

DDPR\_feedback\_0059s

	Name	Grant Miles
	Organisation	
	Email	██████████
	Response Date	Aug 30 22
	Notes	
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on	
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?	
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q4	Feedback/Comments	
	<p>The proposed fencing at 40 % needs to be thought about, whether 900 high or 1.8. A basic batten /open fence is around a 70mm batten and 20mm gap- 28%. Use a 70mm batten @ 40% open-30mm gap which doesn't sound a lot but its too big. The 40 % could be the boundary: 18mbdy -7.2 unfenced ( excluding the Access width) total unfenced say 7.2+4.0 =11.2 therefore 6.8 could be a solid fence. This then allows for a north street boundary to still have outdoor living private. Allows a south street boundary to have private fenced area to protect service rooms which are often on the south. (I'm just using basic orientation here.) So, I would propose that 40 % of the boundary should be open excluding the street crossing and there is no need to have a distinction between 900 and 1.8 high who wants an urban street vista to be all similar fences, let choices been made with a proportion of openness encouraged. Also, for safety openness around the street crossing is good for safety vision when vehicles reverse. We don't really want fence enforcement officers. Cheers. [cid:image001.jpg@01D8BC77.9F178B00] Kind Regards Grant Miles Director Professional Member ADNZ LBP 104796 ██████████</p>	
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q6	Feedback/Comments	
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q8	Feedback/Comments	
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q10	Feedback/Comments	
Q11	supporting documents?	
	0	
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here	