not be relaxed, let alone removed completely.