## Re implementation of new zones -lack of consistency TNV.

One of the reasons given for the new planning system was consistency for developers over similar areas regardless of which Council area they are in. In my situation this is not the case as due to expediency I was advised the existing figures for any given section of land was just carried over to the new zone. It appears no review of this situation has since been done as to the appropriateness. In the below case the figure of 1860sqm is a carryover going back over 40 years with no explanation to what seems to be an arbitrary amount. 1860 is odd even if the imperial acre system is considered. The large size for the allotments can only be explained due to when septic tanks were needed, prior to the installation of sewer and other infrastructure which now services the whole area and is a requirement for development.

With the introduction of the new planning system, I had expected what seems to be an historical hangover to be brought up to current expectations.

The Government has long been advocating urban infill to address housing land shortages and affordable blocks in areas already having the necessary infrastructure.

It seems out of place to have a section of Greenwith in the TTG Council with minimum block size, regardless of suitability due to grade, at 1860sqm

This is unique to this relatively small area with the next zone with large residential blocks having a minimum of 800sqm in steep sections of the Golden Grove Development like Spring Hill and the lower part of McCann Pl. Greenwith.

The similar land in the Salisbury Council was changed a few years back after extensive investigation to correlate size to grade, through a PAR.

The area in TTG Council that was once Salisbury Heights, now Greenwith, has provision in the plan for varying size per grade but has 1860sqm in each group. – see table below

Can you instigate an assessment of those sizes to consider making them comparable to those in Salisbury Heights allowing for appropriate development to happen?

Property Zone Details in TTG for Hills Neighbourhood Zone at Greenwith

## "Local Variation (TNV)

Concept Plan (81)

Gradient Minimum Frontage (Detached) (Minimum frontage for detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 24m; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 24m; greater than 1-in-4 is 24m)

Gradient Minimum Frontage (Semi-detached) (Minimum frontage for semi-detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 24m; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 24m; greater than 1-in-4 is 24m)

Gradient Minimum Site Area (Detached) (Minimum site area for detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 1860sqm; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 1860sqm; greater than 1-in-4 is 1860sqm)

Gradient Minimum Site Area (Semi-detached) (Minimum site area for semi-detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 1860sqm; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 1860sqm; greater than 1-in-4 is 1860sqm)

<u>In Salisbury Heights for adjoining Hills Neighbourhood Zone</u> (just two streets away from me with similar topography)

Minimum frontage for detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 15m; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 15m; greater than 1-in-4 is 15m

Minimum frontage for semi-detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 15m; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 15m; greater than 1-in-4 is 15m

Minimum site area for detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 650sqm; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 1200sqm; greater than 1-in-4 is 1200sqm

Minimum site area for semi-detached dwellings where the site gradient is less than 1-in-8 is 650sqm; 1-in-8 to 1-in-4 is 1200sqm; greater than 1-in-4 is 1200sqm"

I imagine there are other Zones that have this type of unnecessary restriction to development so a review over the whole of the metro area may provide additional land with minimal infrastructure cost, thus helping housing availability at minimal cost..

	t this large and ne further disc	,	ıld be happy to mee	et with you
Keith Pil	kington			
Phone		Email		