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From:

Wendy Fergusson,

In relation to Q7, Q8 and Q11.

1) The following 3 items seem to contradict the statement on page 14 (create high-quality, liveable cities that contribute to the well-being of people and the natural environment).

- Make housing more affordable and reduce car dependency by increasing residential density in areas near city centres and transport corridors
- Change the focus from the needs/wishes of existing residents to those of possible future residents and developers
- Allow growth up and out.

These 3 items mean less variety in both buildings and inhabitants, less green space and why should future residents be more important than those already trying to make a home there. Cars aren’t supported in this document but at this time I still need a car because I can’t get everywhere I need to go on public transport and there seems to be no push or money to be able to improve it.

2) The thought of any protection to your property being removed in relation to neighbouring property heights and recession planes is scary. Surely everyone must be able to secure sunshine into their home or protect what they already have. This is a major amenity. As are site coverage, property size and outdoor space. These are also major amenity issues.

3) The descriptive approach (P6C Option 1) seems to be a much more sensible intensification plan so that local features and feel could be taken into account. The prescriptive approach won’t work – one size does not fit all.

4) I’d like to see a strong policy that protects land zoned residential from non-residential intrusion. In my central city neighbourhood there has been incursions of non-residential which have fragmented the neighbourhood and these aren’t good neighbours. The Council want lots of people to live in the central city and then lets churches and businesses build/occupy residential land, so lets look after the residential neighbourhoods please.

Regards

Wendy Fergusson