

From: [lgoima](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Response to request 313167
Date: Thursday, 22 June 2017 04:17:11 p.m.
Attachments: [REDACTED]
[image001.png](#)
[image002.jpg](#)
[image003.jpg](#)
[image004.jpg](#)

22-Jun-2017

Karl Ashton
Email address
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr Ashton,

Official information request for 589793 ASHTON, VOGEL STREET PARKING CHANGES

I refer to your official information request dated 18-May-2017 for "details of those who were in support of the proposed parking changes in Vogel Street and details of those that opposed."

A copy of a spreadsheet compiling all the submissions received on the proposal is attached.

Personal names, business names and addresses have been redacted to protect the privacy of submitters under section 7(2)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act.

You have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman of this decision. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or freephone 0800 802 602.

If you wish to discuss this decision with us, please feel free to contact Kristy Rusher, Group Manager Legal, at 477 4000.

Arlene Goss
Governance Support Officer
Dunedin City Council
50 The Octagon, Dunedin; P O Box 5045, Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand
Telephone: 03 477 4000
Email: Arlene.Goss@dcc.govt.nz



 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

Feedback for proposed Warehouse Precinct Parking Changes

For/Against		Feedback
1	Against	<p>I would like to know how the DCC will deal with applications for resident’s car parks in light of the proposed changes to parking in and around Vogel St. Will residents be able to apply for a resident’s parking permit and use 90min parks all day? Or will there be another solution?</p>
2	For	<p>I'm writing in response to the Proposed on-street parking in The Warehouse Precinct Revitalisation Plan.</p> <p>As the owner of a business which generates a lot of foot traffic and a reasonable amount of traffic into Vogel Street, I see what's working and what's not on a daily basis.</p> <p>The proposed changes to parking on Vogel Street look like an improvement and I thank the DCC for their endeavours in this area.</p> <p>I do note one area which I think could be improved upon- you have proposed leaving the 4 spaces outside the Donald Reid building on the corner of Vogel Street and Jetty Street as Unrestricted.</p> <p>Can I suggest that they would be better utilised as P30.</p> <p>My reasoning being the downstairs of this site is our proposed new cafe premises- this factor combined with the proposed Pedestrian Mall upgrade concept/closure of Jetty Street means that this particular corner should be high traffic.</p> <p>It would serve the locals, tourists and growing number of people coming into the area to have more short term parking options.</p> <p>Otherwise these 4 parks are likely to be taken by 6am by my employees or other early bird workers in the area.</p>
3	For	<p>Based on our lengthy input regarding the parking changes needed we support the proposed parking plan. That said, in light of what is proposed to the length we would prefer to see, there is still further commitment required to increase traffic movements.</p> <p>In our view any parking over 60 minutes does not send or deliver the correct message towards creating a sustainable business precinct. Observations over the years illustrate that the majority of 60m and 90m parks are being abused by people who work in the area. The intention of people believing they have the right to use any parking within the WP as a 2 minute commute to work is one that only reinforces the need to lower the parking times.</p> <p>There are currently at least 6 vehicles who consistently shift their vehicles amongst the Vogel Street parks throughout the working day, 5 days a week. To believe this is an achievable form of inner city parking does not reflect well on the town planning. There should be no commute parking or incentives of this type in any built up city zone.</p> <p>There is also a contracting business based on Vogel Street that has at least 6 commercial vehicles running from it. These seem to comeback around 4.30 each day to park up for the night.</p> <p>Even though the monitoring has improved it still is not a 6 days a week, all day service.</p>

4	Neutral	<p>I am replying to your request for comments on the proposed changes to parking on Vogel Street.</p> <p>Our business has worked out of [REDACTED] Vogel Street since 1980. (just as an aside... You have us listed as [REDACTED] on the Existing map and our neighbours as [REDACTED], but both our neighbours and us as [REDACTED] on the Proposed map?)</p> <p>We are the building taking up the small block between Police St & the unnamed “dead end” at the South end of the Vogel St warehouse precinct.</p> <p>We are a very busy pharmaceutical wholesaler with a multi million dollar annual turnover supplying Pharmacy with their needs on a daily basis. We have deliveries going out (mainly in Courier vans) several times per day and multiple inbound daily deliveries, a large number of which are tandem axle trucks.</p> <p>We employ 8 staff at this branch who work from 7.30am to 5.30pm so the need for all day parking is essential.</p> <p>We appreciate the P5 that is beside our loading dock as this means that the large trucks I mentioned can back in on an angle without having to negotiate between cars.</p> <p>I park my car in the single park beside the stairwell, that is on the other side of our loading dock, so if a truck needs more room I can move to accommodate this.</p> <p>Our biggest concern with your proposal relates to (what looks like) the large abutment opposite our entrance? Should the proposal go ahead as planned deliveries into our business will be significantly impeded as access to our loading dock is restricted by the new look “bulbous” curbing! This could result in trucks having to back over the curb posing potential dangers and damage which neither of us wants? We question the need for this style curbing on this particular corner.</p> <p>While the removal of a car park in the dead end unnamed street will provide an inconvenience (and we would rather it stayed) we are very concerned regarding the restriction of access the proposed plan poses to our business.</p> <p>To fully appreciate this can I suggest a meeting on site so we can discuss this on a real scale as opposed to the picture presented. Attached is a copy of your plan with the area of concern marked.</p>
5	For	<p>Please note that my comments are in my capacity as an employee/individual and do not represent the views of [REDACTED] - thanks.</p> <p>Comments - great overall that the number of Unrestricted parking spots is being reduced. It is disheartening working in the Warehouse Precinct to see folks doing the rounds of the blocks looking for parks so they can have a coffee/meal (I presume) at VSK, Ocho or to do business with one of the businesses etc.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the four Unrestricted parks outside the back of 65 Crawford Street, on Vogel St seem to be an anomaly. I think that these could be P60? The businesses going into this building will have access off Vogel and I understand will include a cafe. Also I see today there are five cars parked within this area - it appears that the driveway entrance to this building could accommodate a further park, without affecting line of sight. Perhaps this design was started prior to the building being developed??? Perhaps the building owner would agree to this?? There is also a cafe (once again I understand) going into the ground floor of 123 Vogel. • the four 90 minute parks outside VSK - could these be P60? Not everyone going to VSK or the other businesses within this area need an hour and a half. Reducing these four to P60 would help the availability of parks and turnover within the area. <p>Small tweaks but I think they would be improvements.</p>
6	Neutral	<p>One quick further query around our application, the proposed unrestricted parks I don't think will affect the application we submitted as the park closest to Jetty street stops before the "driveway access" outside our property. As such, we would still like a P5 park to please be created over that driveway as per our submission.</p>

7	For	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide some feedback on the proposed on-street parking changes in the Warehouse Precinct. I support the principles identified of changing the balance of unrestricted and short term parking in the area so there is more short term parking, and removing most of the all day free parking out of Vogel St.</p> <p>My business [REDACTED] is at [REDACTED] Vogel St, near the Queens Garden end. I am pleased to see the removal of around 20 unrestricted parks on east side of Vogel St and the south side of Water St. This will be a critical change to increase the vehicle turnover in this part of the Precinct and allow people to access local business, including my own. (I note that the existing parking map incorrectly identifies two P30 parks in this group, whereas in fact they are P90.)</p> <p>Despite my general support for the changes, I am a little disappointed that all these parks are going to be P90 rather than a mix of P90 and P60. I am also disappointed there is no increase in the number of P5 or P30 parks near this end of Vogel Street. For instance, the four parks on the West side of Vogel St between the Gardens and Water St could be changed from P60 to P30 or P5. There is quite some industry in the area involving people switching car parks and rubbing off chalk marks throughout the day to avoid paying for parking. P60 and especially P90 allow a lot of scope for this to continue, so any chance of mixing up the parking a bit will help dampen people's enthusiasm for this strategy. Your wardens are down in the area fairly frequently, but are limited with what they can do when people go to considerable lengths to play the system. Longer term I think metered parking will be the only solution, but I guess that's an issue for another day.</p>
8	Neutral	<p>We received a flier in our letterbox just recently regarding the proposed changes to on-street carparking in the Precinct. The flier calls for comments and feedback to which we will supply but in the meantime, Im just looking to confirm elements of the flier. I have attached below some annotations where the "existing on street parking" appear at odds with the current time restrictions shown on the actual street. For example, the section of parks outside the carpet court building are currently 60 minute parks with some unrestricted. But on the flier for existing parks they are all shown as 90 minute parks. For the proposed parking changes, these are shown as P90's. Thus, are these time limits to increase to 90 minutes, or, are they to simply reflect the status quo of P60? Also, the "authorised vehicles only" parks shown on the corner of Jetty and Vogel are actually P15's currently. Thus, potentially understating the changes to shorter term parking.</p> <p>I was hoping that it might also be possible to understand where the parking is to start outside of 43 Jetty St? The map shows these parks to start almost at the boundary and head south along Vogel St. Is this right?</p>
9	Against	<p>As building manager for [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] Vogel Street I must strongly protest the loss of twenty unrestricted parks in Vogel and Water Streets we have a mixture of accommodation and office space in the building and the feeling is that you are offering a great disservice to the tenants of our building also of the surrounding buildings, please rethink your proposal and keep the status quo.</p> <p>A suggestion is that the Council buys the car park in Water Street and put in a multi level car park</p>

10	Against	<p>Thank you for your invitation for submissions regarding the Revitalisation Plan, we have some concerns as follows regarding the proposal to remove permanent parks from the warehouse precinct; particularly from the blocks bounded by Water St and Queens Gardens.</p> <p>The vast majority of this area is residential, with demand for permanent parking already very high, as you are aware (the Central City Plan clearly states this). The current proposed changes remove a net of 17 permanent parks from this block alone, displacing many vehicles, with very limited alternatives for residents in terms of parking.</p> <p>We believe that this is inappropriate, particularly given the timing of the suggested amendments, year-long tenancy agreements have now been recently signed, with the decision to reside in this area based on the parking that was available at the time the lease was signed</p> <p>Additionally one of the points detailed in the document received was improving safety and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. We fail to appreciate how providing incentive for more motorists to come and go from the area by providing considerably more short-term parking aligns with this goal.</p> <p>We do not currently have a suggestion for a definitive solution for this issue, and appreciate there are competing interests, however it is only reasonable that if not significantly altered the proposal is at very least delayed until current residential tenancy agreements are ended (i.e. conclusion of December 2017).</p> <p>Having discussed this issue with our landlord we will be contributing to the document he is preparing on behalf of all the occupants of █ Vogel Street, but we also wanted to share our feedback individually.</p>
11	For	<p>As owners of four building that are affected by parking in the area, we would like to have the following comments noted:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vogel Street, really pleased to see the 5 minute parks outside the Wine Shop,</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Vogel Street, agree with changing the unrestricted parking in the block with numbers 1-25 to P90. This will encourage flow and better opportunities for customers to find parks to visit the business in the area</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Cumberland Street.</p> <p>Our preference would be for all the Unrestricted Parking between Police Street and Queens Gardens changed to \$5 per day parking. This would encourage some turnover of parks. For the people who park and walk to their work in other areas, they would need to pay for their parking.</p> <p>One business owner from the Octagon area was heard to say all the parks down here should be unrestricted for his staff to park free and walk to work in the Octagon, Surely our business customer’s should be able to park near our business – after all if we want to visit business’s in the Octagon who Stuart Street etc., we have to pay to park near them. We couldn’t imagine Business owners in say the Octagon, Stuart Street, Moray Place, George Street etc. accepting unrestricted parks outside their business’s.</p> <p>We trust you will take our feedback on board.</p>

12	Against	<p>I have received in my office a double sided plan of changes proposed to parking. The proposal is not supported and we require more information.</p> <p>I think the manner which the proposal has been delivered, is so it will slip under the radar. It is deliberately disingenuous to ignore long term metered parking adjacent to Vogel and Water street in Queens Garden where there are 21 car parks, and these are to be left and 20 long term parks removed. Changes to long terms parking on the one way only reflect change to the former Gresham as a “new” residential facility. Owners in the first block of Vogel Street are keen to retain long term parking.</p> <p>It is deceitful to suggest that change from long term parking to short term parking are the same and will not mean a loss of extensive overall parking rights, although the table suggests that there is little or no loss of only two car parks. It is a breach of some of the implied consents issued to owners and existing use which relied on tenant long term parking.</p> <p>If you cannot answer definitively in the time required within 5 working days and before feedback closes, please advise and I will issue a formal official information act request.</p> <p>Why the did proposal not have a named staffer identified on it to contact? Why did the proposal not have the department responsible who are pushing this proposal? Why was the proposal document not served on land (leasehold) and building owners. Why were timeframes for feedback not given on the proposal form? Why was there no effort made to contact most of the tenants and others in resident who use parking, particularly long term parking? Who is the decision maker that will decide whether this goes ahead or not? What are the real time frames that internally you are looking to implement this? What is the deadline for feedback? Why isn’t this promulgated on face book or other media so as to encourage real feedback where residents might have the chance of expressing their needs? What is the proposed cost? What is the proposed benefit to residents? What is the proposed loss to residents? What is the specific case by case benefits to businesses located in the precinct? Which outside or external parties are the principals seeking the changes to the parking as proposed? Which internal parties individual and departments are the principals seeking the changes to the parking as proposed? Who are the internal parties collaborating on the proposal? Are any elected councillors supportive of this proposal and who are they? Have Parking Enforcement Services internal requirements imposed for projected revenue to support budget spending, been a motivating factor for changing the long term parking? Has the loss of parking elsewhere in the city been a motivating factor for changing the long term in Vogel st and surrounding parking as proposed? What information do you base your proposed actions on as to the number of individual residents affected in the precinct and particularly Water and Vogel streets where the majority change proposed is to take place? Is the discrimination in the proposal against the local residents (and workers) who use long term parking deliberate or simply not thought of? Has there been any financial or number projections of the Parking Enforcement Services revenue roll from fines that would result from the removal of the long term parking and replaced with ticketing the short term parking? Please provide a copy of the Transportation Departments monthly fortnightly minutes as to when this idea was first mooted? Please provide copy of the base document directly supporting the proposal as part of, The Warehouse Precinct Revitalisation Plan? Have the 21 long term \$5 all day ‘workers’ metred car parks located under the trees at Queens gardens been targeted in another Transportation plan for change? Why have the 21 long term \$5 all day ‘workers’ metred car parks located under the trees at Queens gardens not been assessed as part of the change proposal? What revenue roll would Parking Enforcement Services be able to budget if the 21 long term \$5 all day ‘workers’ metred car parks located under the trees at Queens gardens were changed to short term parking?</p>
----	---------	---

13	Against	<p>Re Vogel Street parking, we have the following concerns re your planned changes to parking in this area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 75 people have to find all-day parks• It's hard on workers to find parks as it is - there is a shortage already• Buses aren't adequate for the particular hours that workers are working• Part-time workers as in mothers with children need to park close to their work, and presently this is virtually impossible - even with paid parking.• Workers from the North end of the city [e.g. the Hospital] are already parking in this vicinity and walking to the north end, which makes it very hard on the workers at this end of town.
14	For	<p>Thank you for making us aware of the proposed parking changes to Vogel Street and Cumberland Street as part of the Warehouse Precinct Revitalisation plan. We would like to offer the following feedback for parking around our Business at [REDACTED] Vogel Street/[REDACTED] Cumberland Street.</p> <p>[REDACTED] has operated out of this building for the last 26years employing over 50 staff and servicing around 60% of all [REDACTED] requirements to the Dunedin Commercial and residential home owners. Since the development of the area taking off we have noticed significant challengers for our customers to find parking to enable them to shop in this area. Often having to park several blocks away in order to do so. I myself have driven around the block several times before finding a park further down the one way below the BP garage. There are not that many customers that would make that trip just to visit a store in this area.</p> <p>We would like to see more reduced parking restrictions and eliminate the all-day parking from the entire Vogel Street. Allowing more opportunity for the public to come and go from the businesses in the area. Our preference around our building would be to have 30min parking as this usually allows 40mins – 50mins pending traffic wardens return once tyres are marked. Our concerns are that the 90min restriction would allow cars to remain in there parks for even longer and allow people to park all day by moving their vehicle only a few times throughout the day to remove chalk marks, resulting in parks remaining full throughout the day. There would need to be more concentration on monitoring these parks as there are days throughout the week that they are not currently.</p> <p>The proposed change to Cumberland Street to all day parking as opposed to the current 30min parking would impact our business greatly. We have around 250 – 300 people enter through this entrance every week. After 9 months of having a new entrance from Vogel Street we still see most customers entering off Cumberland Street. We would be most grateful if you would consider leaving the 4 – 5 carparks at the north end of our building as 30min parking.</p> <p>Giving thought to how to create some more parking we offer the following ideas,</p> <p>Could the footpath along Vogel Street behind what was Sammy’s up to the McKenzie and Willis Building be reduced to allow for angle parking on that side and perhaps make Vogel street into a one way to create the space?</p> <p>The area under the overhead bridge on Cumberland Street is rather barren looking since the scrub has been removed. Could that area be allocated to all day parking? Cars could park on the angle following Cumberland Street here.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that the current proposal will have a severe impact on our business financially as the increases parking restriction times to 90 minutes will create further difficulties for our customers to find parking.</p>
15	Against	<p>Hi, My name is F [REDACTED] s and I live at [REDACTED] Vogel Street, I have just become aware to the fact that you are planning on decreasing / adding timed parking to the spaces outside and around my home ! This is just a friendly email asking that you don't / reconsider ! Its already hard enough to get a park just to get home as the spaces are limited and I (and multiple other people I live with and know around here) are young and wont be able to afford parking tickets !</p> <p>I hope you reconsider ! Thank you :)</p>

16	Against	<p>Dear transport department,</p> <p>We are writing in regard to the proposed parking changes on Vogel and Water streets. We are the owners/landlords of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] Vogel Street and we are very concerned about the idea put forward and object strongly to the change of 19 unrestricted parks in the block of 1, 17, 23 and 25 Vogel street, out of these 4 buildings there are approximately 25 residential apartments and 2 businesses all of which disapprove of the proposal. The background story in the flyer states that "As a result of more people living and working in the Vogel street area and additional amenity improvements, there is a need to make some further changes to on-street parking. A number of requests have come direct from businesses in the area" Where did this proposal come from? As all we have heard is disapproval so this is an incorrect and dishonest statement. It seems as if this is just another form of revenue collection from the Transport department. What happened to existing use rights of tenants? This is a breach of existing use rights. Not everyone was informed or asked their opinion and only one flyer was dropped in our building entrance. Building owners were not not informed formally and could have a major effect on income and and affect their future business.</p> <p>We are very disappointed.</p>
17	Against	<p>We have reviewed the proposed on-street parking plan received recently.</p> <p>We express concern at the significant loss of unrestricted parks from around this area.</p> <p>As a local employer of 40 people in Vogel Street since 2009 we have been able to rely on staff having reasonable access to all day parking. We recently committed to remaining in Vogel Street through our lease renewal.</p> <p>Our employees have expressed frustration at this recent proposal as it has significant impact on their ability to drive from out of town and find all day parking.</p> <p>We have a reasonably high number of staff residing as far away as Waiholo, Aramoana, Palmerston and Brighton and Mosgiel.</p> <p>We understand the importance to make the area a safer and more enjoyable place for people and to cater safely for a wider range of transport modes (pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles).</p> <p>While the proposed changes try to address and balance the competing demands it appears to overlook that vehicles parked all day in the current plan make the area inherently safer for pedestrians and cyclist than the proposed plan.</p> <p>Increasing the 90 minute parking from 27 to 64 more than doubles the number of short terms parks potential volume of traffic movement during any given day. Instead of a potential 162 vehicle movements over a 9 hour business period each day, the movements would increase to a potential 384 vehicles over the same period.</p> <p>We would propose that further consideration be given to introducing short term, 30, 60 and 90 minute parking along Crawford street and police street and remove current paid parks. This would have the effect of transferring greater traffic movement away from Vogel Street and improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists in this area. Longer term this would fit with encouraging visitors to walk into this precinct knowing the traffic movement is considerably lessened because existing all day parking means most traffic movement would occur at the beginning and end of each day.</p> <p>This alternative proposal presumes the total revenue loss from current paid parking would be offset by improved safety in the Vogel Street precinct and set the scene for the ultimate removal of all traffic in this precinct somewhere in the future.</p>
18	For	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to give feedback on the proposed changes to on-street parking in the warehouse precinct, which I would like to do on behalf of [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] practice that has been based in Water Street for the past five years. During that time, we have witnessed the rapid growth of the warehouse precinct area and the increasing demand for short term parking.</p> <p>We are happy with the proposed changes, and particularly support the introduction of more 90 minute parks in the area as that provides more suitable parking for our clients who attend one hour sessions and need a little more parking time before and after sessions.</p> <p>All our staff pay for parking in the vicinity, and we support the idea of removing unrestricted parks in Vogel and Water streets in favour of 90 minute parks, something we asked for years ago. We would even support the removal of all, or some of the unrestricted parks on the right hand side of the Cumberland Street block between Water and Jetty Streets in favour of 90 minute parks to accommodate the increased demand for parking with the two cafes now operating in Vogel street, and the pressure that has put on parking for our clients.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.</p>

19	For	<p>We are writing to ask that the four proposed unrestricted parks on the map of Vogel Street (between Jetty and Police Streets) become shorter term parking, preferably P30s or P60s. This is to ensure that clients visiting the surrounding businesses are able to find a park during the day. As owners of [REDACTED] Jetty Street we are in the process of submitting a Resource Consent for [REDACTED] to occupy the ground floor of [REDACTED] (with an accounting firm already occupying the upstairs area) and we feel this is yet another reason to have shorter term parking in those four parks. We had also submitted a request that a P5 be included in the area that was formerly a driveway on the Vogel Street side of [REDACTED] Jetty Street. In looking at the proposed plan it does not appear that there is any park currently allocated for the space. We have been advised to include the proposal for this P5 with this submission. As our tenants ([REDACTED]) have a significant number of clients dropping off or picking up documents on any given day, as well as having [REDACTED] as a potential tenant going forward, a short term park here seems to make the most sense.</p> <p>We have no issue with the longer term parking being moved further down Vogel Street towards Police Street so that those unrestricted parks are not lost altogether, but we respectfully ask that they are removed from the current location so as not to impact the businesses in the area.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further clarification of our submission.</p>
20	Against	<p>I am writing in as a concerned resident of the [REDACTED] building in the warehouse precinct.</p> <p>My concern is focused firstly on the inaccurate mapping of current parking in the area and secondly on the reasoning behind the proposed layout.</p> <p>Firstly the current map indicates 75 unrestricted parking spaces which after a quick ten minute walk of the involved it is found there are only 60, the majority of this error is found on cumberland street between police street and jetty street where the parks are not unrestricted but timed 30 minute parks. This inaccuracy unfairly portrays the parking situation in the area.</p> <p>Secondly the proposed changes which sees a loss of twenty three unrestricted parks does not appear to be required, on three seperate walks of the area around two in the afternoon, the highest number of unrestricted parks available was found to be two, however the highest number of timed parks available was found to be twenty three. This is ridiculous considering if my flatmates or I go out during the day we need to drive a kilometre from home to find the nearest unrestricted parking space.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the parking in the area are totally unreasonable and poorly researched, the changes will likely result in dozens or more of unused parks in the area while residents like myself and my flatmates will be left with no usable parking space.</p>
21	For	<p>I have viewed the proposed changes to on-street parking in the warehouse precinct and would support these changes.</p> <p>I know it may be outside the scope of this review, but I would be interested to know if the longer-term strategy includes the development of an off-street multi-level parking building, for which I believe there is a strong need. Over the past few years it has become increasingly difficult for people working in this area (and presumably those who live in apartments, if they don't have allocated carparks) to find spaces to park for a full day. Given that the intention is to provide a safer precinct for pedestrians and cyclists, it would be beneficial to have more cars parked off roads and less people circling looking for parking spaces - which a dedicated parking building would remedy. I sincerely hope that there is a plan for such a facility in this area in the near future.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you would like further information.</p>
22	Against	See pdf of letter

Against	10
For	9
Neutral	3
TOTAL	22