

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Yuan Gao	1.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of the Newstead area as Large Lot Residential Zone and seeks that the area is rezoned to the General Residential, Medium Density Residential or High Density Residential zone. The submitter notes that the Newstead area needs more housing due to the new logistics centre, many nearby schools and new State Highway 1 crossing.	<p>The submitter seeks the Newstead area, which is currently zoned as the Large Lot Residential Zone, is rezoned to one of the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Residential Zone, Medium-Density Residential Zone, or High Density Residential Zone. <p>The submitter does not indicate any preference for rezoning of the area.</p>
Bill Doig	2.1	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1.1 Special Resident ial Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the removal of the Special Residential Zone (Chapter 5, Section 5.1.1). The submitter opposes this change because their property is in Claudelands West which previously was under heritage protection as per Chapter 5.1.1 and will no longer be under Plan Change 12.</p> <p>The submitter notes that during the time that the heritage protection applied to their property they had to ensure that all extensions and additions had to be in keeping with the existing 1929 bungalow at the site (which incurred additional costs). The submitter is not happy that now this would not be required for the proposed medium density (three storey units) developments in the area.</p> <p>The submitter believes that enabling these higher density developments will lead to "the slums of state housing failures from years ago".</p>	Deletion of the high density housing proposal.
Robert Bull	3.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes building three storey buildings in residential areas.	No specific relief sought.
Andrew P Fear	4.1	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 23, specifically development of three houses up to three storeys anywhere in Hamilton. The submitter considers this will have significant impacts on views and privacy and will impact on noise, parking, traffic and house values. The submitter is frustrated that there are no other options for consideration.	Increased density is limited to defined areas (not the whole city) and that developments should not exceed two stories without neighbouring residents agreement.
Andrew P Fear	4.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 23, specifically development of three houses up to three storeys anywhere in Hamilton. The submitter considers this will have significant impacts on views and privacy and will impact on noise, parking, traffic and house values. The submitter is frustrated that there are no other options for consideration.	Increased density is limited to defined areas (not the whole city) and that developments should not exceed 2 stories without neighbouring residents agreement.
Nicholas John Mills	5.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change 12 provisions because they believe that if high density apartment dwellings (2-6 storeys high) with very few parking spaces are built, this will result in widespread illegally parked cars due to the lack of infrastructure in Hamilton currently.</p> <p>The submitter also believes that in time these higher density areas will become slums rife with criminal activity.</p>	No specific relief is sought.
Nicholas John Mills	5.2	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change 12 provisions because they believe that if high density apartment dwellings (2-6 storeys high) with very few parking spaces are built, this will result in widespread illegally parked cars due to the lack of infrastructure in Hamilton currently.</p> <p>The submitter also believes that in time these higher density areas will become slums rife with criminal activity.</p>	No specific relief is sought.
Nicholas John Mills	5.3	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change 12 provisions because they believe that if high density apartment dwellings (2-6 storeys high) with very few parking spaces are built, this will result in widespread illegally parked cars due to the lack of infrastructure in Hamilton currently.</p> <p>The submitter also believes that in time these higher density areas will become slums rife with criminal activity.</p>	No specific relief is sought.
T Steel	6.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		Submitter is concerned about overcrowding and environmental impacts of increased density.	Require green space and outdoor space for new developments. Encourage larger sized developments.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Beverley Crawford	7.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter appreciates the plan changes provide preservation of heritage of the Hamilton East area, but the raises a number of concerns with intensive housing including rubbish, reduced liveability and lack of garage or parking spaces resulting in on street parking which may make it difficult for emergency services.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the Historic Heritage area will preserve roadside and corner properties but omit the infill properties and development of up to 6 stories would be allowed.</p> <p>The submitter appreciates that HCC is trying to direct development in response to Government directives for intensification but is concerned with neighbouring councils have allowed large sections of productive farm land to be built on, for example Tamahere.</p>	No specific relief is sought.
Beverley Crawford	7.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	The submitter supports the protection of historic notable trees and specimen trees along Firth Street.	Retain the Notable Trees as notified along Firth Street.
Rachel Tordoff	8.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes provisions that would allow character homes to be removed and replaced with 6 story buildings. The submitter isn't interested in mode shift because of work requirements makes it impractical.	Opposes 6 stories being built next door.
Jayden Wells	9.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	Supports Plan Change 12.	Supports Plan Change 12.
Jayden Wells	9.2	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support	Supports promotion of walking, cycling and other transport options.	Reduce speed limits, separated bike lanes and prioritise all other transport before cars.
Jordan Godfrey	10.1	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter considers that matters relating to protection of heritage and SNA's can be managed through land use rules and that if the subdivision does not split a SNA or alter heritage features the then the subdivision activity status should not be higher than other sites without those features.	Seeks the removal of specific provisions with properties containing heritage and SNA's and address through rules that achieve specific outcomes instead.
Jordan Godfrey	10.2	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter considers that matters relating to protection of heritage and SNA's can be managed through land use rules and that if the subdivision does not split a SNA or alter heritage features the then the subdivision activity status should not be higher than other sites without those features.	Seeks the removal of specific provisions with properties containing heritage and SNA's and address through rules that achieve specific outcomes instead.
Jordan Godfrey	10.3	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes minimum allotment sizes, particularly when subdivision is for existing dwellings because if a subdivision complies with the relevant standards (i.e. coverage, setbacks, outdoor living etc.) either with existing dwelling/s or demonstrating compliance is able to be achieved, then it should not be restricted or prevented by a minimum lot size.</p> <p>The submitters view is that residential development should be enabled provided an acceptable/compliant outcome can be achieved. The submitter also believes that that intensification in existing urban areas is a wiser use of land than losing finite rural productive resources and enabling intensification of existing urban areas will create a greater range of property choices and in turn increase lower cost options.</p>	Seeks the removal of the minimum lot size requirements and replace with a requirement to demonstrate compliance with land use rules. If the first relief is not adopted then seeks the removal of the minimum lot size for development around existing dwellings.
Jordan Godfrey	10.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for two planted trees per dwelling because it is unnecessary and will result in trees not be looked after and maintained, also considers that the planted landscape requirements are enough. The submitter questions how the requirement will be monitored.	Seeks the removal of the minimum tree planting requirements and replace with an addition to development contributions to go towards planting trees in reserves or gullies and the maintenance of existing reserve areas.
Peter Kivell	11.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes allowing 3 houses in residential areas as it would block sunshine and reduce privacy.	Seeks removal of provisions allowing 3 houses in the residential zone.
Peter Kivell	11.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes 3 waters because it was created by government to put people in roles with no accountability.	Say no to 3 waters

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Peter Kivell	11.3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter considers public transport does not compare to overseas	No specific relief is sought.
Peter Kivell	11.4	Chapter 24 Financial Contributio ns	General	Oppose	The submitter believes that tax pays for development either through rates or a premium on the property.	No specific relief is sought.
S T Mace	12.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 3 to 5 stories in certain areas because it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Result in the lost of character and heritage in the city; 2. Create further parking issues and road hazards already seen in high density areas. 	Seeks amendments to the proposed high density buildings to allow for history and character to be preserved.
S T Mace	12.2	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 3 to 5 stories in certain areas because it will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Result in the lost of character and heritage in the city; 2. Create further parking issues and road hazards already seen in high density areas. 	Seeks amendments to address the issues of parking associated with high density
Margaret Wilson	13.1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about increased street parking from intensification.	Address increased street parking in the plan change.
Margaret Wilson	13.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about lack of outdoor space for children.	Address the lack of and safety of outdoor space for children.
Margaret Wilson	13.3	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the government intensification directive, supporting local planning initiatives.	Oppose the government intensification directive.
Bernie Gilmour	14.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	Opposes the three story height limit.	Limit maximum height to two levels.
Anna Kwan	15.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions.	No relief sought.
Karen van der Lingen	16.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the effect of intensification on sunlight and shading.	Amend the Plan to ensure new developments do not take sunlight away from or cause shadowing to existing/ other buildings.
Ben Efremoff	17.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectiv es and Policies: General Resident ial Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.2.2.2(a) and believes suburbs are meant for family homes with back yards and not for mass housing.	Seeks higher density housing should be to suited areas, i.e. surrounding Town centre, University, the Base, commercial areas.
Ben Efremoff	17.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.3.4.6b and believes suburbs are meant for family homes with back yards and not for mass housing. 1m side/rear spaces is not an appropriate setback.	Seeks higher density housing should be suited to areas, i.e. surrounding Town centre, University, the Base, commercial areas.
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems Firth	18.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the Plan change and mentions that heritage areas should be protected from high-density residential development.	The submitter suggests Plan Change 12 be adopted.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Street Media						
Jeff Howell	19.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports densifying the inner city and suggests improving transport infrastructure within the ring road to make cycling and walking safer.	Seeks a plan to improve transport infrastructure within the ring road to make walking and cycling safer.
Jeff Howell	19.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support	The submitter supports 3 Waters and on-site rainfall collection.	The submitter suggests clear guidelines to be set out and encouragement to re-use grey water for existing properties.
Jeff Howell	19.3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the transport chapter and suggests the re-design of the ring road linkage to the city essentially making the inner city safer and more liveable.	Seeks that Council rethinks the Transport Chapter to make neighbourhoods within the ring road more liveable by regulating vehicle movements, improving safety and mobility.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers	20.1	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the rule mentioning there is a need for residential living within the Central City and Business zones to cater for demand, promote proximity to employment, allow for access to amenities, and support the goal of a compact city. Plan Change 12 needs to promote residential on ground and above-ground living within the Central City and Business zones by considering the relief sought. Needs to be alignment regarding ground floor apartments between Central City (P) and Business zones (NC) taking into consideration primary and secondary activity frontage. Residential privacy and Streetscape need to align between Central City and Business zones.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend Rules 6.3 and 7.3 to insert a provision for Single Attached Residential Units as Permitted. Subsequential amendments as necessary. 2. Amend Rule 6.3 to provide for Apartments (and Single Attached Residential Units) at ground floor as Permitted. Subsequential amendments as necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers	20.2	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status	Oppose	The submitter opposes the rule mentioning there is a need for residential living within the Central City and Business zones to cater for demand, promote proximity to employment, allow for access to amenities, and support the goal of a compact city. Plan Change 12 needs to promote residential on ground and above-ground living within the Central City and Business zones by considering the relief sought. Needs to be alignment regarding ground floor apartments between Central City (P) and Business zones (NC) taking into consideration primary and secondary activity frontage. Residential privacy and Streetscape need to align between Central City and Business zones.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend Rules 6.3 and 7.3 to insert a provision for Single Attached Residential Units as Permitted. Subsequential amendments as necessary. 2. Amend Rule 6.3 to provide for Apartments (and Single Attached Residential Units) at ground floor as Permitted. Subsequential amendments as necessary.
Katherine Barnes	21.1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter expresses concern regarding parking and excess vehicles contributing to traffic congestion.	The submitter seeks adequate realistic provision for car parking for current and future developments of units.
Anna Kwan	22.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	Opposes the provisions.	No specific relief sought.
Logan Perry	23.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes infill housing development as it will increase poverty and lead to Hamilton becoming a slum.	The submitter states: No more infill housing, bowl existing infill housing. Invest in creating new suburbs where New Zealand’s traditional approach to property ownership will be attainable. Crest long term investments throughout several local governments to ensure housing affordability, and the ability of affordable houses to live up to our cultural expectations as a people.
Phillip Lee	24.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part mentioning the need for recreational facilities within a walkable catchment due to loss of green space due to intensification. Concern about the effects of building shading.	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra green space amenities areas will be provided within walking distance of developed properties to compensate for that lost due to intensification. The extra area will be over 75% of that lost due to intensification. • Any development does not shade into existing property boundaries.
Phillip Lee	24.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter mentions the existing strain on infrastructure, an assessment is therefore needed for any increase in development. A targeted approach with regard to funding infrastructure upgrades should be considered.	The submitter states: Change plan to require an infrastructure assessment for any building development. Plan to include information on infrastructure state and infrastructure development limits. Include infrastructure upgrade plans and how that would allow intensification and the conditions that require upgrades. Those conditions include intensification and ageing.
Theresa Pearse	25.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed Medium density residential zone and believes it will negatively affect transport infrastructure and areas around schools. Higher density means more traffic and street parking that can affect the safety of children.	Oppose medium density zone close to centres such as Five Cross Roads and Chartwell
Manda Properties -	26.1	4.3 Medium Density	General	Support in part	Consider increasing density around key employment areas to alleviate travel time and promote walking. Employment areas to consider are Waikato Hospital, Gallagher, Industrial area.	The submitter suggests: To add Waikato Hospital area as an additional centre for which the 2km radius will apply for Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Felix Gonzales		Residential Zone				
Ian and Ruth Bridge	27.1	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter mentions the importance of protection and enhancement of the Waikato River's water quality and that intensification will likely have an adverse impact.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To make decisions and representations to central government that will result in the protection at all costs and all endeavours to protect the Waikato River and the streams that flow into it. To allow sensible intensification around the CBD but have levy those intensifying the city to pay for the infrastructure (water, sewerage, run-off) as part of the building development as well as rates on CBD properties and not on the suburban ratepayer. To stop all multi-level developments in and around Thomas Road, Chartwell, Clyde Street, 5 Cross Roads, Glenview, Dinsdale and Nawton.
Umesh Prasad Sharma	28.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter opposes high rise development blocking out sunlight as this will negatively affect the health and wellbeing of citizens. More greenery is needed to minimise climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the views from the existing dwellings are minimally compromised. Ensure that the existing dwellings access to sunlight is not reduced because of high rise buildings. Ensure that we have a lot of greenery around new dwellings so that climate risks are minimised.
Umesh Prasad Sharma	28.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter suggests more greenery around new developments.	The submitter suggests: More grass to be seen in the new dwellings as well as plants and trees.
Umesh Prasad Sharma	28.3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support in part	The submitter suggests reduced carbon-emitting transportation is needed.	<p>The submitter seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring that the public transport is available in urban areas. Reduction of carbon emission from public transport.
Debbie Ellett	29.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed density changes especially in the 'Northern City Area' and is concerned about the lack of community facilities, parks, playgrounds and shops to accommodate the potential population increase. There is concern around inaccessible green spaces and parking requirements as streets are already clogged by parked cars. The submitter believes 3-waters infrastructure cannot not cope with increased flows. Living next door to a high-rise building will compromise privacy and sunshine which will negatively affect their well-being.	Oppose the North of the Central City intensification area which is not ready for intensification. Costs involved in making it suitable are unrealistic. Submitter suggest that this area is put on hold for now remains low density and the focus continues in the Central City and infill that currently happens.
Greg Gerrand	30.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	There are negative connotations with higher density housing which includes crime and anti-social behaviour. The submitter believes there is a lack of 3 waters infrastructure and that roading and parking are an issue.	No specific relief stated.
Stephen Hay	31.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part mentioning the need for enabling mixed use activity within residential neighbourhoods/corner sites/ground floor of multistorey, as it will serve local residential needs that will promote walking.	<p>Enable corner sites in residential areas to open retail businesses.</p> <p>Enable larger multi-story apartment developments to include cafes etc on the ground floor to serve the local neighbourhood.</p>
Stephen Hay	31.3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter suggests removing setback restrictions to allow for Perimeter block type development.	Enable perimeter blocks by removing front and side setback requirements.
Stephen Hay	31.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	Greenfield development such as Rotokauri and Peacocke need to include a large proportion of medium-high density housing, not just more single family homes.	The submitter suggests: Greenfield development such as Rotokauri and Peacocke need to include a large proportion of medium-high density housing, not just more single family homes.
Stephen Hay	31.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes no intensification in Historic Heritage areas and believes individual properties should be protected and not all properties within the overlay.	Remove historic overlays and allow three by three development at the very least in all suburbs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Stephen Hay	31.6	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the need for emission friendly modes of transport and believes parking should be removed from major, minor and collector roads to make provision for a better cycle network. Submitter seeks any future road surface renewals and road works for water main upgrades must include road reallocation according to the guidance in Appendix 15.</p> <p>If budget does not allow for protected cycle infrastructure immediately, parking must still be removed to accommodate future cycle infrastructure, and the appropriate lane markings should be re-painted with the full width of cycle lanes and cycle wands to be installed at a bare minimum.</p>	The submitter suggests: parking should be removed from major, minor and collector roads to make provision for a better cycle network. Any future road surface renewals and road works for water main upgrades must include road reallocation according to the guidance in Appendix 15.
Olivia Coote	32.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change mentioning the effects on aesthetics, parking, privacy, and public transport.	The submitter suggests: Build Hamilton out not up. Make developers provide plenty of parking for all new builds.
Michael John and Julia Mary Griffin	33.1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitters notes that State Highway offramp at Ruakura Road has increased the road traffic on Morrinsville Road and the new inland port will impact them. The submitter considers new inland port should be classified as an industrial zone. They suggest the life-style blocks at the southern side of the new motorway to be zoned residential for housing development, as the land is self draining and much of the infrastructure already exists there.	The submitters seek a change in residential zone at the southern side of the new motorway to make the area high density as in Hamilton City.
Alison Harker	34.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the high density housing proposal and intensification, as the submitter considers this will address the housing crisis and encourage the wider community to use the spaces in the downtown Hamilton and surrounding areas.</p> <p>The submitter notes that since recently moving to Hamilton, they have been unable to find a rental unit within walking distance to the downtown area and note that none include a car park (which they consider as essential to get to appointments out of town or participate in outdoor recreational activities). The submitter is now looking further out in an area where they believe they can find a quality home within their budget.</p> <p>In addition, the submitted raises the following issues that they have observed since moving to New Zealand from Canada:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality (i.e., run-down and not properly insulated) existing buildings as well as the lack of purpose-built rental apartments; • Lack of affordable housing; • Lack of car-parking spaces in the downtown area; and • The car-oriented life-style (i.e., the submitter wants to walk to take public transport most of the time but feels the need to have a car to go to appointments that are out of town or participate in outdoor recreational activities). <p>The abovementioned reasons will affect the submitter's decision to purchase an apartment in the city</p> <p>The submitter suggests that in order to create a walkable / liveable city to encourage people to live in the city centre, it is important to provide more recreational activities near the city centre so that people don't always need to hop in their car to reach one. He highlighted that there are a lot of green spaces and parks in Hamilton, but there is a lack of community recreational areas such as tennis courts, disc golf courses, community run gardens or indoor / outdoor markets like Riverside market in Christchurch.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests the following changes to be made in order to address issues in Hamilton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more community recreational activities / areas near the city centre, such as tennis courts, disc golf courses, community run veggie gardens or indoor / outdoor markets); • Create affordable and healthy apartment and provide lots of activities to attract young professionals; • Implement the initiative for co-op housing projects, which has been done in Vancouver and Banff, to help lower and middle income groups of Hamiltonians as this solution is family friendly but also great places for singles, couples or seniors.
Frankie Letford	35.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the development of 3 story apartments in areas where they interfere with special character houses, as it will affect the visual and aesthetic values of the areas. In particular, h e is not in favour of the destruction of California ranch style houses along Ohaupo Road for apartment buildings, however, he understood that it is a sensible place for close housing.</p> <p>The submitter believes that high density and low density houses should not be interspersed (i.e., mixing of single story houses with 3 story apartments) within the city, and having neighbourhoods of similar types of houses is aesthetically pleasing.</p>	The submitter suggests that the District Plan should have overlays on groups of houses that cluster together to reflect a style of housing and retain some of the historical features, like what has been done for the Frankton houses and Hamilton East state house overlays. He believes that there should be other parts of Hamilton where there is a street of the classic 1960/70 style houses (i.e., in Dinsdale) and Hamilton can be made into a place where periods of house styles can be viewed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Stuart Roland Glass	36.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed intensification as he believes that multi-story houses will result in issues with street / berm parking and that it will affect the level of sunlight and privacy on his house.	The submitter seeks that multi-story houses should incorporate more parking, including double garage on ground floor and off-street parking (4 spaces in total), to keep cars off the street.
Stuart Roland Glass	36.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes any further cycle lanes next to vehicle lanes. He believes that barriers between the cycle and vehicle lanes prevent the cycle lanes being cleaned and further prevent them being used as intended, which will increase congestion and heightened risk.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes traffic-calming devices as they result in increased emissions, fuel consumption and wear on vehicles.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the removal of all barriers / demarcation between existing cycle and vehicle lanes and the regular clean of the cycle lanes, so they can be used as intended.</p> <p>The submitter also seeks the removal of traffic-calming devices, heavy enforcement and severe penalties for bad behaving drivers.</p>
Celia Taylor	37.1	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed parking requirements for "3 homes of up to 3 storeys" developments, noting that other areas with limited off-street parking are ugly, and potentially dangerous for motorists due to large numbers of moving and parked vehicles which can be obstructive.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that at least one garage (large enough to fit a medium sized car) per home is included as a requirement of PC12. If a site contained three homes, it should provide three garages.</p>	The submitter seeks that at least one garage per unit (to fit a medium size vehicle) are included as a provision of Plan Change 12.
Andrew Clement	38.1	25.14 Transportation	General		<p>The submitter raises several concerns with the proposed carparking provisions and resulting impacts, including that it seems counterproductive to increase the number of people working in town, while removing all carparking. The submitter believes that creating a car free zone will only move the problem as it is already difficult to find a car park in town.</p> <p>They note that the encouragement of alternative options (i.e. electric bikes and scooters) forces costs onto residents, and recounts an unpleasant experience riding around Hamilton and expresses concerns for those with disabilities. The submitter also notes that buses are a cheaper option but take longer to travel the same journey, which may not suit those working 8am-5pm.</p>	No particular relief is sought by the submitter, but they do suggest the implementation of park and ride options as utilised in Auckland to address the parking issue. The submitter notes this would allow for parking, centralisation of bus routes, and reduction in fuel usage. As a result the submitter suggests delaying the car free zone and organising the infrastructure to include vehicle management options that are affordable, accessible, and work for the requirements of residents.
Megan Horrocks	39.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter completely opposes Plan Change 12, particularly considering the potential for a 3-storey dwelling to be established at the adjacent property which they believe would ruin their neighborhood. The submitter notes that construction of such a dwelling next door would impact their access to sunlight (and resultant quality of life), their visual privacy, and the value of their property. The submitter is also concerned with the lack of parking provisions which would result in additional street parking, and increased difficulty in navigating their driveway.	No specific relief is sought other than a request not to further ruin their neighbourhood.
Nicola Parker	40.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the consent application to develop on Fitzroy Avenue and has a number of concerns with this particular project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter believes the proposal will change the character of the street for the range of residents of different demographics; There will be an increase of cars parking around the corner site which will increase congestion and pose difficulty for traffic (including buses) navigating the area; Property values may fall for existing residents; The site is too small to accommodate so many people living on it; and The disruption and compromise resulting from the development is not in the best interests of the quiet street. <p>The submitter also questions why there is such a high density of Kainga Ora properties already in the vicinity of the in the Melville/Bader/Fitzroy area and if this is the best use of taxpayer money. They suggest that HCC should instead consider a purpose built facility where wrap around support can be provided to intense/high needs residents to allow them to transition out into the community. As a result the submitter believes this will be a lose-lose situation.</p>	The submitter seeks that HCC build a purpose built facility for high needs people and that this type of project is relocated a more suitable area.
John Anthony Coulam	41.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that high density residential will impact on the light and privacy of existing dwellings, and that increased traffic will pose a danger to school students.	<p>Amend the residential provisions to ensure that high density residential developments face public areas rather than private spaces, and</p> <p>Ensure that developers provide adequate off-street parking.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
John Anthony Coulam	41.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that high density residential will impact on the light and privacy of existing dwellings, and that increased traffic will pose a danger to school students.	Amend the residential provisions to ensure that high density residential developments face public areas rather than private spaces, and Ensure that developers provide adequate off-street parking.
John Anthony Coulam	41.3	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that high density residential will impact on the light and privacy of existing dwellings, and that increased traffic will pose a danger to school students.	Amend the residential provisions to ensure that high density residential developments face public areas rather than private spaces, and Ensure that developers fund adequate off-street parking.
John Anthony Coulam	41.4	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that high density residential will impact on the light and privacy of existing dwellings, and that increased traffic will pose a danger to school students.	Ensure that developers provide adequate off-street parking.
Dave Scott	42.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes three-storey residential development and is concerned about the effects of shading and seeks consideration of sunlight for new developments.	Ensure that new proposals have access to and account of sunlight so that existing properties are not affected by three-storey development.
Dave Scott	42.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about impacts on traffic and parking.	Amend the proposed provisions to require that off-street parking is provided.
Douglas Emmett	43.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the essential residential nature of Hamilton will be lost and increased infrastructure costs.	Withdraw Plan Change 12.
Angela Bailey	44.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposed residential provisions will impact on on-site amenity, privacy, parking and infrastructure.	No specific relief requested.
Sue Burbage Salon - Susan Burbage	45.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 and is concerned that future multi-store developments will be unattractive.	Withdraw Plan Change 12; and <i>Establish a train centre in Tamahere; and</i> Ensure rubbish bins around parks are emptied.
Kimberley Jane Garside	46.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions will result in the loss of a large kauri tree on their property fence line.	Amend the spatial extent of the medium density residential zone south at least 2 properties so that it does not include 143 Hukanui Road
Kimberley Jane Garside	46.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impact that infill housing will have on on-street parking.	Ensure that developers a required to pay a financial contribution for parking on Hukanui Road.
Kimberley Jane Garside	46.3	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions will result in the loss of a large kauri tree on their property fence line.	Amend the spatial extent of the medium density residential zone south at least two properties so that it does not include 143 Hukanui Road
Carol Jennifer Way	47.1	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	[The submitter has identified Ch 24] The submitter is concerned about the effects of increased on-street parking on movement on roads.	Developers should create a safe off street parking for any new building. Developers are financially responsible for parking infrastructure.
Carol Jennifer Way	47.2	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the effects of increased on-street parking on movement on roads.	Ensure that developers are financially responsible for parking infrastructure.
Emily May and Trevor Stephen Lloyd	48.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed provisions which enable multiple dwellings of multiple storeys.	No specific relief requested.
Kevon Buxton John O'Connor	49.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that three-storey residential development will have shading effects, affecting the health of people.	Amend to ensure "New builds do not stop sunshine to neighbours dwellings and that ratepayers should not share costs of developments".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Trish and Ben Greene	50.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 and the enablement of high density residential development due to a variety of concerns relating to inadequate on-site parking provision and inconvenience; waste management issues; lack of consultation required for new development; effects on existing infrastructure; lack of service areas for new developments; and effects on public and private amenity.	No specific relief requested.
Peter Were	51.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that Hamilton City Council should not continue Plan Change 12 and reject the top-down imposition of blanket rules that lack local context.	Withdraw Plan Change 12.
Monika Sullivan	52.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that intensification (3-5 storey) in areas currently zoned as general residential will result in unattractive neighbourhoods. Suburbs in the south of the city will turn into less desirable living spaces and lose their character as safe, family-oriented neighbourhoods. Submitter encloses photographs of high close board boundary fences onto pedestrian footpaths.	Ensure that 'restrictions and guidelines' are put in place. No specific relief sought.
Mark Slater	53.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 in its entirety. The submitter considers that the notified provisions will have long term irreversible and detrimental impact on local residents.	Withdraw Plan Change 12.
Vanessa Keith	54.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 in its entirety for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provisions will reduce house prices; The provisions will have a detrimental effect on the Waikato River; The provisions will ultimately increase rates; Parking is no longer required to be provided which will impact on neighbourhood streets; The provisions will degrade Hamilton as a whole. 	Submitter suggest making a place in the country for housing with a man made lake. No specific relief sought.
Trevor McKee	55.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 as three-storey developments will destroy the amenity of the Hamilton Lake neighbourhood. In addition, the proposed provisions will exacerbate existing issues within the wastewater network resulting in more wastewater overflows.	No Specific relief requested.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support in part	“Residential areas” is not defined and does not have a clear meaning. This paragraph is open to interpretation. The statutory term “relevant residential zones” should be used.	Amend 2.1(e) as follows: Schedule 3A of the RMA requires all <u>relevant</u> residential areas <u>zones</u> give effect to the MDRS standards, to achieve well-functioning urban environments which enable current and future communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety. In some circumstances qualifying matters may modify the MDRS and these qualifying matters are identified in the Plan.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter considers that the notified wording of Policy 4.1.2.4(d) suggests that local businesses have to take active steps to prevent people from coming from outside the neighbourhood. Further, case law suggests that "only" should not be used in policies, rather "avoid" should be.	Amend policy 4.1.2.4(d) to replace "only" with "primarily".
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	Policy 2.2.14(c) is supported in part however, it is considered that the policy is inconsistent with the corresponding objective. The submitter considers that an average person will walk over 650m in 10 minutes.	Amend policy 2.2.14(c) to replace 400m with 650m.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	Policy 2.2.14(d) is supported in part however, it is considered that the policy is inconsistent with the corresponding objective. The submitter considers that an average person will walk over 650m in 10 minutes.	Amend policy 2.2.14(d) to replace 400m with 650m.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter points to typological error in rule 4.2.3.1(hh).	Amend rule 4.2.3.1(hh) to change "accept" to "except".
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter considers that rule 4.2.3.1(mm) is inconsistent with rule 4.2.3.1(nn).	Amend rule 4.2.3.1(mm) as follows: "nn. Relocated buildings outside an Historic Heritage Area"
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules –	Support in part	The submitter considers that it does not make sense to refer to an extent of infringement as a percentage. Some standards are binary (are either met or they aren't). For example, 4.2.5.3(d).	Amend rule 4.2.4 to address consideration of compliance with binary standards and other standards where extent of infringement cannot be considered as a percentage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			notificati on			
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notificati on	Support in part	The submitter considers that rules 4.2.4(ii) and (iii) are ultra vires RMA s95B.	Delete all references of “to the owners and occupants of adjoining sites” from rules 4.2.4(ii) and (iii).
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5 Rules – General Standar ds – General Resident ial Zone.	Oppose	The submitter considers the layout of table 4.5.2.3 to be confusing.	Amend table 4.5.2.3 to be more readable.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers rule 4.2.5.11(a) to be unclear.	Amend rule 4.2.5.11(a) tom improve clarity.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.1 Childcar e Facility	Support in part	The submitter considers that rule 4.2.6.1(b) is unclear, particularly the phrase "front, corner or through site”.	Amend rule 4.2.6.1(b) to improve clarity.
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.4 Home-based Business es	Support in part	The submitter considers that rule 4.2.6.4(i) could exclude business who hire several cleaners for only a few hours each week. It would be better to refer to full time equivalents.	Amend rule 4.2.6.4(i) as follows: "Not involve more than three full time employees (or part time employees corresponding to an equivalent number of hours) that do not normally reside on the property."
Joshua Sean Marshall	56.13	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that Holloway Place, Kingsway Crescent and those parts of Mitcham Avenue and Storey Avenue currently zoned General Residential Zone are an integrated part of the wider neighbourhood. There is no justification for zoning them in a different neighbourhood to the rest of the Zone. Rather, doing so has the potential to create an isolated pocket of the neighbourhood with a different character to the rest of the neighbourhood which would be incongruous. These streets should also be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend the zoning of Holloway Place, Kingsway Crescent and those parts of Mitcham Avenue and Storey Avenue currently zoned General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Murray Reeve	57.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 because multi-storey developments will negatively affect the amenity of neighbouring properties; reduce property values; increase street gangs; and reduce the quality of life.	No specific relied requested.
Agha Shoeb	58.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes plan change 12 because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will increase pressure on utilities infrastructure; • To intensify the building in central Hamilton area is not the only solution to make new houses; • The proposed provisions will impact on the amenity of the city and of neighbourhoods; • School systems and education resources will be affected; • Transport and road infrastructure will be affected and • The proposed solution is to get more land and focus on quality housing and life style otherwise we will become like Tokyo, New York or like similar other cities. 	No specific relied sought
Susie Evans	59.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that Steele Park is precious to Hamilton Easts history and that five-storey residential development around the park could change the look and feel of the park and detract from its role as an 'alternate village'. In addition, the submitter considers that rear developments in historic heritage areas (HHA) should be subject to resource consent to ensure that they are in keeping with the characteristics of the HHA.	Ensure that high density residential development around Steele Park is in keeping with the existing pre-1940's architecture; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>Enable Council to work with design schools, architects and appropriate developers to develop a high density residential development design protocol; and</p> <p>Ensure that rear development does not affect the street facade of HHAs.</p>
Susie Evans	59.2	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter consider that outdoor recreation and park space within a short walk of home to be important, particularly to young children and senior citizens. Recreation and park space is important for teaching life skills, allowing for leisure and physical activity and providing access to sunlight and nature. The submitter questions whether thought has been given to allotment-style gardening in order to provide the physical and mental health benefits of gardening.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned about safety in high density residential areas.</p>	No specific relief requested.
Susie Evans	59.3	25.12 Solid Waste	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that high density development results in extra waste. Higher density developments in Hamilton East currently display poor waste management habits such as non-regulation rubbish bags and inorganic waste left on the kerb.	<p>Provide education to the community on waste management; and</p> <p>Establish an inorganic waste collection service.</p>
Susie Evans	59.4	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that streets will become busier places as parking is no longer required, and is concerned that parking is not managed or enforced sufficiently.	<p>Consider the introduction of resident parking permits; and</p> <p>Amend the provisions so that off-site electric vehicle charging is required to be provided.</p>
Susie Evans	59.5	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter questions whether the infrastructure in older parts of the city has the capacity to handle higher density residential development. The submitter considers that Council and ratepayers should not fund upgrades unless there is a greater benefit for them, and that developers should pay the actual costs of development. The submitter considers that some parts of the city may be more cost-effective to develop than others.	No specific relief requested.
Susie Evans	59.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter considers that all developments should give all residentials access to warm, natural light and existing properties not affect existing properties.	No specific relief requested.
Susie Evans	59.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permea bility and Landscap ing	Support in part	Rule 4.2.5.3 is supported but questions how the rule will ensure that existing trees are retained.	No specific relied requested.
Susie Evans	59.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter considers that outdoor living areas should be north-facing.	Amend Rule 4.2.5.10 to require that outdoor living areas are north-facing.
Susie Evans	59.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers that service areas should be north-facing for clothes-drying.	Amend rule 4.2.5.11 to require that service areas are north-facing.
Susie Evans	59.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universa l Access	Support in part	Rule 4.2.5.15 is supported, however it should be increased from 10%.	Amend rule 4.2.5.15 to increase the percentage of residential units that must be designed specifically for wheelchairs.
Ilze Rautenbach	61.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5 Rules – General Standar	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed plan change, particularly the provisions which enable construction of a three-storey dwelling without the need for resource consent (permitted activity) adjacent to their one-storey home. The submitter considers that this outcome would be a complete invasion of their privacy given that there will be no notification and negotiation in the process and	The submitter seeks that the construction of a three storey dwelling should not be a permitted activity without the need for resource consent. The submitter seeks that the requirement for resource consent and proper notification for medium to higher density residential development should be retained, to enable neighbours to see proposed plans and negotiate impacts on their property.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			ds – General Resident ial Zone.		proposed plans to ensure privacy is not impacted. The submitter notes that they specifically purchased their house in an area of low density and would have rather bought in the city if they wanted a high density lifestyle. They suggest that areas should be zoned for high or low density in advance of development, so that people can make informed future decisions without major changes.	
Graham Harrison	62.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provision for 3 houses of up to 3 stories high to be built in residential areas without resource consent. The submitter believes such buildings would change the nature of the area and negatively affect the property value and quality of life at neighboring sites, and car parking will be a major problem..	The submitter seeks the removal of this provision (3 houses, 3 stories) from Plan Change 12.
Chris Yu	63.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes the retention of the residential zone at their property (7 Marne Street, Claudelands) under proposed PC12. This is because they are the only property on the small street zoned for Residential Zone, and not in the proposed High Density Residential Zone like all other properties on their street. The submitter notes that they spoke to council staff during a public information session at the Hamilton South Baptist Church who informed the submitter that this may be due to an error in the design stages or desktop GIS analysis.</p> <p>The submitter notes that if high apartments are constructed around their property this will lead to extremely negative impacts such as noise and traffic.</p>	The submitter seeks for the zoning of their property to be amended to the High Density Residential Zone, in order to be the same as all of the properties on their street.
Christina Mulholland	64.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the removal the 'character of the area' because the character of buildings play a part in retaining and attracting people to the city due to appealing aesthetics. Developers should consider retaining the character of the city such as Hamilton East and Claudelands when building.	The submitter seeks to keep the character of higher density new builds. Something similar to what Brookfield are doing in Christchurch https://brooksfeld.co.nz/current-listings/
Christina Mulholland	64.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	Submits that all areas of Hamilton that have villa and bungalow style houses should retain their character not just historic heritage areas.	Keep the character in all areas not just historic heritage areas.
Rachel Johannah Ball	65.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the area around within Charles Crescent, Philip Street, Vercoe Road and Beerescourt Road being within the High Density zone. The submitter is concerned about intensifications effects on shading, parking, the sense of community and connection to river.	Re-zone Charles Crescent, Philip Street, Vercoe Road and Beerescourt Road Medium Density, rather than High Density.
Majella Veronica Heaton	66.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Charles Crescent, Vercoe Road and Beerescourt Road being zoned High Density.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about intensification's effects on the areas sunlight, parking, sense of community and their connection to the River.</p>	Re-zone Charles Crescent, Phillip Street, Vercoe road and Beerescourt Road Medium Density.
Justine Cook	67.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification		The submitter wishes for adjoining properties to be notified when daylight and shading are impacted.	Amend the plan to ensure daylight infringements enable notification.
Mark Kilgour	68.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposed the plan change concerning three-story units in residential areas.	Reject the government proposal and remove the provision for three-story units.
Graeme Rowe	69.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed residential intensification because it will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the feel of Hamilton that has attracted new residents over the last 6 years and will cause some residents to relocate. 2. Increase crime. 3. Be years before there is demand for the new types of housing for which the plan change provides. <p>The submitter considers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intensification near business centres such as Chartwell and Rototuna will intimidate elderly who have downsized their properties to be within walking distance of such centres. 	Seeks the proposed intensification to be limited to the Central Business District and its surrounds.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>2. While growth has made it difficult for Hamilton City Council to keep up with infrastructure supply, this pressure will ease as the housing market cools.</p> <p>3. The intensification rules are a knee-jerk reaction to the housing market, which has since cooled significantly</p> <p>There are already significant duplexes and townhouses in the suburbs.</p>	
Graeme Rowe	69.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes 3 storey houses on 200m ² sections within suburbs outside of the 400m radius of the Rototuna, Chartwell and Dinsdale business centres.	Restrict 3 storey townhouses on 200m2 sections to medium density zones within 400m of business centres such as Chartwell and Rototuna.
Graeme Rowe	69.3	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General	Support	Improvements to transport corridors are overdue.	Supports the proposed improvements to transport corridors.
Graeme Rowe	69.4	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support	The submitter largely supports Council's three-waters proposals.	The submitter seeks for Council to continue reviewing and considering the impact of three-waters while acting in the best interests of the city and its residents.
Graeme Rowe	69.5	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	Supports Council's notified financial contributions proposals.	Seeks for developers to be charged financial contributions and for upgrades to be provided where necessary and appropriate.
Graeme Rowe	69.6	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	General	Support	Council needs to intervene to relieve traffic congestion in Rototuna Town Centre.	Adopt Council's proposals regarding Rototuna.
3 Swans Family Trust - Judith Yvonne McCracken	70.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes proposed provisions that enable high density residential development without public notification. The submitter is concerned that intensification will impact existing infrastructure; the impacts on neighbouring properties, financially and visually; a lack of public participation in the consenting process; increased on-street parking issues; and increased rubbish issues. The submitter is generally supportive of intensification in older suburbs of Hamilton.	<p>Ensure that a public participation process for intensification is provided; and</p> <p>Consider properties in special location and/or are cared for by homeowners; and</p> <p>Ensure that Government understands that their proposals for 'types of houses and neighbourhoods' are too prescriptive.</p>
3 Swans Family Trust - Judith Yvonne McCracken	70.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes proposed provisions that enable high density residential development without public notification. The submitter is concerned that intensification will impact existing infrastructure; the impacts on neighbouring properties, financially and visually; a lack of public participation in the consenting process; increased on-street parking issues; and increased rubbish issues. The submitter is generally supportive of intensification in older suburbs of Hamilton.	<p>Ensure that a public participation process for intensification is provided; and</p> <p>Consider properties in special location and/or are cared for by homeowners; and</p> <p>Ensure that Government understands that their proposals for 'types of houses and neighbourhoods' are too prescriptive.</p>
3 Swans Family Trust - Judith Yvonne McCracken	70.3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.4 Rules - Notification	Oppose	The submitter opposes proposed provisions that enable high density residential development without public notification. The submitter is concerned that intensification will impact existing infrastructure; the impacts on neighbouring properties, financially and visually; a lack of public participation in the consenting process; increased on-street parking issues; and increased rubbish issues. The submitter is generally supportive of intensification in older suburbs of Hamilton.	<p>Ensure that a public participation process for intensification is provided; and</p> <p>Consider properties in special location and/or are cared for by homeowners; and</p> <p>Ensure that Government understands that their proposals for 'types of houses and neighbourhoods' are too prescriptive.</p>
Rakuo Edwards (Tangata Whenua)	71.1	General	General	Oppose	Homes	The relief sought in the submission is "stop wasting money".
Keanu Te Ohaere Tai (Tangata Whenua)	72.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>Stop wasting money on roads that are not needed.</p> <p>Spend more on affordable homes.</p> <p>Stuff the rich help the poor.</p>	The relief sought in the submission is "Sack yourselves."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Leslie and Jennifer Vuletich	73.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to density in mature single-storey housing areas and is particularly concerned about the impacts of parking, noise and high rise fencing.	No specific relief requested.
Mary Anne MacEwan	74.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about noise at night; shading of gardens cast by six-storey development; and fruit trees and other vegetation being removed for buildings.	No specific relief requested.
Chris Palliser	75.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 12, especially the change to enable up to 3 3storey developments on a single site (as per Chapter 4.2). The submitter does not support allowing 3x 3-storey on sites as small as 200m² as they believe this to be too small of an area, and wish for their street to remain devoid of multi-storeyed houses.</p> <p>The submitter comments that if such dwellings are built close the boundaries of their own property this will result in a number of effects, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sun will be blocked from the site including the submitter's gardens, • The new buildings will be be claustrophobic for the submitters leading to health issues, • Increased noise levels in the submitter's street due to the higher number of vehicles, which may disturb the daytime sleep of the submitter's wife who works night shifts, • The submitter's street will be "crammed with vehicles" from the new dwellings. 	No specific relief sought
Ian Schultz	76.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter strongly opposes Plan Change 12 in its current form, and believes that general residential zones should not allow up to 3-storey and 5-storey dwellings to be built. The submitter comments that currently 2-storey housing is generally acceptable to provide privacy to neighbors, but any buildings above 2-storeys in height should be located in the central city so to not affect existing dwellings. The submitter comments that existing home owners do not want to have buildings of 3+ storeys overlooking their properties as they will lead to the following effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction or elimination of privacy; • Sunlight being blocked; • Strain on infrastructure due to a lack of onsite parking; and • Congestion on footpaths and streets due to a lack of onsite parking, which may cause hazards to residents including children. <p>As a result of these impacts the submitter believes the value of properties in the general and medium residential zones will be impacted, and notes they should not lose value on their property because Hamilton City Council supports the central governments directive.</p>	The submitter seeks for the current provisions in the general and medium residential zones to be retained, and for any housing above 3 storeys to be located in the CBD or high residential zone. The submitter also seeks a requirement for any building of 2 or more storeys to gain consent from neighboring properties.
Mike Parker	77.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter notes they will support the proposed Plan Change if it can be guaranteed that there will be no social disruption to Fitzroy Avenue and it's residents. However, it this cannot be guaranteed the submitter would be strongly opposed to the proposed change.	No specific relief sought
Robert Parker	78.1	General	General	Oppose	Does not support the changes and they should be rejected as was done in Christchurch.	The submitter does not specifically offer any relief to be sought, but their submission calls for Council to listen to the ratepayers, see the long term picture, and vote out the proposed plan change.
Guy Charles Brooking	79.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5 Rules – General Standards – General Residential Zone.	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed plan change because building heights up to 10m are not appropriate for the residential general zone, and would significantly change the character of Flagstaff and quality of living in the area for the worse. They note that an increase of families in the area would have a major impact on infrastructure, carparking, traffic, and access to schools, doctors surgeries, playgrounds /parks and shops.	The submitter seeks that Council should reject the intensification requirement as per Christchurch. Height should be limited to one storey alongside supporting improvements to infrastructure.
Guy Charles Brooking	79.2	General	General	Oppose	Rate payers should not have to pay for additional supporting infrastructure as they are the ones who will suffer adverse consequences from intensification.	Require all costs of supporting infrastructure are borne by developers and not residents.
Lindsay McGowan	81.1	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	There is little provision for the charging of electric vehicles. The submitter notes that in order to charge such vehicles without breaching other regulations, a garage or off street parking with fast charge unit would be required.	The submitter seeks provision of on-site charging for electric cars including a requirement for 1 fast charger unit and a garage or parking area in multi-unit complexes.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Trevor Harris	82.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the changes in existing established suburbs. There is no room for additional parking to accommodate the extra cars and properties will be overshadowed.	The submitter seeks consideration of neighboring properties which will; be overshadowed by the proposed high density (multi-storey) buildings.
Peter Anton Klinkhamer	83.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes allowing 3 dwellings of up to 3 stories very close to the boundary with out consent or agreement from neighbours because 3 stories will block sunlight to neighbouring especially if built 1 meter from the boundary on small sections with no room for motor vehicles which will add to the existing parking issues, including thefts.</p> <p>The submitter states that the planning of Hamilton should be thought out properly with respect to the existing community and not just follow the law.</p>	Seeks an alternative to the government direction which considers what is best for Hamilton and its ratepayers.
Suzanne Deihl	84.1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes allowing 3x3 dwellings to be constructed without providing off street parking because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On Street parked vehicles safety and security of vehicles, less room for passing vehicles and parking on roadside berms; 2. We are always going to have cars; 3. The effects of on-road parking for existing neighbours who don't have a say on the intensification; 4. Shading and show on neighbouring properties; 5. Existing residential neighbourhoods were not established with intensification in mind and the roads are not built to accommodate more cars parking on the street from residents, family members and visitors. 	Seeks amendments that require all residential 3x3 developments to provide consented off street parking for residents.
Jorge and Nora Rodriguez	85.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the General Residential zoning of Enderley (Mardon Road to Snell Drive and east of Peachgrove Road to Wairere Drive) because the notified zoning is contrary to the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD 2020.	Seeks the rezoning of the area from Mardon Road to Snell Drive east of Peachgrove Road to Wairere Drive to Medium Density Residential Zone.
Mary Revell Vincent Steencamp	86.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters submits that the unintended consequences of this fast paced environment change have not been properly considered by both Central and local government levels.</p> <p>These are not just environmental consequences but also physical and mental health consequences including sun light being blocked, noise effects, high density areas being a hot spot for viral illnesses, lack of storage space and facilities, single car garages being used for storage then cars being parked on the street or common areas which will create traffic flow issues, loss of privacy, overcrowding and subsequent issues from developments which were designed on a lower number of people.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A community based resolution process is initiated to help resolve local issues which occur due to overcrowding. The local community board or sub committee of the same may help. 2. Clear guidelines as to how many people can occupy a dwelling. How many cars per household. This should be part of the selling / promotion packs of real estate agents. 3. Free public transport was highlighted. Express routes introduced. Thus encouraging residents in high density areas to use these services. 4. Allocated areas for wheelie bins on the curb side. 5. Better enforcement of local bylaws. This is suggested as better enforcement will dissuade willing abuse of those bylaws.
Mary Revell Vincent Steencamp	86.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		<p>The submitters, submission is that the unintended consequences of this fast paced environment change have not been properly considered by both Central and local government levels.</p> <p>These are not just environmental consequences but also physical and mental health consequences including sun light being blocked, noise effects, high density areas being a hot spot for viral illnesses, lack of storage space and facilities, single car garages being used for storage then cars being parked on the street or common areas which will create traffic flow issues, loss of privacy, overcrowding and subsequent issues from developments which were designed on a lower number of people.</p>	Requests that the area ring fenced for development be restricted to the actual City Centre, light commercial areas and industrial land not being utilised.
Mary Revell Vincent Steencamp	86.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	<p>The submitters submission is that the unintended consequences of this fast paced environment change have not been properly considered by both Central and local government levels.</p> <p>These are not just environmental consequences but also physical and mental health consequences including sun light being blocked, noise effects, high density areas being a hot spot for viral illnesses, lack of storage space and facilities, single car garages being used for storage then cars being parked on the street or common areas which will create traffic flow issues, loss of privacy,</p>	Seeks that the established neighbourhoods which are being redeveloped, that dwellings built are of one level.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					overcrowding and subsequent issues from developments which were designed on a lower number of people.	
James Hsieh	87.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Pukete and St Andrews are included in the list of Medium Density Areas for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lots of employees work at The Base, surrounding car dealers, retails shops, industrial businesses, factories on Maui St and surround areas Rotokauri Transport HUB/Buses/Train station behind The Base Mall which lots of people also uilitize park and ride. Increase uptake of public transport at Rotokauri Transport HUB when you allow more people to live in Pukete and St Andrews Medium Density zone in Pukete/St Andrews will allow more supplies of housing than just Duplex Better for the environment, more people love in Pukete/St Andrews can walk, bike or catch ACW/CW buses to go work in Te Rapa, or to get to the Bus Depot for rest of journey This would mean getting people out of their cars, less people driving, less traffic jam on Wairere Drive. Less emission from vehicles sitting in the traffic jam, better traffic flow for Wairere Drive and in Te Rapa it self. More housing supplies/higher density would encourage workers in the Industrial areas to move closer to where they work, less time on commuting. Medium Density Zone also means the housing supply will be more affordable then Duplex under Low Density zone. More affordable housing supply from Medium Density Zone will mean more rentals for renters and cheaper houses for home buyers. Council needs to get away from the mentality that more people now still want to go to CBD to work and live. There are more people work in The Base/Te Rapa Industrial/industrial areas than Chartwell, University, Nawtona and the likes, therefore Pukete/St Andrew should be changed to Medium density Zone especially when there is a Bus transport Centre at the Base. After Covid 19, and this is a fact where many businesses are moving out of CBD areas and more employees are working from homes. As a result, many people have decided to move away from CBD for cheaper rent. At the same time, they still prefer living in reasonable distances from businesses/Shopping centres and areas such as Pukete and St Andrews fit the bill When more workers/employees move into Pukete/St Andrew from increased housing density, they will be less traffic Jam during week days. Unclogging daily traffic jam on Wairere Drive/Te Rapa Road. Close proximity between Rotokauri Transport Hub to Pukete and St Andrews, when you make it easy for the public to use buses, more of us will be using them. 	Seeks the addition of Pukete and St Andres to the list of Medium Density Residential Zone areas.
James Hsieh	87.2	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Pukete and St Andrews are rezoned to Medium Density Residential for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lots of employees work at The Base, surrounding car dealers, retails shops, industrial businesses, factories on Maui St and surround areas Rotokauri Transport HUB/Buses/Train station behind The Base Mall which lots of people also uilitize park and ride. Increase uptake of public transport at Rotokauri Transport HUB when you allow more people to live in Pukete and St Andrews Medium Density zone in Pukete/St Andrews will allow more supplies of housing than just Duplex Better for the environment, more people love in Pukete/St Andrews can walk, bike or catch ACW/CW buses to go work in Te Rapa, or to get to the Bus Depot for rest of journey This would mean getting people out of their cars, less people driving, less traffic jam on Wairere Drive. 	Seeks the rezoning of Pukete and St Andres to Medium Density Residential Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less emission from vehicles sitting in the traffic jam, better traffic flow for Wairere Drive and in Te Rapa it self. More housing supplies/higher density would encourage workers in the Industrial areas to move closer to where they work, less time on commuting. Medium Density Zone also means the housing supply will be more affordable then Duplex under Low Density zone. More affordable housing supply from Medium Density Zone will mean more rentals for renters and cheaper houses for home buyers. Council needs to get away from the mentality that more people now still want to go to CBD to work and live. There are more people work in The Base/Te Rapa Industrial/industrial areas than Chartwell, University, Nawtona and the likes, therefore Pukete/St Andrew should be changed to Medium density Zone especially when there is a Bus transport Centre at the Base. After Covid 19, and this is a fact where many businesses are moving out of CBD areas and more employees are working from homes. As a result, many people have decided to move away from CBD for cheaper rent. At the same time, they still prefer living in reasonable distances from businesses/Shopping centres and areas such as Pukete and St Andrews fit the bill When more workers/employees move into Pukete/St Andrew from increased housing density, they will be less traffic Jam during week days. Unclogging daily traffic jam on Wairere Drive/Te Rapa Road. Close proximity between Rotokauri Transport Hub to Pukete and St Andrews, when you make it easy for the public to use buses, more of us will be using them. 	
Collier Ancell Family Trust - Andrew Collier and Robyn Ancell	88.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters strongly oppose the proposed high density zoning of their property and its environs [on River Road north of Whitiara Bridge] because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would destroy the area's character and dramatically reduce property values in this area; and There would be low demand for sections in this area because of the large number of sections becoming available elsewhere in the city, the area's distance from the Central City, and the area is sloping and has river bank soils. <p>The submitters oppose central government's intensification directive; they consider cities and communities should be able to decide what is best for their city.</p>	The submitters seek for their property and its environs [on River Road north of Whitiara Bridge] to be removed from the High Density Residential Zone.
Collier Ancell Family Trust - Andrew Collier and Robyn Ancell	88.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitters strongly oppose the proposed high density zoning of their property and its environs [on River Road north of Whitiara Bridge] because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would destroy the area's character and dramatically reduce property values in this area; and There would be low demand for sections in this area because of the large number of sections becoming available elsewhere in the city, the area's distance from the Central City, and the area is sloping and has river bank soils. <p>The submitters oppose central government's intensification directive; they consider cities and communities should be able to decide what is best for their city.</p>	The submitters seek for the High Density Residential Zone to be restricted to areas where similar development is already occurring, namely, the established Central City.
Collier Ancell Family Trust - Andrew Collier and Robyn Ancell	88.3	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	The submitters consider that car parking for residential units should be provided on site and existing roads should not be narrowed to provide for on-road, kerbside parking.	Maintain the movement function of existing roads.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Christopher Carter	89.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter seeks sufficient building setbacks and shading rules so that food can be grown on properties.	The submitter seeks sufficient building setbacks and shading rules so that food can be grown on properties.
Christopher Carter	89.2	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The duplex rules in the last plan change have resulted in a proliferation of cars parked willy-nilly around our streets. Please protect our city from becoming a giant parking lot. Consideration to properly cater for parking in all cases.	Mandate sufficient garaging in the new housing rules.
Christopher Carter	89.3	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	Please protect our city from becoming a giant parking lot by incentivising bus alternatives.	Make public transport sufficiently affordable, or free, that people do not need multiple cars to travel our city.
Christopher Carter	89.4	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	Improve cycleways. Fund more safe cycleways so school and commuter traffic can use this as an alternative. This should also incentivise e-bikes and the like as they are a valuable short-distance alternative to private cars.	Please protect our city from becoming a giant parking lot by incentivising cycleway alternatives. Improve cycleways. Fund more safe cycleways so school and commuter traffic can use this as an alternative. This should also incentivise e-bikes and the like as they are a valuable short-distance alternative to private cars.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	90.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose		1. Prioritize Climate Change/Global Warming. 2. Bring in Tree Protection Laws. 3. Do not use older established suburbs like Dinsdale, Glenview etc to build your ghettos over new flashier ones like Flagstaff etc. 4. Identify the need for more family STATE HOUSES to accommodate those in emergency housing who have no finances for new town houses anyway. 5. Make developers pay for resource consents. 6. HCC to adopt recycle and reuse policy instead of dumping good reusable materials and plants in landfill. ie availing them to families that cant afford to buy them.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	90.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	HCC omits protecting our European heritage. It demolishes all our old buildings. The latest being the iconic old Hamilton Hotel. Only a facade remains for a gaudy interior. Our natural environment is fast diminishing in preference to intensification. HCC does not take climate change serious. Too little too late. Get serious on saving trees and the environment instead of replacing them with concrete and ghettos.	Put tree protection laws in place and get your priorities right. We live in a rapidly changing world and HCC/central Government have to change with it. The bias on business of past decisions for 'progress' is no longer the priority. HCC have been wasteful and extravagant. Recycle, reuse, re-purpose.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	90.3	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose		No specific relief sought
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	90.4	General	General	Oppose	Address green policies seriously - not tip toeing around gullies when the rest is a sea of concrete and cars. Prioritise and respect the natural environment. Recycle materials from demolition and building sites. Plants, whether shrubs or small trees can be made available for replanting for those who cannot afford to buy them. Reuse and Repurpose	Address green policies seriously - not tip toeing around gullies when the rest is a sea of concrete and cars. Prioritise and respect the natural environment. Recycle materials from demolition and building sites. Plants, whether shrubs or small trees can be made available for replanting for those who cannot afford to buy them. Reuse and Repurpose
Alan Grainer	91.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	The general purpose of the Plan 12 change makes sense in making a compact city, and avoiding the alienation of further rural land.	4.1.1 is supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Section 4.1.2 is supported. It is essential the Council manages the development of the city over the next decades to ensure a good balance between new housing, amenities and sufficient natural environment: a healthy city. Over-intensification will only produce a city that no-one enjoys living in, and be counter-productive. So the operation of the plan needs to be more than building specifications, it must actively incorporate the objectives and policy positions in decision-making. This submission considers a blanket adoption of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development will produce a city that is over-intensified, and will produce social problems that could be avoided. The specific statements in this submission are based on this general position.	Section 4.1.2 is supported and no specific relief is requested.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Alan Grainer	91.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	Objective 4.2.2.2 is opposed.	The submitter suggests that the objective limits development to two storeys, with three storeys being an exception if it does not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood.
Alan Grainer	91.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	4.3.2.1(f) is supported.	4.3.2.1(f) is supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Objective 4.3.2.2 is opposed. Buildings should be limited to three storeys with four and five storey development being exceptions of they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area. The submitter considers that all properties on the riverbank of Beerescourt Road, Awatere Avenue and all of Ann Street be designated General Residential due to adverse visual and environmental impact of more intensive development adjacent to the city's key natural treasure.	Limit residential development to 3 storeys, providing an exception for 4-5 storey residential developments where they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area. Re-designate the area in Beerescourt on historic riverbank.
Alan Grainer	91.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Objective 4.4.2.1 is opposed. The Plan should limit the general provision to 5-story residential developments, with any taller buildings being exceptions if they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area. This would apply to areas in Whitiara and Te Rapa in particular so they 'step-down' from the CBD. All properties on the historic riverbank adjacent to the Central City are limited to a lower 3-story level due to the adverse visual and environment impact of more intensive development adjacent to the city's key natural treasure.	Limit residential development to 5 storeys, with any taller buildings being exceptions if they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area, particularly in Whitiara and Te Rapa. Limit all properties on the riverbank adjacent to the Central City to 3 storeys due to the adverse visual and environment impact of more intensive development adjacent to the city's key natural treasure.
Alan Grainer	91.7	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support	Chapter 7 is supported.	Chapter 7 is supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	Chapter 19 is supported.	Chapter 19 is supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.9	General	General	Support	[Moving around our city] is generally supported.	[Moving around our city] is generally supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.10	General	General	Support	[Green policies] are fully supported.	[Green policies] are fully supported and no specific relief is requested.
Alan Grainer	91.11	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	[How its paid for] makes sense.	No specific relief requested.
A Blizzard - Alison karika	92.1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter is strongly opposed to the High Density Residential Zone applying north of the corner of Victoria Street and Te Rapa Road because of concerns about traffic safety for residents when slowing in moving traffic to access these properties with a car.	Should development increase as allowed in Plan Change 12, the speed limit for Te Rapa Road should be decreased.
A Blizzard - Alison karika	92.2	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of secure on-road car parking spaces if developers do no provide on-site car park spaces.	The submitter wants Council to consider seriously car parking in the High Density Residential Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
A Blizzard - Alison karika	92.3	Appendix 15 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter is strongly opposed to the High Density Residential Zone applying north of the corner of Victoria Street and Te Rapa Road because of concerns about traffic safety for residents when slowing in moving traffic to access these properties with a car.	Should development increase as allowed in Plan Change 12, the speed limit for Te Rapa Road should be decreased.
A Blizzard - Alison karika	92.4	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is strongly opposed to the High Density Residential Zone applying north of the corner of Victoria Street and Te Rapa Road because of concerns about traffic safety for residents when slowing in moving traffic to access these properties with a car.	Should development increase as allowed in Plan Change 12, the speed limit for Te Rapa Road should be decreased.
Eric Wayne Thompson	93.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change in its entirety.	Lobby Government to reject Plan Change 12. Protect neighbouring properties daylight from large dwellings.
Eric Wayne Thompson	93.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about natural light and road safety.	No specific relief sought.
Julienne Anastasia Ashby	94.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Oppose	The submitter notes the limited services in the Claudelands area for intensification and the effects on the wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Oppose housing intensification within Plan Change 12.
Julienne Anastasia Ashby	94.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectiv es and Policies: General Resident ial Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage to intensification and effects resulting from loss on light and privacy on community wellbeing.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Marcella Sonntag	95.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about reduced natural light from developments greater than two stories.	Amend the plan to take into account reduced sunlight and the affected neighbours.
Dell Hood	96.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	The submitter supports provisions in 4.1.2.6.c.(v) and 4.1.2.6.j that refer to minimising impact on neighbours, however, opposes this section because of the likelihood of a reduction in the quality of life for neighbours.	Improve the management of storm water quality before housing intensification; and The Council first assesses whether the nature of houses anticipated will meet the needs of all citizens; and That the Council considers delaying the development, particularly of multi storey dwellings in neighbourhoods where there are long term residents perhaps using 10 years' continuous occupancy as a criterion.
Dell Hood	96.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports the provisions of Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa O Waikato.	That more investment be made into managing the increased pollution of storm water from increases in traffic as the population grows.
Dell Hood	96.3	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports Objective18.2.2 but is concerned about adverse effects from traffic congestion already happening. The submitter notes that new dwellings have one garage, resulting in on street or on footpath parking, obstructing drivers' views and creating hazards for pedestrians.	That the Council delays intensification until better options are already in place for alternative transport options, and resulted in reduced traffic congestion.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Dell Hood	96.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	I ask the Council to take whatever action is possible immediately to prevent more mature trees being destroyed as current development proceeds.	No specific relief sought
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes suburban centre intensification and general residential zone intensification.	Oppose consent for building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres; and Homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square.
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports objectives and policies that ensure a good balance between new housing, amenities and sufficient natural environment:	Council to not give consent to - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres 3 homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square.
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes three storey developments unless they do not adversely effect surrounding neighbourhood.	Council to not give consent to - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres 3 homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square.
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports 4.3.2.1 (f).	The submitter supports 4.3.2.1 (f).
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter does not support 4.3.2.2. 4 and 5-story buildings should only be allowed if the impact on the surrounding neighbourhood is limited. The submitter is concerned for the visual and environment impact of more intensive development adjacent to the river.	Council to not give consent to - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres 3 homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square. Rezone Beerescourt Road, Awatere Avenue, and all of Ann Street General Residential.
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter does not support 4.4.2.1 wishing for limits to building height so that the visual and environmental impact of more intensive development adjacent to the river is limited.	Council to not give consent to - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres 3 homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square; and properties along the river are limited to a lower 3-story level
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres and intensification within the general residential zone.	Remove building 3 and 5 storey buildings within 400 metres of suburban centres; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 homes of up to 3 storey across general residential zones of sections greater than 200 metres square.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
R W and H C Oxborrow and Brown	97.8	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 due to concerns for infrastructure, parking, green policies, solar and daylight, and mental health.	Oppose Plan Change 12.
Darrin Robert Smith	98.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes more on-street carparking, because streets will become clogged with cars as they are narrow and don't have enough parking already.	The submitter opposes 4.3.2.1e.
Darrin Robert Smith	98.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.3.2 because it allows for infringement on each of the standards up to 10%, and they believe that developers will use this to break rules such as a setback.	The submitter opposes rule 4.3.3.2 -Notification Rule.
Darrin Robert Smith	98.3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.4.4, because they believe 15m building heights will block views, create areas for crime to occur, decrease privacy and access to sunlight.	The submitter opposes 4.3.4.4 -15m Building height
Darrin Robert Smith	98.4	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes 25.15, because good quality urban design is fundamental for Council to deliver on its vision. Wording of the rule has removed emphasis on good design and instead placed an emphasis on providing as many homes as possible at all costs.	The submitter proposes that the wording in 25.15.1 is amended to read "Good quality urban design is fundamental in delivering the Council's Vision for a city that is easy to live in; where our people thrive; with a central city where people love to be; that is a fun city with lots to do; that is a green city. The consideration of urban design throughout the Plan chapters is required to ensure that urban design principles are applied consistently throughout all zones."
Darrin Robert Smith	98.5	General	General	Oppose		Seeks that the northern side of Arawa Street will not become medium density, and that both sides of the street will be residential.
Anton and Vicky Mashlan	99.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes provisions that allow the construction of houses up to five stories in their neighbourhood in addition to the sunlight effects of such developments.	Oppose Medium Density zone in vicinity of Thomas Road centre
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	100.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the purpose, policies, objectives and controls proposed under Chapter 19 for protecting and maintaining historic heritage. The submitter recommends aligning the consenting classifications under Plan Change 12 with the future simplified classification system.	Change proposed activity classes under Chapter 19 to align with the four classes of permitted, controlled, discretionary and prohibited that are proposed under the Natural and Built Environment Act. Non-complying activities should be changed to prohibited. Restricted discretionary activities would be changed to discretionary.
John David Fisher	101.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about reduced daylight from new developments.	Make amendments that address reduced daylight from new developments.
John David Fisher	101.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks minimum on-site car parking standards.	Amend the plan to include minimum parking standards.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Rob Gray	102.1	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Intensification without planned parking puts a lot of cars on both sides of the street making narrow bus routes even narrower. The current bus strategy is at odds with this proposal as it reduces the number of bus routes available. 	<p>All bus routes to be wide enough to accommodate bus movement and parking on both sides of the street.</p> <p>The submitter proposes that Hamilton City Council takes over the running of the buses from Regional Council to ensure full alignment between strategy and reality.</p>
Richard Cain	103.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the creation of 6 storey buildings on Grey Street or elsewhere in Hamilton, particularly Hamilton East, because it would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Be out of character in a heritage area; Increase traffic congestion; Add to traffic being left on streets; Affect the light and shadow on neighbouring houses; and 	Hamilton City Council should oppose any Central Govt decision to increase buildings heights more than two storeys.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					5. Exacerbate the potential damage resulting from any earthquakes.	
Richard Cain	103. 2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	Hamilton City Council should seek to preserve and enhance Heritage areas.	Hamilton City Council should seek to preserve and enhance Heritage areas. Householders should be given incentives to retain heritage features of their properties.
Richard Cain	103. 3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	Hamilton City Council must widen new and existing footpaths to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and scooters.	Hamilton City Council must widen new and existing footpaths to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and scooters.
Richard Cain	103. 4	General	General	Support	Hamilton City Council must adopt carbon friendly policies in respect to trees and gullies. If exotic trees are felled from gullies ie pines the money could be used to plant natives and carbon credits could be obtained.	Hamilton City Council must adopt carbon friendly policies in respect to trees and gullies. If exotic trees are felled from gullies ie pines the money could be used to plant natives and carbon credits could be obtained.
Robert George	104. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes unlimited heights in Central City and blanket 3 -5 stories in Chartwell, Thomas Road, Five Cross Roads, Clyde Street east, Hamilton East, Glenview, Frankton and Dinsdale and within 200m of Nawton. And 3 x 3 development in all other parts of the city. Does support the general heritage and natural environment protections.	No specific relief sought.
Bike Action Hamilton - Phil Evans	105. 1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	Roads and streets are for moving people and goods, and not storing private property. BEFORE intensification occurs, protect road space for moving goods and vehicles, including bikes. Eliminate on-street parking, and install separated bike lanes so that developers are required to put OFF street parking in to any developments. If the city does not do this, our streets will clog up storing private property. It is far easier to do this now, than try and remove car parking from homes already built with no provision.	BEFORE intensification occurs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Protect road space for moving goods and vehicles, including bikes. Remove on street parking and install separated bike lanes so that developers are required to put OFF street parking in to any developments.
Bike Action Hamilton - Phil Evans	105. 2	25.14 Transportati on	General		There used to be bike lanes down both sides of Killarney Road, but the bike lanes were removed in favour of car parking when building of infill housing started.	Completely remove car parks from Killarney Road and restore the bike lanes.
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106. 2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	Behind the subdivisions in Glen Lynne Avenue are areas of protected land enclosing rue kumara (storage pits). The submitter is also concerned that development will not drive native birds away and that more cars will lead to more contaminants in the air and water, affecting the Waikato River and gullies.	Keep housing away from gullies.
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106. 3	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Oppose	With respect to chapters 25.14.2 and 18.2.1 cars parking on the road, berms, and footpaths in Glen Lynne Avenue are an existing problem. The parked cars often slow buses and necessitate the buses driving on the wrong side of the road. The lack of minimum car parking requirements in the plan and the continued infilling of properties will exacerbate parked car congestion on the berms and roadsides. Additional vehicles parking kerbside or on the berm will impair visibility for vehicles exiting the submitter's property and endanger cyclists. More cars are using Glen Lynne Avenue as a shortcut to avoid congestion on Hukanui Road, Wairere Drive, and the roundabout. Traffic flow is so heavy on Hukanui Road and River Road that from 7am to 10am, 11am to 1pm, 2.30pm to 3.30pm, and 4pm to 6pm, the only way vehicles can exit Glen Lynne Avenue is if a kind driver lets them. Turning right out Glen Lynne Avenue is impossible. Traffic queued to exist Glen Lynne Ave at Hukanui Road will obstruct vehicles wishing to exit properties and access Glen Lynne Ave.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> EVERY new home built in Glen Lynne Avenue NEEDS to have on-site parking. NO cycle lanes on Glen Lynne Avenue. A cycle lane behind the subdivisions and going onto Portree Place, then through the park. In the opposite direction it could join Clements Crescent by Tauhara park and loop around. We do NOT need speed bumps or anything like that to slow traffic. A roundabout or traffic lights at the River Road or Hukanui Road end of Glen Lynne Avenue so that residents can exit at least one end of Glen Lynne Avenue. Widening Hukanui Road to accommodate a turning lane.
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106. 4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effects: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Of continued developments on indigenous birds; and On the Waikato River and Kirikiriroa Stream of contaminants released to air and waterways by more people and cars. 	Keep housing away from the gullies.
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106. 5	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	Hamilton City Council should focus more on high density living in the CBD where it makes sense. People who opt to live that way want to enjoy the nightlife and city amenities. Building 5 storey apartment blocks around shopping centres e.g. Chartwell Square makes no sense and would look	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					strange as they would tower over the Square. The submitter considers that infill development is starting to look the same when the city is supposed to be beautified and a great place to live.	
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		<p>The submitter is concerned about the effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of continued developments on indigenous birds; and 2. On the Waikato River and Kirikiriroa Stream of contaminants released to air and waterways by more people and cars. 	Keep housing away from the gullies.
Kathryn Elsie Russell	106.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		<p>The submitter is concerned about the effects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Of continued developments on indigenous birds; and 2. On the Waikato River and Kirikiriroa Stream of contaminants released to air and waterways by more people and cars. 	Keep housing away from the gullies.
Bill Mitchellmore	107.2	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	<p>The operative District Plan provides for FCs to be levied on the Crown as a means of preventing it from circumventing a statutory exemption to the payment of DCs provided in the Local Government Act (2002). The proposed amendment to Chapter 24 removes this ratepayer funding protection without any supporting explanation or justification. In my view, the rules in the operative District Plan for ensuring the Crown pays FCs in lieu of DCs as set out in 24.1.e(i) should be retained to ensure Crown agencies cannot and do not avoid funding an equitable and fair share of the costs associated with the growth capacity needed to service their future developments in Hamilton.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to Chapter 24 assume the Council can require the payment of FCs for any class of activity other than a prohibited activity as provided by S77E of the RMA. Council appears to have overlooked the fact that FCs can only be enforced as conditions of resource consents in accordance with S108 of the RMA or possibly by using abatement notices. Resource consents are the RMA's primary enforcement tool. This means that, in the absence of a resource consent, the Council is reliant on the use of the notional "Bluff Act" (or the belated use of an abatement notice) on developments not requiring a resource consent to ensure the payment of FCs it intends to impose. As a consequence, non-consented developments can potentially avoid the payment of FCs, whilst all other developments cannot. The associated risks undermine the proposed purposes of the FCs and their use by the Council.</p>	<p>Retain the rules already in the Chapter 24 enabling FCs to be levied on the Crown in lieu of DCs.</p> <p>Before amending Chapter 24, seek written confirmation from the MfE that FCs can be legally enforced under the RMA in the absence of either a resource consent or the threatened use of abatement notices.</p>
Bill Mitchellmore	107.3	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	18-1 Financial Contributions: Calculation methodology and worked examples	Oppose	<p>This formula for calculating financial contributions is highly problematic and unreasonable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The city wide approach for the streetscape and Te Ture Whaimana purposes provide no recognition of the substantial costs that greenfield developments are now required to incur to satisfy resource consent conditions for adverse environment effect mitigation relative to comparable historical and/or brownfield development. As a consequence, greenfield developments will be paying proportionately higher costs to mitigate adverse environment effects and to provide for betterment than identical developments located in brownfield locations. This represents an administratively driven cost transfer from greenfield to brownfield development by the Council. • The proposed adoption of an equity multiplier based on transport demand conversion factors set out in the DC Policy has no underlying logic for assessing a FC other than as a deliberate attempt to transfer costs from residential to non-residential types of development in Hamilton. Transport demand conversion factors have no more relevance to the generation of adverse environmental effects than the materially lower demand conversion factors set in the DC policy for other Council-owned infrastructure including water, wastewater or stormwater. • To compound the fundamental inequities attributable to the use of equity multipliers, they result in the over recovery of costs for both the Network Renewal and Te Ture Whaimana purposes 	<p>Set a PUD to 100 sqm for all types of development</p> <p>Remove the Equity Multiplier from the FC formula</p> <p>Remove the GFA definition from Chapter 24 and apply the GFA definition already in the District Plan</p> <p>Base the PUDs solely on increases in GFA (as presently defined in the Administration section of the operative District Plan) for all types of development and do not apply any unavoidably subjective equity multipliers to PUDs.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">The demand attributed to non-residential development is based on a GFA definition in the DC policy that is subtly different to the GFA definition set out in the interpretations section of the operative District Plan. This has been achieved by adding an extra definition in Chapter 24 specifically intended to increase FC revenue from non-residential development. The approach will likely cause totally avoidable confusion and ongoing mistrust about the Council’s overall motives for the changes to Chapter 24 within the broader development community and amongst their various advisors. <p>The methodology for calculating FCs does not take account of changes in land uses such as conversions from commercial or retail land uses to residential in brownfield areas of Hamilton. In these situations, recognition of the existing PUDs needs to be taken into account. Otherwise, some brownfield developments will incur a FC as mitigation of an adverse environment effect that they do not create.</p>	
Bill Mitchelmore	107.4	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which:	Oppose	<p>Purpose of network infrastructure renewals:</p> <p>The proposed changes to Chapter 24 provide for a FC to fund the cost of capacity upgrades to existing network infrastructure that the Council has previously decided not to fund in accordance with its DC Policy. The capacity upgrades are deceptively referred to as “Network Renewals” in an attempt to distinguish the assumed costs of capacity upgrades from the costs allocated of growth identified in the DC Policy. The term “Network Renewals” is also defined in Chapter 24 in a manner that enables existing network components to be repaired and replaced in a manner that provides new and additional development to connect. The proposed definition of what constitutes a renewal defies common logic and general understandings of the term “renewal”. It is also inconsistent with the definition for “renewal works” in the operative District Plan in respect to transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council is understood to have identified \$5.7M of supposed renewal costs based on cost allocations to renewals in the Schedule of Assets supporting the DC Policy and then attributed 50% of these cost allocations to FCs. This rather arbitrary approach to cost allocation undermines the credibility of the very complicated cost allocation methodology used by the Council to allocate costs to growth in the DC Policy. In addition, the renewal costs are being recovered from developments located in greenfield areas where land developers either directly fund future growth capacity needs to the most up-to-date standards set by the Council (or they contribute via DCs) at the time of consent. As a consequence, the infrastructure renewal FC has been constructed to transfer costs from future infill development to greenfield development in a manner that is unrelated to the adverse environmental effects that can be attributed to greenfield development.</p> <p>Purpose of Te Ture Whaimana:</p> <p>In 2019, the Council has indicated it identified a total cost of \$44.7M to meet Te Ture Whaimana objectives in gullies occupying 73.7 Ha of the City over a 10-year time period of the current LTP. The cost estimates have subsequently been raised to \$47.2M to account for inflation in the last 3 years. The Council is now proposing to take advantage of the opportunity provided by a recent RMA amendment encompassing betterment (ie s77e.2) to recover 100% of these costs from all types of future development in Hamilton in the form of a FC. The cost estimates provided are understood to include the supply, planting and maintenance of vegetation and public access into and along gullies including construction of paths, stairs, boardwalks and bridges and the installation of signage and operational costs. These projects will clearly benefit all Hamilton residents (existing and future) yet the Council considers all of the costs should be borne by future development. It is obvious that the goal of the Council is to transfer the costs of its Te Ture Whaimana objectives from ratepayers to future development without reasonable regard to who will enjoy the benefits and what adverse environmental effects are being mitigated.</p> <p>Purpose of Streetscape Amenity:</p> <p>The Council is proposing to upgrade community parks and plant trees on existing road reserves using FCs levied on residential development. It anticipates it will incur costs of \$36M over a 10 year period. As with the cost estimates for funding the purpose of the proposed Te Ture Whaimana FC,</p>	<p>Review the assumptions supporting the cost estimates</p> <p>Ensure the FCs are targeted to developments that are demonstrably responsible for the adverse environmental effects justifying the FCs (which will logically exclude developments located in greenfield areas).</p> <p>Review the cost allocations associated with the Te Ture Whaimana FC (including consideration of the environmental degradation attributable to all historical development in Hamilton) and reset the Te Ture Whaimana FC charge accordingly.</p> <p>Review the cost allocations associated with the Streetscape FC to take reasonable and appropriate account of the benefits to be enjoyed by existing residential development and reset the FC charges accordingly.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					the Council does not appear to have attributed any benefits of the planned expenditure to existing residential development located in the existing brownfield areas of Hamilton. As a consequence, the Council is essentially using FCs to generate additional revenue in the first instance and then to transfer costs to future residential development for the benefit of existing ratepayers.	
David and Merie McGall	108.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes intensification as proposed in Plan Change 12, because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They are concerned about the social impact of higher housing densities, with less recreational and private living spaces; 2. They believe it is unfair that neighbours do not need to be consulted and have concerns for the impact on sunlight access; 3. They say that Hamilton's streets are too narrow for more on-street car parking; 4. Infill housing creates more impermeable surfaces, thereby increasing the risk of flooding. Loss of vegetation affects aesthetics and stormwater management; 5. Increased flooding risk will mean higher insurance premiums for surrounding homeowners; and 6. This is a step away from beautification of the city. 	Seeks that Council will provide assurance to neighbouring property owners that any increased stormwater risk will be managed by Council. Seeks that high-rise and multi-unit developments should be restricted to existing zoning. Existing height and shade line restrictions should be maintained, unless there is significant recreational buffers provided. Each unit should provide for an exterior recreation zone.
Jennylee Godwin	109.1	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to suburban areas with concerns for city infrastructure capacity.	No specific relief sought
Jennylee Godwin	109.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about parking in the Dinsdale suburban area.	No specific relief sought
Jennylee Godwin	109.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Oppose	The submitter does not consider that the proposed changes will be effective enough to protect the Waikato river and surrounding environment.	No specific relief sought
Jennylee Godwin	109.4	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter does not believe the proposal will effectively resolve commuting issues as Public Transport is not well used	No specific relief sought
Jennylee Godwin	109.5	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the need for approval to connect to the three waters network. Suggest that the three waters upgrade work is planned for and delivered prior to this change being implemented.	That the three waters upgrade work is planned for and delivered prior to this change being implemented.
Jennylee Godwin	109.6	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter does not support rate payers covering development costs.	Make developer financial contributions bigger.
Clare Bayly	110.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12, noting the service capacity of Claudelands and potential effects on the Waikato River from storm water.	Refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA to refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Clare Bayly	110.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned for the loss of heritage homes from intensification and the effects on light and community wellbeing.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments.
M J and W N McLeod and Vant	111.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extension of the medium density zone around the University with concerns for street parking, rubbish bin space, and safety of children in the area.	Amend the boundaries of the proposed Clyde St medium density area to match those of the existing medium density area north of Clyde St and Helena Rd; and include the Knighton Rd and Brocas Ave area south of the Clyde St roundabout in the existing General Residential Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12. Hamilton's unique requirements should be considered.	Oppose Plan Change 12; and Require all Councillors to declare any conflicts of interest where they will take financial gains by this plan going ahead.
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres		The submitter is concerned by possible intensification around suburban centres especially those with smaller shop numbers (5-20)	Refine the definition of suburban centres.
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter has concerns from intensification occurring in general residential zones concerning safety, privacy, general health of existing home owners.	Limit building height in the general residential zone to two stories.
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.4	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of parking and traffic safety of new developments.	Provide off street parking; and consider traffic safety of new developments.
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about provision of green space and provision of sufficient space to enable natural daylight to as many rooms as possible	Ensure green space is provided on new units and sufficient space to protect daylight.
Annette Bradley-Ingle	112.6	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned for access new two-story units.	Require double storied homes have electric lifts.
Rajeshkumar Shanmugam	113.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 30, 32, and 34 Cairns Crescent being zoned Medium Density Residential because these properties do not have driveway access to Hukanui Road but back onto Hukanui Road where a bus stop is currently located.	Seeks the rezoning of 30, 32 and 34 Cairns Crescent to General Residential.
Anneliese Ginnaw	114.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The high density urban character change will be at odds with some existing neighbourhoods, eg Claudelands The number of trees and amount of green space will be reduced which will significantly impact wildlife numbers The visible changes to the built environment is likely to be significant and rather stark due to the loss of existing old character houses. Insufficient on street car parking particularly in relation to multi unit developments. Concerns about access for emergency vehicles due to parking congestion. 	No specific relief sought.
Anneliese Ginnaw	114.2	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1.1 Special Residential Zone	Oppose	Several properties that currently form part of the West Claudelands Special Character Zone have been excluded from the new proposed HHA despite being pre 1939 homes, many of which are unchanged. These houses form part of the overall character of the area and the potential for them to be replaced with multi storey dwellings will affect the historic sense this area conveys.	The submitter seeks to ensure that any pre-1940 home currently under the protection of a special character zone (specifically but not exclusively West Claudelands) is categorized as part of the new HHA designation to preserve the character of the areas.
Tony Trail	115.1	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about car parking on road berms from intensification.	Remove grass berms and install sealed parking bays.
Tony Trail	115.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about inconsistent building heights in predominantly single story areas.	Have defined localised intensification areas.
Brad Stack	116.1	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter opposes general intensification mentioning issues surrounding lack parking and believes people are not making use of other means of transport. The presence of more parked cars is seen as a risk therefore this should be taken into consideration with regard to medium/high density areas. They mention 2 off-street carparks per 3 bedroom unit with resource consent.	More incentives for less cars in high/medium density areas. Otherwise enforce 2 off-street carparks per 3 bedrooms in order to get past resource consent.
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	117.1	DELETED 4.2 Objectives and Policies:	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the removal of the current General Residential Zone provisions in sections 4.2. Concerns include the impact on daylight, amenity values and wellbeing.	Retain the current provisions for the General Residential Zone; and Decline to implement the proposed regulations.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
		Residential Zones				
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	117.2	DELETED 4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the removal of the current General Residential Zone provisions in sections 4.3. Concerns include the impact on daylight, amenity values and wellbeing.	Retain the current provisions for the General Residential Zone; and Decline to implement the proposed regulations.
Geoff Lewis	118.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12, and considered Hamilton does not want, or need urban, intensification forced upon it.	Hamilton City Council should make it clear that Hamilton does not want, or need urban, intensification forced upon it; and Hamilton City Council not to notify any plan changes associated with the NPS-UD.
Fiona Jarden	119.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the medium density zoning around Nawton Mall. The submitter notes the absence of retail shops, banking, or community services (doctors, police, libraries, gymnasiums) that would make this area suitable for this level of density. Existing intensification is already putting strain on the community resulting in a failure to meet the needs and safety of the community.	Remove Nawton Mall from the medium density zone; and work to bring together those interested in providing free services to this community.
Fiona Jarden	119.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter does not consider the Medium Density zoning appropriate for the Nawton Mall area citing unsuitable sopping services, current intensification, the needs of and effects on existing residents, and the impact on poorly services low socioeconomic communities.	Remove Nawton Mall from the proposed medium density plan; and Build further support services for the Nawton community
Vanessa Milne	120.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports intensification on sites over 200m2, up to 3 stories where infrastructure is capable of supporting this. The submitter seeks amendment to rear lot standards.	Support the plan change with amendments to rear lot standards.
Vanessa Milne	120.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the Historic Heritage Areas to be too broad.	Reconsider extent of Historic Heritage Areas.
Vanessa Milne	120.3	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay and the Financial contributions conditions.	Determine the infrastructure capacity to obviate individual assessments in the near term which may be costly and replicate already known capacity availability.
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Steeghs	121.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about crime and visual effects.	Reduce building height limits in residential areas to 2 stories.
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Steeghs	121.2	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effects of increase housing density on the Waikato River.	N/A
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Steeghs	121.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about crime and visual effects of housing intensification.	Reduce building height limits in residential areas to 2 stories.
Paul Burroughs	122.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about housing accessibility for those with a disability.	Require that universal design standards be used in the design and building of any multi-level housing intensification development.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Paul Burroughs	122. 2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about housing accessibility for those with disabilities.	To provide developers with discounted consent fees if their buildings are built using the Lifemark Universal design standards and are accessible to the whole Hamilton population.
Paul Burroughs	122. 3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about housing accessibility for those with a disability.	In a terraced house development where each level is self-contained that it is a requirement that the bottom level be designed to Lifemark Universal design standards.
William Harvey Douglas	123. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	Supports a compact city.	[No specific relief requested]
William Harvey Douglas	123. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about a blanket intensification approach seeking a good balance between new housing, amenities and a sufficient natural environment.	[No specific relief requested]
William Harvey Douglas	123. 3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter seeks a lower building height.	Limits buildings to 2-stories, with 3-story building being an exception if it does not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood.
William Harvey Douglas	123. 4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	4.3.2.1 (f) is supported.	[No specific relief requested]
William Harvey Douglas	123. 5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impact of housing intensification on the River.	Limit the general provision to 3-story residential developments, with 4 and 5-story buildings being exceptions if they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area; and all properties on the historic riverbank of Beerescourt Road, Awatere Avenue, and all of Ann Street be designated General Residential.
William Harvey Douglas	123. 6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impact on building heights on the River.	Limits the general provision to 5-story residential developments, with any taller buildings being exceptions if they do not adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood and/or are limited as a proportion of the overall area; and all properties on the riverbank adjacent to the Central City are limited to a lower 3-story level due to the adverse visual and environment impact of more intensive development adjacent to the city's key natural treasure.
William Harvey Douglas	123. 7	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support	Supported.	[No specific relief requested]

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
William Harvey Douglas	123.8	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the placement of speedbumps around roundabouts.	No speedbumps on roundabout exits.
Morris William Ross Broadbent	124.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about adverse effects from medium density development noting shade, parking and street access concerns.	Oppose five story buildings in the Medium Density Residential zones.
Katherine Mary Luketina	125.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>[All provisions that relate to enabling greater housing density]</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that greater housing densities will exacerbate the existing issues arising from increased parking on residential streets, such as blocked gutters and bike lanes, parking on footpaths and across driveways and damage to footpaths.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned about flooding arising from increased impervious surfaces associated with more houses on slopes.</p>	<p>[All provisions that relate to enabling greater housing density]</p> <p>Police suburban parking bylaws to a much greater degree. Police building consent conditions to a much greater degree. Require sufficient offstreet parking for all new dwellings to accommodate 1 vehicle per likely adult occupancy Increase the stormwater management provisions for high-density housing on sloping sections. Install structures such as bollards that physically prevent cars parking on the footpath.</p>
Katherine Mary Luketina	125.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>HCC is the country’s biggest heritage vandal. HCC has a heritage plan but it appears that having heritage status places a demolition bulls-eye on a building or structure, rather than making any attempts at protection and preservation. The current council has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowed the demolition of much of the historic Hamilton Hotel • Sought to demolish the Founders Hotel • Closed the Celebrating Age Centre for lack of maintenance • And in a case of egregious vandalism on a national level, demolished the 110-year old Municipal Pools, the oldest inground public swimming complex in New Zealand. <p>HCC ignores its policies regarding heritage. If HCC’s idea of ‘getting things done’ means sending the wrecking crew to demolish public heritage structures of National Significance, then this ‘getting things done’ needs to stop.</p> <p>HCC needs to start valuing its heritage and honouring its heritage plan. This means honouring not just the European heritage but pre-European as well.</p> <p>Honour the unique national significance of the Municipal Pools by building on the site a modern swimming complex that continues the heritage story of that site’s swimming history.</p>	Implement the HCC "Nga Tapuwae O Hotumauea" Maori Landmarks On Riverside Reserves Management Plan April 2003.
Katherine Mary Luketina	125.3	25.14 Transportation	General	Support in part	<p>[all the provisions that relate to providing cycling and pedestrian access, and to providing local amenities]</p> <p>The submitter supports plans to get cycle lanes installed to and make the city safer for cyclists. However, some recent examples of HCC’s moves in this direction have been ridiculous. To make a 20-minute city you need to not only make cycle lanes, preferably separate from traffic, but to build public amenities within 20 minutes walk of major concentrations of residents and workers. Hamilton is a ghetto when it comes to public swimming pools, the worst city or town in NZ. The 2017 Sport Waikato report on the provision of swimming pools in the Waikato Region shows Hamilton to be deficient in all criteria.</p>	Build a public outdoor heated swimming in the central city to provide amenity to inner-city dwellers and workers, and one in the south-east to service Hamilton East and Peacocks. Continue to develop cycle lanes throughout the city, preferably off-road.
Katherine Mary Luketina	125.4	General	General	Oppose	<p>[all the provisions that relate to SNAs]</p> <p>My husband and I have a gully section. We have restored it from privet and tradescantia to native vegetation at our own expense. We have planted hundreds of eco-sourced native plants under the guidance of a natural heritage expert. Some of our trees such as kahikatea and lemonwood are now 10-15 m high. Now the gully is an SNA we will need a permit to do any maintenance on it such as cutting down a tree that has died and become a risk to the house. The SNA provisions are draconian and counter-productive. They encourage people NOT to restore their gullies.</p>	Allow as a permitted activity reasonable maintenance within an SNA on a person’s property. Provide rates relief for that part of the property that is mapped as SNA.
Emma Furlonger-Jones	126.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about intensification and the City's infrastructure capacity.	Seek assurance that intensification can be supported by infrastructure and essential services (eg schools, medical centres and hospitals) will be included in the plans.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Emma Furlonger-Jones	126. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The seeks greater protection of greenspaces.	Seeks clarification on how all green spaces, parks and reserves in and around the city will be protected from development and continue to be managed for everyone's enjoyment.
Emma Furlonger-Jones	126. 3	25.15 Urban Design	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the City's infrastructure capacity.	Seeks assurance that intensification can be supported by infrastructure and that essential services
Emma Furlonger-Jones	126. 4	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about greenspaces.	Seeks clarification on how green spaces, parks and reserves in and around the city will be protected from development and continue to be managed for everyone's enjoyment.
Anna Kwan	127. 1	General	General	Oppose	Opposes plan provisions.	Not stated.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 1	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change and believes the zoning is broad brushed favouring developers building locations and limiting property owners rights.	Seeks the establishment of Community Boards to promote transparent discussions with stakeholders and that a community led Urban design and implementation plan should be enforced.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 2	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter mentions that existing ratepayers should not be financially liable as they will be negatively affected by development through the Plan Change. They do not believe developers will cover the cost of bulk infrastructure and the discussions around micro-systems is needed.	Seeks the establishment of Community Boards to promote transparent discussions with stakeholders.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 3	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter believes the City's transport network is in disorder with incomplete projects. A practical example of change is needed instead of being theoretical. They question how will streets be widened without compromising street infrastructure i.e. bus shelters, street lights, etc. Suggestions made with regard to implementation of one way streets, park and ride areas, mini busses in suburbs feeding larger transport networks. Focus is needed on pothole repair instead of dedicated bicycle lanes.	Seeks the establishment of community-council design team to define the volume transport routes, for multi-modal transport.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter believes individual properties are allowed to re-designate their residential status to industrial or commercial therefore the noise from these activities in residential areas is unacceptable. The lack of a heritage village puts all heritage buildings at risk.	Seeks community discussions relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of an enforcement policy that specifies a specific use for residential zones. Implementation of a historic village that is designed to retain and display the significant architectural dwellings in the city.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 5	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks Council to consider other options for managing 3 Waters as it places financial strain on the community.	Seeks discussions with the community to implement suburb or sub-division micro systems, with overflow into the main sewage system.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 6	General	General	Oppose	The submitter believes that a community volunteer workforce is capable of achieving the redevelopment outcomes sought by the city and that traditional methods i.e. wheelbarrow, shovel, bobcat should be used instead of costly machinery.	Seeks a Community-Council task force be created to design the cycling and walking routes for school children and a planting plan for volunteer implementation.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 7	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter mentions lack of transparency regarding forecasting future growth, the cost of achieving this growth and who pays. Are activities compliant with NPS-UD.	The submitter recommends stopping 'ratepayer subsidies of development'. Stop behind closed doors private developer agreements and improve decision transparency. Make the calculation for development contributions transparent and compliant with national standards.
Raymond Noel Mudford	128. 8	3.5 Rototuna	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rototuna town centre zone mentioning there is already sufficient retail and by enabling more, will create an imbalance to the economic sustainability of Hamilton. Cyclists will be in danger due to increased traffic and incomplete cycleways. They mention an element of visual pollution with power poles and inappropriate tree planting that break up footpaths. Swimming in the river should be considered (adding low cost barriers) instead of building swimming pools.	Opposes size of Rototuna town centre zone. Seek Implementation of Community Boards that can remedy the Plan Change seeing as the community has not been consulted during early stages. Community-staff engagement is important when designing and shaping a city.
Sarah Kelly	129. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter seeks further space for community structures.	Allocate space for community structures.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sarah Kelly	129.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about accessible neighbourhoods and the removal of car parking spaces.	Provision for community centres to be allocated for each community, to be within walking distance of all residents facing intensification.
Sarah Kelly	129.4	1.2 Information Requirements	General	Support in part	The submitter seeks housing that is accessible to the disabled and elderly.	Locate accessible housing near transport hubs and stops.
Sarah Kelly	129.5	General	General	Support	The submitter thanks Council for doing what it can to mitigate the effects of intensification on our city and its environment.	No specific relief sought.
Sarah Kelly	129.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about reduced daylight from 3-story development.	Amend the plan to emphasise maximum sunlight.
Knighton Normal School Board of Trustees - Camilla Carty-Melis	130.1	General	General	Support in part	Ensure access to child-accessible playgrounds, parks and nature spaces is considered when new developments are being built.	Ensure access to child-accessible playgrounds, parks and nature spaces is considered when new developments are being built.
Carolyn Gibbs	131.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter disagrees with the medium density zoning around Christobel Circle.	Remove medium density zoning from Christobel Circle.
Carolyn Gibbs	131.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks driveways and parking pads a requirement, rather than option.	That driveways and parking pads must be provided for all new dwellings.
Survey and Spatial NZ (Waikato Branch) - Marcus Brown	132.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>SSNZ broadly agrees with, and wishes to lend support to many of the concerns raised by the Property Council within their submission on Plan Change 12. In particular, we wish to support and amplify the following key points raised within their submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending proposed six storey maximum to create a varied skyline near the central city (para 4.8). Concerns over assumption of adverse effects within policies 4.2.2.2b and 4.3.2.2b and rewording to better reflect the positive impacts of development (para 4.12-4.14). Concerns over approach to walkable catchments and recommendation to align with other Tier 1 cities (para 7). Concerns over the proposed approach to heritage, character and archaeological sites (para 8). Concerns about unintended consequences and lack of clarity surrounding implementation of the proposed infrastructure capacity overlay (para 9). More on this below. Recommendation that HCC not adopt the proposed EV charging requirements (para 13.10) Concerns about the requirement for Integrated Transport Assessments to consider impact on greenhouse gas emissions (para 13.14). Concerns about a tendency toward overly prescriptive planning rules (para 14.1). SSNZ strongly agrees that overly prescriptive planning rules can frequently stifle creative solutions to site specific challenges and ultimately result in lower quality urban design outcomes. Support of incentives to encourage comprehensive and integrated developments on larger, amalgamated sites (para 14.2). 	<p>The submitter supports the Property Councils submission with regard to the following points in that submission (refer to submission #166)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending proposed six storey maximum to create a varied skyline near the central city (para 4.8). Concerns over assumption of adverse effects within policies 4.2.2.2b and 4.3.2.2b and rewording to better reflect the positive impacts of development (para 4.12-4.14). Concerns over approach to walkable catchments and recommendation to align with other Tier 1 cities (para 7). Concerns over the proposed approach to heritage, character and archaeological sites (para 8). Concerns about unintended consequences and lack of clarity surrounding implementation of the proposed infrastructure capacity overlay (para 9). Recommendation that HCC not adopt the proposed EV charging requirements (para 13.10) Concerns about the requirement for Integrated Transport Assessments to consider impact on greenhouse gas emissions (para 13.14). Concerns about a tendency toward overly prescriptive planning rules (para 14.1). SSNZ strongly agrees that overly prescriptive planning rules can frequently stifle creative solutions to site specific challenges and ultimately result in lower quality urban design outcomes. Support of incentives to encourage comprehensive and integrated developments on larger, amalgamated sites (para 14.2).
Survey and Spatial NZ (Waikato Branch) -	132.2	General	General	Support in part	<p>[Infrastructure Capacity Overlay]</p> <p>SSNZ recognizes and appreciates the need for HCC to impose controls on development commensurate with the ability of existing infrastructure to handle that development. We likewise</p>	<p>The key outcomes SSNZ wishes to pursue in the application of this [connections] policy are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maximizing certainty for landowners as to development potential of their land Minimizing administration and timeframes associated with connection applications

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Marcus Brown					acknowledge that the need for a more complex approach to controlling development on this basis (beyond simple zoning provisions) is a necessary response to the blanket requirements of the RMA Amendment Act. Nonetheless, we hold serious concerns about the administrative burden imposed by the proposed policy, the extent to which the overlay has been applied across Hamilton and the associated uncertainty that this imposes on prospective developers across the city. SSNZ understands the development of the corresponding ‘Three Waters Connection Policy’ is ongoing. The details of this will need to be carefully worked out, and SSNZ wishes to engage further with HCC in the development of this policy and its application through the District Plan.	3. Minimizing risk of connections approved/constructed for land use but inappropriate for subsequent subdivision and vesting, with associated rework.
Survey and Spatial NZ (Waikato Branch) - Marcus Brown	132.3	General	General	Support in part	[encouraging comprehensive development] SSNZ is concerned that the proposed Plan Change 12 (in alignment with the RMA Amendment Act) will give rise to a dominant ‘tri-plex’ typology owing to the streamlined (or eliminated) consenting pathway granted by the highly publicized ‘3x3’ land use rules. We anticipate scenarios where developers of large sites will favour development of vacant sites, for subsequent development in groups of 3’s, rather than a single integrated development comprising a range of housing styles, densities and holistically designed greenspace.	We recommend that HCC give serious consideration to providing financial incentives for developers willing to undertake the additional design and consenting work associated with delivering higher quality, comprehensive and integrated developments of large and amalgamated sites. We suggest that this could be achieved by reducing/waiving the financial contribution imposed on such comprehensive developments.
Survey and Spatial NZ (Waikato Branch) - Marcus Brown	132.4	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support in part	Plan Change 12 reduces the minimum net site area for a vacant lot in the general residential zone from 400m ² down to 300m ² . Nonetheless, it maintains the 15m diameter circle as a minimum shape factor (Rule 23.7.1a) and a 15m minimum transport corridor boundary length (Rule 23.7.3a). SSNZ supports the reduced net site area, however considers that a 15m frontage and shape factor circle are not appropriate for the density enabled by this rule. A 300m ² rectangular site with the 15m minimum frontage and width prescribed by these rules would require a depth of 20m, resulting in a width to length ratio of 1:1.3. In reality, good quality and functional homes are frequently constructed on narrower lots than this, with width to length ratios ranging from 1:2 (12.2m width for a 300m ² site) up to 1:3 (10m width for a 300m ² site). Enforcing wider, squarer sections will limit the variation possible in subdivision design and associated housing typology, and will likely lead to poor urban design outcomes.	SSNZ recommends reducing these requirements to a more appropriate width, and consider introducing an alternate rectangular shape factor to provide for a more appropriate range of lot shapes commensurate with the density afforded by 300m ² vacant sections. Reduce 15m minimum shape factor circles and frontage criteria for vacant lots in the general residential zone.
Leanne Nobilo	133.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impact of intensification on sunlight, access to green space, parking and transport options and housing accessibility.	Limit intensification in suburbs to 2 stories.
Hexagon Properties - Shai Ben-Yosef	134.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter takes issue with the consultation effort while also raising concern for effects on water, air and land.	Oppose the plan change.
Hexagon Properties - Shai Ben-Yosef	134.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter notes the Oak trees down Oak Ave and the potential impacts 3 story buildings will have on these trees.	[No specific relief sought.]
Hexagon Properties - Shai Ben-Yosef	134.3	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	The submitter seeks greater investment in electric public transport and bike lanes.	Invest in electric busses and bike lanes.
Hexagon Properties - Shai Ben-Yosef	134.5	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about people leaving the country and the reduced demand for housing.	Oppose Plan Change 12.
Hexagon Properties - Shai Ben-Yosef	134.6	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the need for more trees and water from intensification.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Suzanne Hayes	135.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change with concerns for school capacity, quality of living, social issues, daylight, street parking, visual effects, and climate change. Supports central city intensification.	Oppose intensification in existing residential areas; and Support Intensification in new residential areas and Hamilton City Central.
Nicole Huggard	136.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the potential loss of heritage in Hamilton East as a result of intensification.	Seek heritage status for MacFarlane Street and surrounding area.
J and G Gallagher Manageme nt - John Gallagher	137.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter seeks the 800m walkable catchment be reduced. Specifically, that the Hamilton Lake/Lake Domain Drive/Lake Rd and Parts of Pembroke Street should not be included in the 800m area from the City Centre.	Reclarify the 800m walkable catchment.
J and G Gallagher Manageme nt - John Gallagher	137.2	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General		The submitter seeks consultation on financial fees.	Consultation on any additional fee; and Clarity on what the fees are going towards.
Sharon Tattley	138.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the residential zone provisions for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of sunshine/light Change to character of neighbourhood Loss of privacy Noise & air pollution Increased traffic, parking issues, safety Impact on 3 waters With the future need for further green areas / parks / schools etc where will these go. 	Submitter seeks high density to be the same as general residential of 3 stories maximum and same guidelines.
Sharon Tattley	138.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the three waters provisions due to the impact of intensification on three waters and concern about where further green areas, parks and schools will go in the future.	Submitter seeks the high density to be the same as general residential of 3 stories maximum and same guidelines.
Sharon Tattley F Purdie	139.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change citing potential loss of sunlight, change in neighbourhood character, noise and pollution, traffic, infrastructure and greenspace issues.	Change the high density zone to general residential where the submitter lives.
Sharon Tattley F Purdie	139.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about intensifications effects on three waters and greenspaces.	Re-zone the submitters area to general residential zone.
Peter James Millar	140.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks development of sections in the outer areas of the city. Intensification concerns include privacy, sunlight, noise, recreational space, traffic, social issues and infrastructure capacity.	No specific relief sought.
Suzanne Lisa Parker Grant	141.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes medium density zoning around Chartwell citing impacts on sunlight, and social effects.	Re-zone the Chartwell suburban centre.
Suzanne Lisa Parker Grant	141.2	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support in part	The submitter has concern intensification will adversely effect efficient public transport.	Re-zone the medium density areas of Chartwell; and Increase the number of rubbish bins available at suburban bus stops.
Shirley Warner	142.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to housing intensification in their area of Gwendoline Place, Jeanette Street and Bruce Avenue where properties affect my boundary citing privacy, sunlight and traffic effects.	Oppose the building of any multi-storey housing in and around Gwendoline Place, Jeanette Street and Bruce Avenue particularly the following properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Gwendoline Place, Lot 3, DPs 8997 (boundary property) 4 Gwendoline Place, Lot 4, DPS 8997 7 Gwendoline Place, Lot 4, DPS 8997 (boundary property) 6 Gwendoline Place, Lot 6, DPS 8997 8 Gwendoline Place, Lot 8, DPS 8997

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Jeanette Street, Lot 1, DPS 8997 (boundary property) 86 Bruce Avenue, Lot 42, DPS 8373 (boundary property) 88A Bruce Avenue, Flat 1, DPS 50821 88B Bruce Avenue, Flat 2, DPS 50821 (boundary property on a cross lease) 90 Bruce Avenue, Lot 42, DPS 8373,
Tina Carey	143.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes indenisation around the Five Cross Roads area citing concerns for parking and traffic, and outdoor space.	<p>Oppose Government intensification directive.</p> <p>The submitter would like the council to consider the impact of this on young families. Lots of people will end up just living inside, not supportive of good health and will eventually become a burden on the health system.</p> <p>The Submitter would also like the council to put in place restrictions on building materials, fencing materials, plantings and even require for units that are 3-5 stories to have underground parking for at least one car per unit.</p>
Warren and Nannette Lee	144.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter supports central city intensification, however, has concern for intensification in general residential zones citing concerns for outdoor space, privacy and sunlight.	<p>Create specific zones for 3 x 3's within the general residential zone; and</p> <p>Oppose Government intensification directive.</p>
Chloe Liu	145.1	General	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the plan change.</p> <p>Hamilton is one of the largest city in NZ, we need to expand the city and attracting more people by building more affordable houses, units and town houses. Also this can help create more employment for the city. The train running for connecting Auckland and Hamilton is great, but at the moment is not enough people. So Hamilton city really need to expand for giving people more opportunities for living and working. Compare to Auckland, the high density residential zone is working well, especially for young people and family so that they can have their own home. People need more city life, the high density residential zone around our city which can help our city more active and busy!</p>	Support the plan change.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>WEL submits that the Plan Change fails to adequately include provisions for electricity distribution and renewable energy generation infrastructure which support or are consequential on the MDRS or to give effect to policies 3 and 4 of the NPS-UD. Accordingly, WEL requests amendments to the Plan Change to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the importance of network utilities in enabling growth, is recognised. Ensure networks utilities are not adversely affected by development. Ensure sufficient space within the road berm for network utilities and other infrastructure. Efficiency gains from common utility corridors and trenches. Enable renewable energy, as it will assist in supplying electricity to development anticipated by NPS-UD. Ensure vegetation in the vicinity of network utilities is appropriately chosen and planted. Ensure network utilities development within Historical Heritage Areas is not inappropriately restricted. 	The specific relief sought by WEL to address its concerns are set out in further submission points. If the specific relief is not accepted by Council, WEL alternatively requests that appropriate amendments be made to the provisions to give effect to the concerns raised by WEL.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Site Coverage	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 19.4.3a which provides for a site coverage of 35% in Historical Heritage Areas ("HHA"). WEL submits that the site coverage rules remain at the current General Residential Zone standard of 40%. Plan Change 9 introduced HHA throughout Hamilton over existing General Residential Zoned properties. The Plan Change will enable intensification of the General Residential Zone except in the vicinity of a HHA where intensification is generally not permitted without a resource consent. It is unclear why Council is proposing to restrict site coverage by 5% instead of relying on the current General Residential Zone standards, as intensification is already restricted by the HHA overlay.	Amend Rule 19.4.3a, as follows: "Front, corner or through sites (maximum % unless otherwise stated) 35 <u>40</u> %"
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable	Oppose	WEL opposes Rules 19.4.4a and 19.4.4b which provides for permeability across the entire site at 40% and permeability of front sites at 80% in HHA. Currently the Residential Zone of the District Plan provides for permeability across the entire site at 30% and permeability of front sites at 50%. Plan Change 9 introduced HHA throughout Hamilton over existing General Residential Zoned properties. The Plan Change will enable intensification of the General Residential Zone except in the vicinity of a HHA where intensification is generally not permitted without a resource consent. It	<p>amend Rules 19.4.4a and 19.4.4b, as follows:</p> <p>"a. Permeability across the entire site (including area required by Rule 19.4.5.b below) (minimum % unless otherwise stated) 40<u>30</u>%"</p> <p>b. Front sites, corner sites, through sites only: front setback (required by Rule 19.4.8 Building Setbacks) to be planted in grass, shrubs or trees (see Figure 19.4.5) 80<u>50</u>%"</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Surface and Planting		is unclear why Council is proposing to restrict site permeability by 10% and front site permeability by 30% instead of relying on the current General Residential Zone standards, as intensification is already restricted by the HHA overlay.	
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 19.4.5a which provides for building height in HHA. WEL is requesting that the building height rules reflect the rear height HHA standard of 8m. It is noted that the current height of the General Residential Zone provides for buildings of 10m. Plan Change 9 introduced HHA throughout Hamilton over existing General Residential Zoned properties. The Plan Change will enable intensification of the General Residential Zone except in the vicinity of a HHA where intensification is generally not permitted without a resource consent. It is unclear why Council is proposing to restrict the building height for front sites, as intensification is already restricted by the HHA overlay.	amends Rule 19.4.5a, as follows: "a. Front, corner and through site (maximum height unless otherwise stated) HAA - except Temple View HHA All buildings shall have a maximum height of: i. The original height of the building on the subject site; or 8m ii. The average of existing heights of buildings on adjacent sites, being the three sites on either side of the subject site or six sites on one side of the subject site. Whichever is higher"
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 19.4.7a which provides for a front boundary setback in HHA. Currently the Residential Zone of the District Plan provides for a front boundary setback of 3m. Plan Change 9 introduced HHA throughout Hamilton over existing General Residential Zoned properties. The Plan Change will enable intensification of the General Residential Zone except in the vicinity of a HHA where intensification is generally not permitted without a resource consent. It is unclear why Council is proposing to restrict the building front boundary setbacks, intensification is already restricted by the HHA overlay.	amends Rule 19.4.7a, as follows: Activity From a boundary with - any transport corridor (minimum setback unless otherwise stated) HHA Except for Temple View HHA, all HHAs: All buildings shall be set back from the boundary the greater of: i. 3m The front setback of the original building on the subject site; or ii. The average of existing front setback of buildings on adjacent sites, being the three sites on either side of the subject site or six sites on one side of the subject site.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.6	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	WEL requests that Policy 23.2.2a is amended to ensure that it is demonstrated that building platforms can be located in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances ("NZECP 34:2001"). Further WEL request that the policy be amended to ensure that vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003 ("Tree Regs"). Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for future development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The amended policy will ensure that a compliant building platform can be provided.	amends Policy 23.2.2a, as follows: i. Is in general accordance with Subdivision Design Assessment Criteria to achieve good amenity and design outcomes. ii. Is in general accordance with any relevant Structure Plan. iii. Is in general accordance with any relevant Integrated Catchment Management Plan. v. Promotes energy, water and resource efficiency. vi. Provides for the recreational needs of the community. vii. Discourages cross-lease land ownership. viii. Ensures that any allotment is suitable for activities anticipated for the zone in which the subdivision is occurring. ix. Contributes to future residential development being able to achieve densities that are consistent with the growth management policies of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and Future Proof. x. Avoids or minimises adverse effects on the safe and efficient operation, maintenance of and access to network utilities and the transport network. xi. Is avoided where significant adverse effects on established network utilities or the transport network are likely to occur. xii. Promotes connectivity and the integration of transport networks. xiii. Provides appropriate facilities for walking, cycling and passenger transport usage. xiv. Provides and enhances public access to and along the margins of the Waikato River and the City's lakes, gullies and rivers. xv. Facilitates good amenity and urban design outcomes by taking existing electricity transmission infrastructure into account in subdivision design, and where possible locating compatible activities such as infrastructure, roads or open space under or in close proximity to electricity transmission infrastructure. xvi. Ensures that a compliant building platform can be accommodated within the subdivided allotment outside of the National Grid Yard. <u>xvii. In the vicinity of electricity infrastructure demonstrates that building platforms can be located in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> <u>xviii. Ensures that vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</u>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.7	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	WEL supports Rules 23.3.a.iv, 23.3.c.iv and 23.3.d.iv as they enable subdivision to accommodate a network utility as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	That Council retains Rules 23.3iv, 23.3iv and 23.3iv, as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.8	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support in part	WEL requests that a new standard be included as 23.6.7. The standard will give effect to Policy 23.2.2a. The standard is proposed to ensure that any subdivision demonstrates that building platforms can be located in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Further WEL request that the standard be amended to ensure that vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Tree Regs. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for future development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed standard will ensure that a compliant and safe building platform can be provided.	includes a new standard, as follows: <p><u>"23.6.7 Subdivision Activities adjacent Electricity Distribution Infrastructure</u> <u>Any subdivision in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure must demonstrate that building platforms can be located in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> <u>Vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure should be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003."</u></p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.9	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivisi on Suitabilit y	Support	WEL supports Rule 23.7.2b as the rule excludes network utility allotments from complying with the standards included in section 23.7.	That Council retains Rule 23.7.2b, as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.10	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	<p>WEL supports in part Policy 25.14.2.1b. However, WEL requests that the policy is amended to ensure that the vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure is selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. The requested amendment would be consistent with Objective 18.2.4 and Policy 18.2.4a which seeks to enable non-network utility activities provided they do not compromise the function, safety and efficiency of the transport corridor, and the provision and operation of network utility infrastructure.</p> <p>WEL supports in part Policy 25.14.2.1hE. However, WEL requests the inclusion of associated electricity infrastructure that supplies the charging facilities, which is an essential function to their operation.</p> <p>WEL supports in part Policy 25.14.2.1q. WEL requests that the policy is amended to ensure that the vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p>	<p>amends 25.14.2.1b, as follows: "Climate Change Policy 25.14.2.1b Promote the establishment and maintenance of a continuous tree canopy along transport corridors to improve amenity for corridor users and adjoining land use, <u>and to</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimise the urban heat island effects of urban intensification, • enhance biodiversity and ecological function, • provide summer shade to make the corridors more comfortable for walking, cycling, and micro-mobility during hotter weather, and store carbon. <p><u>Provided that the vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003."</u></p> <p>amends Policy 25.14.2.1hE, as follows: "Manage the design, location, quantity, and pricing of any parking infrastructure provided in a way that: ... E. Provides charging facilities for electric powered vehicles <u>and associated electricity infrastructure</u> and micromobility devices."</p> <p>amends Policy 25.14.2.1q, as follows "Encourage the planting, retention, and maintenance of indigenous trees and vegetation within transport corridors, where appropriate <u>and provided it does not interfere with network utilities</u>, to recognise and reflect ecological, amenity, cultural, and landscape values and to support the establishment and enhancement of ecological corridors."</p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.11	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	WEL supports in part Rule 25.14.4.2b which requires new residential activities to provide an electric vehicle charging point for each vehicle parking space provided. However, WEL submits that one vehicle charging point per parking space is excessive and not required. WEL considers that one vehicle charging point per dwelling is reasonable.	Amends Rule 25.14.4.2b, as follows: "a. All new residential activities with on-site vehicle parking must provide an electric vehicle charging point for each vehicle parking space provided. Note An electric vehicle charging point excludes the charging cable that connects between a residential unit’s electrical outlet and the electric vehicle. The owner or driver of the electric vehicle is expected to provide this."
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.12	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		WEL supports in part Rule 25.14.4.3a Travel Plan Requirements. However, WEL requests that Council includes a note to Rule 25.14.4.3a to exempt network utility activities. Construction or operation of network utility activities may trigger the requirement for a travel plan as the proposal may require the construction of a building on previously vacant land and/or the introduction of a new use. To ensure clarity WEL requests that the note be included to exempt network utility activities. It is noted that network utility sites are generally unmanned and do not generate large volumes of traffic.	That Council amends Rule 25.14.4.3a Travel Plan Requirements by including a note under point (v), as follows: <u>"Note: 25.14.4.3a does not apply to Network Utilities."</u>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.13	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All	Support in part	WEL supports in part Policy 4.1.2.4d which requires non- residential activities to serve the local community. WEL submits that the policy be amended to exclude regional significant infrastructure which are non-residential and, in some circumstances, required to locate in residential areas but serve the region rather than the local community.	amend Policy 4.1.2.4d, as follows: "Non-residential activities must only serve the local residential area, <u>excluding regionally significant infrastructure</u> , and be of a size that reflects the anticipated residential amenity of the neighbourhood"

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Residential Zones			
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.14	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	WEL supports Objective 4.1.2.5 and Policy 4.1.2.5b and supports in part Policy 4.1.2.5a which requires development to encourage the efficient use of energy and water through reducing the use of reticulated electricity while utilising solar energy and charging infrastructure. The policies fail to address that the demand for reticulated electricity infrastructure is only going to increase with intensification and more reliance on electric vehicles and small and community scale renewable energy. Further it is noted that increased electricity usage offsets more pollution intensive activities at a local level, such as fireplaces. The explanation to the objective and associated policies states that Residential units, for example, may wish to install solar panels on the roof and install a rainwater tank and provide infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles. Part of the infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles includes the chargers as well as the electricity reticulation supplying the chargers.	amend Policy 4.1.2.5a, as follows: "Development must encourage the efficient use of energy and water, by: i. Incorporating water-sensitive techniques. ii. Off-setting the effects of loss of permeable surface iii. Reducing the use of reticulated electricity. iv. Utilizing solar energy. v". Providing for electric mobility and its associated charging infrastructure. retain Objective 4.1.2.5 and Policy 4.1.2.5b
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.15	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	WEL supports Policy 4.1.2.6cviii and requests that a new Policy 4.1.2.6d is included to ensure buildings and development are located in positions that comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed policy ensures that complying development is provided.	retain Policy 4.1.2.6cviii include Policy 4.1.2.6d, as follows: " <u>Policy 4.1.2.6d</u> <u>Ensure buildings and structures adjacent to electricity infrastructure in the Transport Corridor can comply with NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> "
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.16	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 4.2.5.6a which provides for a setback from the Transport corridor of 1.5m. WEL requests that the rule is amended to ensure buildings and development are located in positions to comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed rule will give effect to proposed Policy 4.1.2.6d and ensures that complying development is provided.	Amends Rule 4.2.5.6a, as follows: "a. Transport corridor boundary – 1.5m, <u>provided the building or structure can achieve compliance with NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> "
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.17	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 4.3.5.6a which provides for a setback from the Transport Corridor of 1m to 1.5m. WEL requests that the rule is amended to ensure buildings and development are located in positions to comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed rule will give effect to proposed Policy 4.1.2.6d and ensures that complying development is provided.	Amends Rule 4.3.5.6a, as follows: "a. Transport corridor boundary – 1 to 1.5m, <u>provided the building or structure can achieve compliance with NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> "
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.18	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	WEL opposes Rule 4.4.5.6a which provides for a setback from the Transport Corridor of 1m. WEL requests that the rule is amended to ensure buildings and development are located in positions to comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed rule will give effect to proposed Policy 4.1.2.6d and ensures that complying development is provided.	Amends Rule 4.4.5.6a, as follows: "a. Transport corridor boundary – 1m, <u>provided the building or structure can achieve compliance with NZ Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001).</u> "
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.19	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	[Community scale energy generation (produces less than 20kW)] WEL requests that the definition of community scale energy generation is amended to be more enabling of renewable energy generation. The definition currently places a 20kW restriction on all community-scale renewable energy generation and it is unclear what the effects of 20kW generation versus 21kW or more. WEL considers that the 20kW limit is arbitrary and doesn't translate to actual effects. It is noted that the scale of generation is limited in scale by the means of only being able to supply the community or connect to the distribution network (i.e., instead of Transpower's National Grid). Renewable energy will become increasingly important to New Zealand's future and in particular to the intensification of Hamilton. The rules for renewable energy should be more enabling.	Amend the definition of community scale energy generation, as follows: "Community scale energy generation: (produces less than 20kW) : Means renewable energy generation for the purpose of using electricity on a particular site, supplying an immediate community, or connecting into the distribution network (but excludes solar panels supplying electricity for the site on which they are located)."
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.20	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	WEL supports in part the definition of electric charging point which provides specific details on charging point requirements. WEL request that the definition is amended to reference AS/NZS 3000:2018 7.9.3 to a Mode 2 charging point. A Mode 2 charger would only require a standard power socket to be installed to comply with NZS PAS 6011:2021, whereas a Mode 2 charger to comply to AS/NZS 3000:2018 7.9.3 would require a minimal current-carrying capacity of 20A and unable to supply any other socket- outlet point or point in wiring.	Amend the definition of electric vehicle charging point, as follows: "Means either a Mode 2 <u>as defined in AS/NZS 3000:2018 7.9.3</u> or Mode 3 electric vehicle charger as defined in NZS PAS 6011:2021. Note An electric vehicle charging point excludes the charging cable that connects between a residential unit's electrical outlet and the electric vehicle. The owner or driver of the electric vehicle is expected to provide this."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.21	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	WEL supports the definition of “redevelopment of impermeable surfaces” as it excludes trenching and resurfacing associated with the installation, maintenance, repair and replacement of underground equipment, underground infrastructure, or underground utility works.	retain the definition of redevelopment of impermeable surfaces.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.22	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	<p>[Small-scale energy generation (produces less than 20kW)]</p> <p>WEL requests that the definition of small-scale energy generation is amended to be more enabling of renewable energy generation. The definition currently places a 20kW restriction on all renewable and it is unclear what the effects of 20kW generation versus 21kW or more. WEL considers that the 20kW limit is arbitrary and doesn’t translate to actual effects. Small scale energy generation is already restricted by the requirement to only serve the site. Renewable energy will become increasingly important to New Zealand's future and in particular to the intensification of Hamilton. The rules for renewable energy should be more enabling.</p>	Amend the definition of community scale energy generation, as follows: "Small-scale energy generation (produces less than 20kW): Means renewable energy generation for the purpose of using electricity on a particular site or connecting into the distribution network (but excludes solar panels supplying electricity for the site on which they are located)."
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.23	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	WEL supports in part the definition of Transport Infrastructure. The definition includes the provision of electric vehicles, but it is not clear that it includes electric vehicle chargers. WEL submits that the definition is amended to make it clear that it includes electric vehicle chargers which can be located in some instances adjacent to parking and loading spaces for cars and buses.	amends the definition of Transport Infrastructure as follows: "Means any structure that is necessary for the functioning of the transport network and that caters for the needs of transport users. This includes but is not limited to surfacing and pavement, traffic services and structures such as transport lighting, bridges, retaining walls, bus shelters, taxi shelters, information fixtures for bus passengers, parking and loading spaces and facilities, end-of-journey facilities, litter bins, drinking fountains, charging points for mobility scooters, electric vehicles <u>and</u> micro-mobility devices, and public seating."
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.24	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control	Support in part	WEL supports in part the matters of control contained in section 1.3.2g which provide for subdivision in the residential areas. However, WEL request that a new matter of control is included to ensure that building platforms can be located in positions where a subsequent building can comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Further WEL request that the policy be amended to ensure that vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure should be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Tree Regs. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the Transport Corridor, there is potential for future development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The proposed policy ensure that a compliant building platform can be provided.	<p>Amend 1.3.2g Controlled Activities – Matters of Control, as follows:</p> <p>"G. Subdivision</p> <p>Subdivision within the General Residential, Medium density and High Density Residential Zones.</p> <p>i. The extendt to which the subdivision does not increase the noncompliance with the Standards within the Residential Chapter.</p> <p>ii. The subdivision contains an existing residential unit or a land use consent has been granted or is accompanied by a land use consent.</p> <p>iii. No vacant allotments are created.</p> <p><u>iv. The proximity of allotments to any existing network utilities and any requirements that may be considered necessary to ensure the continued safe, efficient and effective operation of those network utilities is not compromised.</u>"</p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.25	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	WEL supports in part 1.3.3.G1.h which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana by enhancing public access to the Waikato River and planting along transport corridors. WEL request that 1.3.3.G1.h be amended to refer to Policy 25.14.2.1q (subject to amendment) ensure appropriate plant selection in Transport Corridors, in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure, be selected and/or managed so that the Tree Regs are not breached. The proposed amendment would be consistent with Objective 18.2.4 and Policy 18.2.4a which seeks to enable non-network utility activities provided they do not compromise the function, safety and efficiency of the transport corridor, and the provision and operation of network utility infrastructure.	<p>Amend 1.3.3.G1.h. as follows:</p> <p>"Transportation General</p> <p>G1 The extent to which the proposal:</p> <p>...</p> <p>h. Gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana by:</p> <p>i. Realising opportunities to maintain and enhance public access to and along the Waikato River in accordance with Policy 2.2.2b</p> <p>ii. Including the planting, retention, and maintenance of indigenous trees and vegetation within transport corridors, <u>in accordance with Policy 25.14.2.1q</u> and supporting the establishment of ecological corridors."</p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.26	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment	Support in part	WEL supports in part 1.3.3.G9.f which seeks to ensure that vehicle crossing points do not obstruct access to network utilities. The requirement as worded is supported and will ensure that WEL are able to access network utility equipment for maintenance and repair. However, the matter of discretion fails to address how intensification may affecting existing electricity infrastructure in some circumstances entranceways/driveways being created in unsafe locations in the vicinity of existing infrastructure. Further, Objective 25.7.2.1 provides for the importance of network utilities to support the development and functioning of Hamilton is recognised. Policy 25.7.2.1b seeks to ensure that existing network utilities shall not be adversely affected by subdivision, land use and development.	<p>Amend 1.3.3.G9.f. as follows:</p> <p>"Transportation Access</p> <p>G9 The extent to which the proposal minimises the number of vehicle access points to transport corridors, considering:</p> <p>...</p> <p>f. Potential obstruction for access to network utilities <u>and potential for network utilities to be in unsafe locations.</u>"</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			ent Criteria			
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.27	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>[I Network Utilities and Transmission; Network Utilities]</p> <p>WEL supports in part section I of the assessment criteria which seeks to ensure that network utilities to not generate adverse effects. However, this section fail address how development may adversely affect network utilities, specifically electricity distribution infrastructure. Through the intensification of Hamilton and the reduction of setbacks from the transport corridor, there is potential for future development to be located in positions which may breach NZECP 34:2001. The assessment criteria sought will ensure that development does not adversely affect existing electricity distribution infrastructure. Further, the amendment will ensure appropriate plant selection in transport corridors in the vicinity of electricity infrastructure should be selected and/or managed so that it does not breach the Tree Regs. The proposed amendments would be consistent with Objective 18.2.4 and Policy 18.2.4a which seeks to enable non-network utility activities provided they do not compromise the function, safety and efficiency of the transport corridor, and the provision and operation of network utility infrastructure. It is noted that I7 does not relate to electricity distribution infrastructure.</p>	<p>include new assessment criteria I12, as follows:</p> <p><u>"Electricity Distribution</u> <u>I12 The extent to which the location, height, scale, orientation and use of buildings and structures is appropriate to manage the following effects.</u> <u>a. The risk to the structural integrity of the electricity distribution line.</u> <u>b. The effects on the ability of the electricity distribution line owner to access, operate, maintain and upgrade the electricity distribution network.</u> <u>c. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and risk of property damage.</u> <u>d. The extent of earthworks required, and use of mobile machinery near distribution lines, which may put the line at risk.</u> <u>e. Minimising adverse effects including reverse sensitivity, visual and nuisance effects on and from distribution lines.</u> <u>Note: The New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice NZECP 34:2001 contain restrictions on the location of structures in relation to lines.</u></p> <p><u>I13. The extent of separation between specified building envelopes and existing lines ensures any adverse effects on and from the electricity distribution network and on public safety are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u> <u>I14. The extent of separation between the location of any proposed trees and existing electricity distribution lines, taking into account:</u> <u>a. The likely mature height of the trees,</u> <u>b. Whether they have potential to interfere with the lines, and</u> <u>c. Whether an alternative location for the trees would be more suitable to meet the operational requirements of the lines’ owner.</u> <u>Note: All trees/vegetation planted near electricity distribution lines must achieve compliance with the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</u></p> <p><u>I15 The extent to which appropriate safeguards are in place to avoid contact or flashovers from lines, and effects on the stability of support structures.</u> <u>Note: All earthworks, including the use of mobile plant, must comply with the requirements of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice 34:2001 (NZECP 34:2001)."</u></p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.28	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-5 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Support in part	<p>[Residential Land Use Environment; Berm Requirements; Service corridor (min desirable)]</p> <p>WEL support in part Table 15-5a)i: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridor for Berm Requirements. However, WEL request that the word “desirable” be replace with “required”. The reasoning for this request is to ensure that more scrutiny is placed on achieving a higher level of compliance. WEL submits that the berm widths provided for in Table 15-5a)i are sufficient to enable underground utilities as well as footpaths, amenity planting and road furniture. A width any less will likely create long term issues such as utility congestion, potential root damage to utilities and disruption of planting and furniture during maintenance and upgrading of utilities. Further, it is noted that the restricted discretionary activity status currently provides for a level of flexibility regardless of the wording, however the word ‘required’ rather than ‘desirable’ may encourage a higher level of achieving compliance with the berm widths to avoid long term problems.</p>	<p>Amend Table 15-5a)i: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridor, as follows:</p> <p>"Berm Requirements Service corridor (min desirable <u>required</u>)"</p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.29	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-5 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Support in part	<p>[Berm Requirements; Service corridor (min desirable)]</p> <p>WEL support in part Table 15-5a)ii: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridor for Berm Requirements. However, WEL request that the word “desirable” be replace with “required”. The reasoning for this request is to ensure that more scrutiny is placed on achieving a higher level of compliance. WEL submits that the berm widths provided for in Table 15-5a)ii are sufficient to enable underground utilities as well as footpaths, amenity planting and road furniture. A width any less will likely create long term issues such as utility congestion, potential root damage to utilities and disruption of planting and furniture during maintenance and upgrading of utilities. Further, it is noted that the restricted discretionary activity status currently provides for a level of flexibility regardless of the wording, however the word ‘required’ rather than ‘desirable’ may encourage a higher level of achieving compliance with the berm widths to avoid long term problems.</p>	<p>Amends Table 15-5a)ii: Criteria for the form of Transport Corridor, as follows:</p> <p>"Berm Requirements Service corridor (min desirable <u>required</u>)"</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.30	General	General	Support in part	<p>[25.7 Network Utilities]</p> <p>WEL requests that Rule 25.7.3xx is amended which provides for community scale distributed renewable energy. WEL submits that the activity status should be restricted discretionary activity rather than discretionary. WEL submits that renewable energy will become increasingly important to New Zealand's future and in particular to the intensification of Hamilton. The rules for renewable energy should be more enabling.</p> <p>WEL requests that a new rule is included to enable roof top solar panels and solar heating systems for the purposes of serving more than one site as a permitted activity. Currently if large scale solar was installed on the roof top of a commercial or industrial building for the purposes of serving the site and other sites, resource consent would likely be required. Solar power will become increasingly important to New Zealand's future and in particular to the intensification of Hamilton, through (for example) installing commercial scale solar on roof tops of industrial and commercial buildings to supply communities. It is renewable, one of the cheapest forms of renewable energy, and has advantages over wind in terms of construction times and the potential for adverse effects. It is critical that the District Plan makes provision for community scale solar farms in appropriate sites.</p> <p>WEL requests that Rule 25.7.5.5a is amended which provides for cabinets and other structures in the Industrial, Ruakura Industrial Park, Te Rapa North Industrial, Business 1 to 7, Central City and Ruakura Logistics zones ii. Transport Corridor Zone and all other zones. WEL submit that there is uncertainty regarding whether overhead transformers or batteries are included in the rule and request their specific inclusion to remove any ambiguity. Batteries, and other forms of network utility infrastructure will become increasingly important as the country moves towards a higher capacity of renewable energy, the demand for electricity increases through intensification. For these reasons it is important that there is a clear understanding of which forms of infrastructure are permitted.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.7.3xx, as follows: "xx. Community scale distributed renewable energy generation – <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary"</p> <p>Include a new rule to enable roof top solar panels and solar heating systems for the purposes of serving more than one site, as follows: "yy. Solar panels and solar heating systems for the purposes of serving the site on which they are located - Permitted zz. Solar panels and solar heating systems for the purposes of serving more than one site - Restricted Discretionary <u>zzz. Roof top solar panels and solar heating systems for the purposes of serving more than one site - Permitted</u>"</p> <p>amends Rule 25.7.5.5a, as follows: "a) Maximum volume for individual cabinets, <u>batteries</u> or other above ground <u>or overhead structures</u> for electricity and telecommunications: i. Industrial, Ruakura Industrial Park, Te Rapa North Industrial, Business 1 to 7, Central City and Ruakura Logistics zones ii. Transport Corridor Zone and all other zones"</p>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	146.31	General	General	Support in part	<p>[25.8 Noise and Vibration]</p> <p>WEL requests that Rule 25.8.3.6a for Events and Temporary Activities is amended to include the provision of Temporary generators, as a permitted activity. WEL submit that temporary generators are currently not exempt from noise rules, and this can become problematic when a generator is required for emergency and maintenance situation where temporary generation is required. Intensification will trigger the need to upgrade existing infrastructure and, in some instances, generators will be required to keep existing electricity supply operational.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.8.3.6a, as follows: "a) The relevant zone noise standards shall apply to all events and temporary activities, except as provided in Rule 25.3.5.2(c), and 25.3.5.3(e) <u>and 25.7.6.3.</u>"</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.1	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support	Transpower supports the introductory text and reference to Qualifying Matters as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA.	Retain the text that refers to ‘Qualifying Matters’.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Transpower supports the reference to Qualifying Matters as it assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA. However, Transpower considers that there is a need to ensure that the plan provisions themselves (not just the s32 report) are explicit about what are qualifying matters. As notified, qualifying matters are not identified in the plan.	Subject to clarification within the plan as to qualifying matters, retain the text that refers to ‘qualifying matters’. Transpower has sought that clarification be provided through the provision of a definition for ‘Qualifying matter’ and ‘Qualifying matter area’. Should this not be accepted, Transpower seeks the listing of qualifying matters (and specifically the National Grid) within section 2.1 Purpose.
Transpower New Zealand	147.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use,	Support	Transpower supports retention of this policy, noting that it provides support for application of the National Grid as a qualifying matter.	Retain Policy 2.2.13a.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Limited - Pauline Whitney			Transport and Infrastructure			
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	<p>Objective 2.2.14 - Transpower supports clause (i), and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety and acknowledging that clause (i) reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(a) of the RMA. Transpower is neutral in regard to clause (ii).</p> <p>Policy 2.2.14b - On the basis that the High-Density Residential Zone is not located near the Central City Zone, Transpower is neutral on this policy.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.14c - Transpower is generally supportive of this policy which provides direction on how the Medium Density Residential Zone has been identified.</p>	<p>Retain Strategic Objective 2.2.14.</p> <p>Retain Policy 2.2.14b, if current extent of Central City Zone is not altered.</p> <p>Retain Policy 2.2.14c.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	The Purpose section currently refers to the Vision and Strategy – Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato and indicates its relevance to residential development. Similarly, it refers to Historic Heritage and notes that the Chapter 19 provisions take preference over those in Chapter 4. Transpower considers that it is appropriate to also include other qualifying matters to be clear where they take precedence over or influence the provisions in Chapter 4. Suggested text is set out in relation to the National Grid, but could be expanded to generally refer to all qualifying matters and list those of relevance (including historic heritage).	<p>Insert the following sub-section after the ‘Historic Heritage’ sub-section in 4.1.1 Purpose: <u>"National Grid Corridors</u></p> <p><u>The District Plan includes provisions applying to activities and built form within the National Grid Yard and National Grid Corridor (see Chapter 25.7: Network Utilities and the Electricity National Grid Corridor). Within the Corridor, the provisions within Chapter 25.7 take precedence over Chapter 4."</u></p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.2 - Transpower is generally supportive of the broad outcome sought through this objective. However, in some areas, the planned urban built character will be limited by a qualifying matter, and Transpower considers it necessary that the provisions are explicit regarding this.</p> <p>Policy 4.1.2.2d - Transpower supports the direction to manage effects of new buildings and activities on regionally significant infrastructure. However, in the case of the National Grid Corridor provisions, avoidance rather than mitigation is required in some instances, consistent with Policies 25.7.2.1c, 25.7.2.1d and 25.7.2.1f. A change is sought to reflect this.</p> <p>Explanation - Transpower supports explicit recognition that residential activities need to be managed as they relate to regionally significant infrastructure. Some additional wording is sought to provide greater clarity and better reflect the objective and policy direction.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 4.1.2.2 as follows: "Development maximises the use of land by providing a range of housing typologies that are <u>generally</u> consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, <u>taking into account any qualifying matters</u>, while ensuring the provision of infrastructure services as part of any development."</p> <p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.2d as follows: "New buildings and activities shall <u>avoid or</u> mitigate effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure."</p> <p>Amend the fourth and fifth paragraphs in the ‘Explanation’ to Objective 4.1.2.2 and its related policies, as follows: "The use of land can be affected by the presence of infrastructure, <u>as well as compromise the infrastructure itself</u>. Not only does residential development need to have an adequate level of servicing available, but it needs to respond to regionally significant infrastructure, such as telecommunication infrastructure or the national electricity grid, either existing or planned. <u>In some instances this will require the avoidance of residential activities</u>."</p> <p>The policies recognise the need to manage <u>and, in some instances, avoid</u> residential land uses around regionally significant infrastructure, both existing and proposed – both to manage the effects that residential activities and structures can have on the infrastructure, as well as the adverse effects that the infrastructure can have on residential uses.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	<p>Objective 4.1.2.3 - Transpower supports the objective, and in particular the recognition of wellbeing and health and safety, acknowledging that is also reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(a) of the RMA.</p> <p>Policy 4.1.2.3a - Transpower supports the clear reference to qualifying matters, and how they override the height and density standards that would otherwise apply within the relevant residential zones. The policy assists in plan interpretation and gives effect to the RMA. However, as this is the key policy direction which explicitly identifies how qualifying matters relate to the provisions otherwise applying in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones, Transpower considers it necessary to be explicit about what the qualifying matters are that are applied in the ODP. This can be achieved by including a definition of ‘qualifying matters’ which lists all relevant matters.</p> <p>Explanation - Transpower note that the explanation appears to relate to Objective 4.1.2.4 and its related policies; but does not refer to the matters addressed in Objective 4.1.2.3 and its related policies. Transpower considers that an explanation should be included in relation to Objective 4.1.2.3 as well.</p>	<p>Retain Objective 4.1.2.3.</p> <p>Retain Policy 4.1.2.3a.</p> <p>Separate out Objective 4.1.2.4 and its related policies from Objective 4.1.2.3 and add an explanation relating to Objective 4.1.2.3 and policies 4.1.2.3a-d. Or Amend the current explanation to also encompass the matters addressed in Objective 4.1.2.3 and policies 4.1.2.3a-d.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	<p>Objective 4.2.2.2 - Transpower supports the objective, nothing that it reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, clause (6)(1)(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Policy 4.2.2.2a - Within the General Residential Zone, existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA), Transpower supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.</p>	<p>Retain Objective 4.2.2.2.</p> <p>Amend Policy 4.2.2.2a as follows: "Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 1,2 and 3-storey attached and detached residential units., <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u>"</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this note, which ensures that plan users are aware of the application of the National Grid Corridor to activities in this zone. This note is important in making it clear that the National Grid Corridors are applied as a qualifying matter.	Retain 'Note' under 4.2.3.1 activity status table.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.8 Provisions in Other Chapters	Support	Transpower supports reference to Chapter 25: City-wide which contains the land use provisions pertaining to the National Grid. This explicit reference is necessary to ensure that it is clear that the provisions in Chapter 25 continue to apply as the National Grid is a qualifying matter.	Retain 4.2.8, particularly the reference to Chapter 25, and provided that the note above (under 4.2.3.1 Activity status tables) is retained.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Policy 4.3.2.2a - Within the Medium Density Residential Zone, existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive is supported (and reflects Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA), Transpower supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.	Amend Policy 4.3.2.2a as follows: "Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3 to 5 storey terrace residential units and apartment buildings., <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u> "
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	Transpower supports the inclusion of this note, which ensures that plan users are aware of the application of the National Grid Corridor to activities in this zone. This note is important in making it clear that the National Grid Corridors are applied as a qualifying matter.	Retain 'Note' under 4.3.3.1 activity status table.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.8 Provisions in Other Chapters	Support	Transpower supports reference to Chapter 25: City-wide which contains the land provisions pertaining to the National Grid. This explicit reference is necessary to ensure that it is clear that the provisions in Chapter 25 continue to apply as the National Grid is a qualifying matter.	Retain 4.3.8, particularly the reference to Chapter 25, and provided that the note above (under 4.3.3.1 Activity status tables) is retained.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.14	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General		On the basis the extent of the High Density Residential Zone is not amended, Transpower is neutral on the extent (as notified) and nature of provisions on the High Density Residential zone. However, should the zone extent be amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone, Transpower seeks that the relief sought in its submission points to the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones are also applied to the High Density Residential Zone.	Should the HRZ extent be amended such that existing National Grid assets traverse the zone, Transpower seeks that the relief sought in its submission points to the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones are also applied to the High Density Residential Zone.
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.15	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	Activities 23.3av, vi, vii, xii - Transpower supports the explicit exemption in the proposed rules to clause xii, which relates to subdivision involving any allotments within the Electricity National Grid Corridor. This ensures that it is clear how the qualifying matter is to be applied.	Retain exemption in v., vi., and vii in Table 23.3a, for subdivision provided in xii.
Transpower New Zealand	147.16	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support	Rule 23.6.7 - Transpower agrees with the retention of this rule, which is necessary to give effect to the National Grid Corridor being applied as a qualifying matter.	Retain Rule 23.6.7 without amendment.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Limited - Pauline Whitney						
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.17	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	<p>New definition – Qualifying Matter - Transpower considers that it is necessary to include a definition of ‘qualifying matter’ to highlight to plan users the existence of the matters and to support Policy 4.1.2.3a. The definition reflects that provided within the RMA.</p> <p>New definition – Qualifying Matter Area - The concept of qualifying matters was introduced within the RMA. As outlined in Appendix C to this submission, as defined by section 77I and 77O of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); and it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure. <p>Given the role and importance of qualifying matter areas to the implementation of the RMA, Transpower considers that a definition of ‘qualifying matter’ is required within PC12 to link back to the RMA. In addition, Transpower submits it would be of further benefit to plan users to provide a clear list as to what are qualifying matter areas in the ODP (i.e. spatially defined areas within which qualifying matters apply), and specifically, provide explicit reference to the National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor as a qualifying matter area. To differentiate between the RMA provided definition of ‘qualifying matter’, a definition of ‘qualifying matter area’ is proposed.</p>	<p>Insert a definition for ‘Qualifying Matter’ as follows: "<u>Qualifying matter has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA: means a matter referred to in section 77I or 77O</u></p> <p>The matters referred to in section 77I and 77O are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. a matter of national importance that decision makers are required to recognise and provide for under section 6:</u> <u>b. a matter required in order to give effect to a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD) or the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010:</u> <u>c. a matter required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato—the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River:</u> <u>d. a matter required to give effect to the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 or the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008:</u> <u>e. a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure:</u> <u>f. open space provided for public use, but only in relation to land that is open space:</u> <u>g. the need to give effect to a designation or heritage order, but only in relation to land that is subject to the designation or heritage order:</u> <u>h. a matter necessary to implement, or to ensure consistency with, iwi participation legislation:</u> <u>i. the requirement in the NPS-UD to provide sufficient business land suitable for low density uses to meet expected demand:</u> <u>j. any other matter that makes higher density development as provided for by policy 3, as the case requires, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77R is satisfied/any other matter that makes higher density, as provided for by the MDRS or policy 3, inappropriate in an area, but only if section 77L is satisfied."</u> <p>Insert a definition for ‘Qualifying Matter Area’ as follows: "<u>Qualifying matter area means an area within which the following qualifying matters apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) The National Grid Yard</u> <u>(b) The National Grid Subdivision Corridor</u> <u>(c) (other qualifying matters to be listed)"</u>
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Pauline Whitney	147.18	General	General	Support	<p>[Section 32; Appendix 2.4 Qualifying Matters Assessment]</p> <p>1.1 Qualifying Matters for Hamilton City Operative District Plan (ODP) - Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter within the Section 32.</p> <p>2.6 National Grid Yards - Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports the conclusion that enabling built form to the level of the MDRS and policy 3 within the National Grid Yard is inappropriate. Further consideration of this is provided in Appendix C to this submission.</p> <p>2.7 National Grid Corridors - Although not forming part of the IPI, Transpower supports the assessment that the risks of adopting the existing provisions and rules as a way to modify MDRS to ensure the protection, maintenance and where possible the enhancement of these Qualifying Matters, are far outweighed by the risks of not acting. Transpower notes that the assessment only refers to Rule 25.7.6.1. However, the National Grid Corridor is also implemented through Chapter 23 – Subdivision. For the reasons outlined in this submission and expanded on in Appendix C to this submission, it is appropriate to continue to apply the current subdivision provisions applying within the Corridor (as proposed in PC12) as a Qualifying Matter.</p>	<p>[Section 32; Appendix 2.4 Qualifying Matters Assessment]</p> <p>1.1 Qualifying Matters for Hamilton City Operative District Plan (ODP) - Retain the National Grid as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>2.6 National Grid Yards - Retain the National Grid Yard as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>2.7 National Grid Corridors - Retain the National Grid Corridor as a qualifying matter.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The Department of Conservation wishes to ensure consistency and transparency of Plan Change 5 and Plan Change 9 with the subject Plan Change 12. There should be alignment with section6(a) of the RMA. In particular, the submitter seeks appropriate provisions that protect, restore and enhance SNAs, and habitat for the long-tailed bat and black mudfish.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That there is alignment with section 6(a) of the RMA outcomes from concurrent plan changes PC5 and PC9 in PC12; and That the particular provisions of Proposed Plan Change 12 that I support, as identified in Attachment 1, are retained; and That the amendments, additions and deletions to Proposed Plan Change 12 sought in Attachment 1 are made; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any other similar, alternative, additional, or consequential relief which will address the matters outlined in this submission.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.2	General	General	Support in part	The Department of Conservation seeks consistency and transparency in the application of qualifying matters throughout Hamilton District and relevant structure plans, particularly in relation to section 6 matters of national importance under the RMA. The submitter seeks appropriate urban design and layout principles for areas adjacent to an SNA to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The relief sought by the Director-General in PC5 and PC9 may be appropriate to apply wider than just the Peacocke Structure Plan and also beyond an SNA throughout the Hamilton district.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> That there is alignment with section 6(a) of the RMA outcomes from concurrent plan changes PC5 and PC9 in PC12; and That the particular provisions of Proposed Plan Change 12 that I support, as identified in Attachment 1, are retained; and That the amendments, additions and deletions to Proposed Plan Change 12 sought in Attachment 1 are made; and Any other similar, alternative, additional, or consequential relief which will address the matters outlined in this submission.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.3	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	The Department of Conservation notes the plan change reference to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2011. This should be updated to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020. DOC considers there has been limited assessment against the NPS-FM 2020, substantial analysis of this NPS should be provided.	<p>Provide an analysis of how PC12 gives effect to the Objective and Policies of the NPSFM 2020; and</p> <p>Amend 1.1.2.2(a) to reflect that the plan intends to give effect to the operative NPSFM 2020 not the NPSFM 2011 version.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support in part	The Department of Conservation notes no reference to the NPSFM 2020 and its objectives and policies as well as Te Mana o te Wai within this strategic framework chapter.	Amend Chapter 2 Strategic Framework to say how the NPSFM 2020 is being given effect to in relation to Te Mana o te Wai, and the relevant Objective and Policies of the NPSFM 2020 in PC12.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.5	3.7 Ruakura	3.7.4 Rules	Oppose	The Department of Conservation questions why reference to Land Development Rules 3.7.4.2 has been deleted as section 3.7.4.2 Land Development Rules remains in PC12.	Reference to “Land Development Rules 3.7.4.2” should be retained in Rule 3.7.4.1c.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The Department of Conservation supports giving effect to the outcomes in the “Vision and Strategy – Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato”. The ecological restoration of the gullies should also ensure there is alignment with the ecological corridors and the connectivity of these throughout Hamilton, and provide for the protection, enhancement and restoration of habitats for critically threatened long-tailed bats and other significant ecological values such as to give effect to the WRPS and be in accordance with Section 6(c) of the RMA.	<p>Retain Objective 4.1.2.1, Policies 4.1.2.1a, 4.1.2.1b, 4.1.2.1c, 4.1.2.1d and 4.1.2.1e; and</p> <p>Ensure there is also restoration of the connectivity of ecological corridors within the Hamilton District, requiring alignment of other relevant plan changes to the Hamilton District Plan such as PC5 and PC9 throughout PC12 provisions; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address DoC's concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The Department of Conservation seeks that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. There should be appropriate urban design and layout principles are applied to areas adjacent to an SNA. The relief sought in PC5 and PC9 may be appropriate to apply wider than just the Peacocke Structure Plan and also beyond an SNA throughout the Hamilton district.	<p>That appropriate urban design and layout principles are applied to areas adjacent to an SNA or bat habitat so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna, such as habitat for long-tailed bats, from lighting for example, but not limited to; and</p> <p>Include a policy with lighting recommendations in line with National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds - DAWE; and</p> <p>Incorporate design principles that seek to reduce lighting effects of development adjacent to natural areas.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.9	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA. New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.10	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA. New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA. New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.12	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA. New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.13	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that residential developments should also be designed and developed to minimise adverse effects on habitats of indigenous fauna and seeks alignment with matters raised in PC5 and PC9 to be incorporated as appropriate in PC12. Adverse effects on SNAs may arise from development adjacent to such SNAs or bat habitat. Appropriate urban design and layout principles should be applied to areas adjacent to an SNA so as to reduce possible adverse effects on significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The provision of a buffer or setback between new development and SNAs will reduce the possibility of adverse effects and allow the consideration of effects/mitigation at resource consent stage if new development is proposed within the setback.	<p>Include the following standards within the chapters that manage development setbacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 50m from the boundary of a “Nationally” or “Regionally” significant SNA. New buildings, building additions, and swimming pools shall be setback 5m from from the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA.
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.14	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers policy 4.1.2.6f not strong in its direction and it is unclear how trees and vegetation are protected.	<p>Provide stronger direction of the protection of existing vegetation and trees, especially if they provide significant habitat for indigenous fauna; and</p> <p>Consider the application of qualifying matters for s6(c) matters beyond SNAs to urban trees and vegetation in PC12; and</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address DoC's concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers their limited direction as to how trees and vegetation are protected. Particularly concerning existing vegetation and trees below 6m in height, and urban trees that are habitat for long-tailed bats which would be a matter of national importance under s6(c) of the RMA.	<p>Provide stronger direction of the protection of existing vegetation and trees, especially if they provide significant habitat for indigenous fauna; and</p> <p>Consider the application of qualifying matters for s6(c) matters beyond SNAs to urban trees and vegetation in PC12; and</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers their limited direction as to how trees and vegetation are protected. Particularly concerning existing vegetation and trees below 6m in height, and urban trees that are habitat for long-tailed bats which would be a matter of national importance under s6(c) of the RMA.	<p>Provide stronger direction of the protection of existing vegetation and trees, especially if they provide significant habitat for indigenous fauna; and</p> <p>Consider the application of qualifying matters for s6(c) matters beyond SNAs to urban trees and vegetation in PC12; and</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address DoC's concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.17	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that Policy 4.1.2.7a does not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.7a so that such pruning of vegetation to protect the ecological values of SNAs that are adjacent to residential zones so that vegetation pruning and maintenance do not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.18	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.10 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of the Significant Natural Area in Schedule 9C (Volume	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that Policy 4.1.2.7a does not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species. In addition, Policy 4.1.2.7a and Rule 4.2.6.10 [4.3.5.9 and 4.5.5.9] do not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.6.10 or provide another rule that requires consent for such pruning of vegetation to protect the ecological values of SNAs that are adjacent to residential zones so that vegetation pruning and maintenance do not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			2, Appendix 9).			
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.9 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of a SNA in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that Policy 4.1.2.7a does not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species. In addition, Policy 4.1.2.7a and Rules 4.2.6.10, [4.3.5.9 and 4.5.5.9] do not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.	<p>Amend Rules 4.2.6.10, [4.3.5.9 and 4.5.5.9] or provide another rule that requires consent for such pruning of vegetation to protect the ecological values of SNAs that are adjacent to residential zones so that vegetation pruning and maintenance do not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.20	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.5.9 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of the Significant Natural Area in Schedule 9C	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers that Policy 4.1.2.7a does not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species. In addition, Policy 4.1.2.7a and Rules 4.2.6.10, [4.3.5.9 and 4.5.5.9] do not give effect to Objective 4.1.2.7 in that these provisions do not ensure that vegetation pruning and maintenance does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.6.10, [4.3.5.9 and 4.5.5.9] or provide another rule that requires consent for such pruning of vegetation to protect the ecological values of SNAs that are adjacent to residential zones so that vegetation pruning and maintenance do not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12 in this regard.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			(Volume 2, Appendix 9)			
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.21	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The Department of Conservation considers objectives and policies for the medium density residential zone do not provide for development to be sensitive to ecological corridors or provide for ecological connectivity to the Waikato River.	<p>Provide for wider ecological connection to the Waikato River, ensure the policies include development to be sensitive to ecological corridors and ecological connectivity to the Waikato River; and</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.22	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		The Department of Conservation considers that two matters of discretion “D – Natural Character and Open Space” and “F – Hazards and Safety” do not explicitly consider the effects on threatened indigenous species consider as required under s6(a) of the RMA.	<p>Insert a further matter of discretion for Rule 4.5.6(a)(xii) to consider the effects on <u>threatened indigenous species</u>; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address these concerns to any other provision in PC12.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.23	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General		The Department of Conservation submits that the extent to which a proposed subdivision protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna should be provided for in Chapter 23 Subdivision, including as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities.	<p>Include the following wording in Policy 23.2.1a, Policy 23.2.2a, Policy 23.2.5a, 23.9 matters of discretion (or words to like effect):</p> <p><u>“Protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna.”</u></p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.24	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	The Department of Conservation supports the avoidance or minimising adverse effects of the transport network on the environment and the improvement of biodiversity. This should also be recognised in the Objective 25.14.2.1 (vi).	<p>Retain Policy 25.14.2.1k; and</p> <p>Amend Objective 25.14.2.1(vi) to include significant habitat and SNAs, and recognise the need to protect and restore significant vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns; and</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.25	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design	Support in part	The Department of Conservation seeks to ensure that urban design provisions protect, enhance and restore populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna and that this should be provided for in Chapter 25.15.	<p>Amend Policy 25.15.2.2d to include reference to the natural environment; and</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns; and</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12.</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.26	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design	Support in part	The Department of Conservation seeks that the consideration of gullies and open spaces, including SNAs, are also relevant considerations and should be acknowledged in the provisions.	<p>Amend the Explanation to Objective 25.15.2.5 and Policy 25.15.2.5b so that design avoids and minimises adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.</p> <p><i>Explanation</i></p> <p><i>Integrating land use in subdivision and development design has positive impacts on people economically, socially and culturally, as well as benefitting the natural environment. Through the District Plan and other</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p><i>methods Council can encourage an integrated approach to land use and transport planning which promotes sustainable travel patterns and energy use, either through integration of existing circulation networks including transport corridors, cycleways, public reserves and green corridors or a highly connected and permeable road hierarchy. <u>This includes design that avoids and minimises adverse effects on significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna.</u></i></p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12</p>
Department of Conservation - Linda Kirk	148.27	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		The Department of Conservation submits that the extent to which a proposed subdivision protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna should be provided for in Chapter 23 Subdivision, including as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities.	<p>Include the following wording in 23.9 matters of discretion (or words to like effect):</p> <p><u>“Protects, enhances and restores populations of at-risk, threatened or critically endangered flora and fauna.”</u></p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p> <p>Ensure there is alignment with PC5 and PC9 matters in PC12.</p>
Fiona and Maurice Woods	149.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 citing concerns for the health and wellbeing of residents. In particular, impacts on daylight, security, rubbish, noise, population and infrastructure, emissions and the environment , rates, heritage, traffic safety, and crime.	Oppose Plan Change 12.
Ministry of Education - Danielle Rogers	150.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter is neutral on PC12, if the relief is accepted.</p> <p>The submitter acknowledges that the plan change will contribute to providing additional housing which will require additional capacity in the local school network to cater for this growth. This will potentially drive the need for additional schools throughout the city. The submitter has an interest in ensuring the district plan specifically acknowledges and provides for educational facilities. The absence of supportive provisions can place obstacles in the way of the establishment of education facilities in future years.</p> <p>With regard to qualifying matters, the submitter considers that applying a qualifying matter to the Ministry of Education's designations is contrary to the requirements of section 77(g) , as it is not necessary in order to ensure that the Ministry's designations are given effect to. Instead, the purported qualifying matter would constrain the Ministry's ability to utilise its designation over time in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding future planned built environment.</p> <p>Further, section 77M allows the Ministry to develop their sites to the same standards that are applied to the immediately adjoining residential neighbourhoods. This ensures that schools are able to provide for growth over time and recognises that development on school sites should not be unduly constrained in a manner inconsistent with the existing and future planned built environment in which they are located. PC12 identifies all designations as a qualifying matter. This may unnecessarily result in section 77M(6) not being available to the Ministry until after the plan change becomes operative.</p>	Confirm that the purported qualifying matter does not apply to Minister of Education designations, such that in the absence of any other qualifying matters applying to Schools, section 77M(6) can immediately be relied upon by the Ministry.
Ministry of Education - Danielle Rogers	150.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter broadly supports the proposed provisions that seek to put in place a framework that will deliver integrated communities that support the concepts of liveable, walkable and connected neighbourhoods. The currently proposed Objective 4.1.2.2 discusses existing and planned infrastructure, however it does not include additional infrastructure. Amending the objective to include "additional infrastructure" (as defined by the NPS-UD 2020) will ensure schools and educational facilities are provided for.	<p>Amend objective 4.1.2.2 as follows: "Development maximises the use of land by providing a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character while ensuring the provision of <u>additional infrastructure</u> and infrastructure services as part of any development."; and</p> <p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 4.1.2.2g</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p><u>Enable non-residential development and activities that:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Support the social and economic well-being of the community;</u> <u>Are in keeping with the with the scale and intensity of development anticipated within the zone;</u> <u>Enable educational facilities;</u> <u>Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on residential amenity; and</u> <u>Will not detract from the vitality of the zone.</u>
Ministry of Education - Danielle Rogers	150.3	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter considers that a definition for "additional infrastructure" should be consequentially added to Appendix 1.1.2, in order to support other relief sought. The definition is from the NPS-UD and the use of a broad definition rather than a lower tier definition of educational facilities will enable a wider category of infrastructure to be captured by inclusions of the definition within the provisions of the plan.	<p>Add the following definition to Appendix 1.1.2:</p> <p><u>"Additional infrastructure means:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Public open space.</u> <u>Community infrastructure as defined in section 197 of the Local Government Act 2002.</u> <u>Land transport (as defined in the Land Transport Management Act 2003) that is not controlled by local authorities.</u> <u>Social infrastructure, such as schools and healthcare facilities.</u> <u>A network operated for the purpose of telecommunications (as defined in section 5 of the Telecommunications Act 2001).</u> <u>A network operated for the purpose of transmitting or distributing electricity or gas."</u>
Michael John Corby	151.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes Plan Change 12, noting the service capacity of Claudelands and potential effects on the Waikato River from storm water.	Refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA to refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Michael John Corby	151.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		The submitter is concerned for the loss of heritage homes from intensification and the effects on light and community wellbeing.	Reject any proposal which would allow for unconsented three storey and above developments.
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about managing the interface between urban development and the railway network, specifically the effects of reverse sensitivity on railways arising from residential zones adjoining the rail corridor, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects on people living near the rail corridor, and the potential interference with the rail corridor by building maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the railway corridor. The submitter manages the interface nationally with noise, vibration, and setback controls.	<p>KiwiRail seeks that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rail be identified as a qualifying matter pursuant to s77I(e) and s77O(e) of the Resource Management Act 1991. An additional qualifying matter is identified as follows (or similar) "Where sites are located proximate to nationally significant infrastructure, such as the National Grid transmission lines, state highways and the railway line".
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.3	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria		KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of 1.3.3.C2e, a new reverse sensitivity assessment criteria relating to rail as has been proposed for the Waikato Expressway.	<p>Add a new assessment criteria as follows (or similar):</p> <p><i>C Character and Amenity</i></p> <p><i>Reverse Sensitivity</i></p> <p><u>C2e The extent to which the design of the dwelling or building within the 100m setback from the railway corridor considers effects from the railway corridor, particularly:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The extent of a reasonable internal noise environment</u> <u>The siting of any principal outdoor living area to mitigate rail noise</u> <u>The extent of any acoustic mitigation to new buildings or additions for habitable uses to mitigate noise</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>4. <u>The extent to which the acoustic mitigation of new residential buildings or additions to existing residential buildings for habitable uses will result in mitigating any noise issues generated from the rail corridor.</u></p> <p>5. <u>The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		KiwiRail seeks to amend policy 4.1.2.2e to clarify how effects are to be avoided and to include a reference to rail.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.2e as follows:</p> <p><u>Residential land uses should be managed to avoid potential effects, such as noise, from arterial transport corridors and state highways. Require activities to be appropriately located and/or designed to avoid where practicable or otherwise remedy or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on arterial transport corridors, state highways and railway networks.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.5	General	General		KiwiRail seeks to amend rules 25.8.3.10(d) and 25.8.3.11(e) to ensure that the noise controls apply 100m from the rail corridor and to delete the reference to designation numbers in rule 25.8.3.10(d) to allow for any future designations. This is consistent with the reference in rule 25.8.3.11(e) and in the vibration standards.	<p>Amend 25.8.3.10 d as follows:</p> <p><i>25.8.3.10 Noise sensitive Activities - Activities in all Zones except Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and the Knowledge Zone</i></p> <p><i>(d) "Near a railway line" applies to noise sensitive activities where the building line of the building containing the activity is within 40100m of the boundary of a designation for Railway Purposes (Designations F1 and F1a).</i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.6	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	KiwiRail supports the recognition of potential reverse sensitivity effects on transport networks in policy 25.14.2.1(ii)	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1(ii) as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u>4.2.2.3. Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add new policy as follows:</p> <p><u>4.2.2.3a. Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><u>4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks</u></p> <p><u>(x) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><u>4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks</u></p> <p><u>(x) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.12	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><u>4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks</u></p> <p><u>(x) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.13	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><i>6.4.3 Building Setbacks</i></p> <p><i><u>(g) Business 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.14	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><i><u>4.2.3.1 Activity status table</u></i></p> <p><i><u>zz. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor RD</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.15	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><i>7.4.6 Building Setbacks</i></p> <p><i><u>(f) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.16	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	18.6.1 Any New Works		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><i>18.6.1 Any New Works</i></p> <p><i><u>b. Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.17	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows:</p> <p><i><u>4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(i) Buildings and structures must be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the rail corridor.</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.18	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new rule as follows:</p> <p><i><u>4.2.3.1 Activity status table</u></i></p> <p><i><u>ddd. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor RD</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.19	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new rule as follows:</p> <p><i><u>4.3.3.1 Activity status table</u></i></p> <p><i><u>ddd. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor RD</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.20	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new rule as follows:</p> <p><i><u>4.5.3.1 Activity status table</u></i></p> <p><i><u>zz. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor RD</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.21	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	<p>Insert a new rule as follows:</p> <p><i>6.3 Activity status table</i></p> <p><i><u>fa. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor</u></i></p> <p><u>Business Zone 1 RD</u></p> <p><u>Business Zone 2 -</u></p> <p><u>Business Zone 3 RD</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<u>Business Zone 4 -</u> <u>Business Zone 5 RD</u> <u>Business Zone 6 RD</u> <u>Business Zone 7 RD</u> <u>Business Zone 1 RD</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.22	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	Insert a new rule as follows: <i>4.2.3.1 Activity status table</i> <u>ea. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor</u> <u>Downtown Precinct 1: RD</u> <u>City Living Precinct 2: -</u> <u>Ferry bank Precinct 3: -</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.23	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General		In all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12, KiwiRail seeks a new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback 5m from a boundary with a rail corridor to be added to the setback rules. KiwiRail seeks that non-compliance with the proposed permitted activity rule be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity with appropriate matters of discretion.	Insert a new rule as follows: <i>18.4 Rules - Activity status table</i> <u>h. Buildings or structures within 5m of a rail corridor RD</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.24	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	Insert new assessment criteria as follows: <i>1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria</i> <i>G Transportation</i> <u>[G35 Proximity to a rail corridor]</u> <u>a. The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access, and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u> <u>b. Outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.25	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	Insert a new matter of discretion as follows: <u>4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</u> <u>a. xvii. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G 35</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle	152.26	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	Insert a new matter of discretion as follows: <u>4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</u> <u>.... xiv. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Grinlinton-Hancock			nary Activitie s: Matters of Discretio n and Assessm ent Criteria			
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.27	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restrict ed Discretio nary Activitie s: Matters of Discretio n and Assessm ent Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</u></p> <p><u>a. j. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.28	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.6 Restrict ed Discretio nary Activitie s: Matters of Discretio n and Assessm ent Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>4.5.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</u></p> <p><u>a. xiii. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.29	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.6 Restrict ed Discretio nary Activitie s: Matters of Discretio n and Assessm ent Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><u>6.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</u></p> <p><u>a. xviii. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.30	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p>7.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</p> <p><u>a. iiii. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.31	25.14 Transportation	25.14.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		KiwiRail seeks new matters of discretion be added for activities that do not comply with the new permitted activity rule requiring buildings and structures to be setback at least 5m from the rail corridor.	<p>Insert a new matter of discretion as follows:</p> <p><i>25.14.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</i></p> <p><i>a. iv. Any building or structure within 5m of a rail corridor G35</i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.32	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Objective 4.3.2.2A. Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</i></u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.33	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Policy 4.3.2.2Aa. Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</i></u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.34	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Objective 4.4.2.3 Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</i></u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.35	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone			<p>Add a new policy as follows:</p> <p><u><i>Policy 4.4.2.3a Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</i></u></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.36	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.2 Objectives and Policies: Large Lot Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	<p>Add a new objective as follows:</p> <p><u><i>4.5.2.4. Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</i></u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.37	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.2 Objectives and Policies: Large Lot Residential Zone		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy 4.5.2.4a Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.38	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Objective 6.2.2A Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.39	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy 6.6.2Aa. Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.40	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Objective 6.2.2A Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.41	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy 6.2.2Aa Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.42	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Objective 7.2.6A Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.43	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy 7.2.6A Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.44	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Objective 18.2.2A Built development is of an appropriate scale and location to minimise risks to public health and safety.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.45	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General		KiwiRail seeks a new objective and policy applicable to all zones adjoining the rail corridor that are affected by Plan Change 12 to be included to support the new setback rule and matters of discretion that KiwiRail also seek.	Add a new policy as follows: <u>Policy 18.2.2Aa Require activities adjacent to regionally significant network infrastructure to be setback a safe distance in order to ensure the ongoing safe and efficient operation of that infrastructure and the communities who live adjacent to them.</u>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.46	General	General		KiwiRail seeks to amend rules 25.8.3.10(d) and 25.8.3.11(e) [d] to ensure that the noise controls apply 100m from the rail corridor and to delete the reference to designation numbers in rule 25.8.3.10(d) to allow for any future designations. This is consistent with the reference in rule 25.8.3.11(e) and in the vibration standards.	Amend 25.8.3.11 e as follows: <i>25.8.3.11(e) "Near a railway line" applies to noise sensitive activities where the building line of the building containing the activity is within 40<u>100</u>m of the boundary of a designation for Railway Purposes.</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.47	General	General		KiwiRail seeks that the ventilation standards 25.8.3.10(g) are updated to provide appropriate protection.	<p>Amend Rule 25.8.3.10(g) as follows:</p> <p><i>25.8.3.10 Noise-sensitive Activities - Activities in all Zones except Ruakura Logistics Zone, Ruakura Industrial Park Zone and the Knowledge Zone</i></p> <p><i>(g) Where the internal noise design standards in Rule 25.8.3.10(e) can only be achieved in a habitable room with windows and doors closed, an alternative ventilation system shall be installed <u>and maintained</u> that:</i></p> <p><i><u>a. complies with the requirements of Section G4 – Ventilation of the New Zealand Building Code 2011, and is adjustable by the occupant to control the ventilation rate in increments up to a high air flow setting that provides at least 6 air changes per hour; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>b. provides relief for equivalent volumes of spill air; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>c. provides cooling and heating that is controllable by the occupant and that can maintain the inside temperature of the room or space between 180C and 250C.</u></i></p> <p><i><u>d. Ensure that where a ventilation or cooling system is used that it does not generate more than 35dBLAeq when measured 1m away from any grille or diffuser).</u></i></p>
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	152.48	General	General		KiwiRail seeks to amend rule 25.8.3.12(a) to ensure that the vibration controls apply to 60m from the rail corridor and use the most up to date standard.	<p>Amend 25.8.3.12(a) as follows:</p> <p><i>25.8.3.12 Operational Vibration from Rail Lines - Activities in All Zones</i></p> <p><i>a) Any new building developed for a vibration sensitive activity within 6029m of a boundary of a designation for railway purposes shall comply with Class C vibration limits in NS 8176E:2005<u>17</u> – Vibration and Shock: Measurement of Vibration in Buildings from Land Based Transport and Guidance to Evaluation of its Effects on Human Beings.</i></p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports the direct reference to "qualifying matters" in provision 2.1(e) as notified in PC12 because they can be considered as an exemption to the intensity and design of development on certain sites and are included as part of this chapter.	Retain Purpose 2.1(e) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Mana Whenua objective and policies as part of Strategic Policy section (Objective 2.2.1) as notified because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Objective 2.2.1 as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Mana Whenua objective and policies as part of Strategic Policy section (Policy 2.2.1a) as notified because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Policy 2.2.1(a) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Mana Whenua objective and policies as part of Strategic Policy section (Policy 2.2.1b) as notified because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Policy 2.2.1(b) as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.5	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Mana Whenua objective and policies as part of Strategic Policy section (Policy 2.2.1c) as notified because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Policy 2.2.1(c) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Mana Whenua objective and policies as part of Strategic Policy section (Policy 2.2.1d) as notified because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Policy 2.2.1(d) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.2(a) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Objective 2.2.2(a) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.2(b) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga	Retain Objective 2.2.2(b) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.9	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.2(a) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga	Retain Policy 2.2.2(a) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.10	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.2(b) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga	Retain Policy 2.2.2(b) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.11	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.2(c) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga	Retain Policy 2.2.2(c)
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.12	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.10 as notified because this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Retain Objective 2.2.10 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.13	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 2.10(a) because this will enable to the Plan to provide for as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Amend Policy 2.10(a) as follows: "Development is sensitive to and promotes Hamilton identity and heritage values"
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.14	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Policy 2.2.10(b) because it will enable to the Plan to provide for as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Amend Policy 2.2.10(b) to delete the word 'enhances'.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.15	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.10(c) because it will enable to the Plan to provide for as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Retain Policy 2.2.10(c) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.16	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.10(d) because it will enable to the Plan to provide for as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Retain Policy 2.2.10(d) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.17	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports provision 4.1.1 in regards to the impacts of development on the Waikato River and the consideration of the retention of historic heritage at the time of development but understands that a reference to qualifying matters is necessary.	Amend paragraphs on page 1 of Section 4.1 that relate to Vision and Strategy (Te Ture Whaimana) & Historic Heritage to discuss qualifying matters.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.18	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports provision 4.1.2.3(a) because it will enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.	Retain Policy 4.1.2.3(a) as notified.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.19	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new provision because this framework would enable the Plan to better provide for cultural and historic heritage landscape which is often spread across several sites.	Include new provisions 4.1.2.3(e) as follows "Ensure development is compatible with the values of adjacent historic heritage sites" with any consequential amendments as required.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.20	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.8 because it will enable to the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Retain Objective 4.1.2.8 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 21	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Policy 4.1.2.8(a) because there are concerns that the historic heritage areas are not being managed in the same manner as historic heritage buildings with regards non-residential activities and the possible impacts for non-residential activities. If there is a concern that this approach would be limiting to the Victoria Street Historic Heritage area, the submitter considers that there would be benefit in creating a separate framework to acknowledge the differing makeup of the various historic heritage areas.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.8(a) as follows: "Certain non-residential activities shall only be established within any identified historic heritage area when the activity maintains the heritage values of the area through built scale and form" Any consequential amendments as required, in particular the insertion of the equivalent rule for non-residential activities within Historic Heritage Areas. And the creation, if required, of a separate approach for Victoria Street Historic heritage Area.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 22	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes to provision 4.2 because there is no reference to "qualifying matters," which include historic heritage cultural, archaeological and built heritage values.	Amend provision 4.2 to add an additional sentence at the end of the 2nd paragraph as follows: "Buildings densities and design should be amended to better accommodate the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent to it."
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 23	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that Objective 4.2.2.2 does not make any reference to accommodating "qualifying matters" at the time of development in the General Residential zone because the users of the Plan should be aware of qualifying matters alerted to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal.	Amend Objective 4.2.2.2 as follows: "The General Residential zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Housing needs and demands; and The neighbourhoods planned urban built character, including 1 to 3 storey buildings, and; Qualifying matters on and adjacent to development sites."
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 24	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new policy that should anticipate the reduced density and significant design elements required to accommodate the qualifying historical, cultural, archaeological, and built heritage items.	Include Policy 4.2.2.2(d) as follows: "Building densities, design and layout should not detract from the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent to it."
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 25	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support	The submitter partially supports the assessment criteria that assess the impact of development on historic heritage values on adjacent sites at the time of more intensive development are required to ensure that the impacts on historic heritage are avoided or as minimal as possible but considers that reliance on the historic heritage provisions is not sufficient.	Include a new assessment criteria into Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria- B2-Context, as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Configures buildings and site layout to avoid effects of dominance and overlooking on adjacent sites that contain cultural, archaeological, or built heritage.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 26	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support	The submitter supports the assessment criteria that assess the impact of development on historic heritage values at the time of more intensive development are required to ensure that the impacts on historic heritage are avoided or as minimal as possible and considers that reliance on the historic heritage provisions is not sufficient.	Include a new assessment criteria into Appendix 1.3 - B4-Site Layout, as follows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Configures buildings, access, landscaping and plantings on the site to ensure long term retention of the historic heritage values-cultural, archaeological and built, and their settings and surrounds.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153. 27	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that there is no reference to 'qualifying matters' in the Purpose section of the Medium Density Residential Zone because since these matters can be exceptions to the MDRS and also have to be considered by those developing adjacent sites, it is important that the users of the Plan are alerted to this to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal.	Add the following sentence at the end of the 4th paragraph: "Buildings densities, design and layout should be amended to better accommodate the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent to it."
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	153. 28	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies:	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that Objective 4.3.2.2 make no reference to 'qualifying matters' at the time of development in the General Residential zone because users of the Plan should be aware of the many qualifying matters (historic heritage), within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend Objective 4.3.2.2 as follows; "The Medium Density Residential zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Taonga - Carolyn McAlley			Medium Density Residential Zone			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Housing needs and demands; and The neighbourhoods planned urban built character, including 3 to 5 storey buildings, and; Qualifying matters on and adjacent to development sites.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.29	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter considers that a new Policy will be required to further implement the addition that is being sought to Objective 4.3.2.2 because the policy should anticipate the reduced density, and important design detail that will be required to accommodate the qualifying matter of historic heritage- cultural, archaeological and built.	Include a new Policy (Policy 4.3.2.2(d)) as follows: "Building densities, design and layout should not detract from the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent."
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.30	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter considers that assessment criteria that assess the impact of development on historic heritage values on adjacent sites at the time of more intensive development are required to ensure that the impacts on historic heritage are avoided or as minimal as possible because reliance on the historic heritage provisions is not sufficient.	<p>Include a new assessment criteria as follows:</p> <p>Configures buildings and site layout to avoid effects of dominance and overlooking on adjacent sites that contain cultural, archaeological, or built heritage.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.31	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of reference to 'qualifying matters' since these matters can be exceptions to intensification and also have to be considered by those developing adjacent sites and it is important that the users of the Plan are alerted to this to enable them to accommodate qualifying matters within the design of their proposal.	<p>Amend provision 4.4.1 with the addition of an additional sentence at the end of the 4th paragraph as follows:</p> <p>"Buildings densities and design must be amended to better accommodate the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent to it."</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.32	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter considers that a new Policy will be required to further implement the addition that is being sought to Objective 4.3.2.2 and it should anticipate the reduced density, and important design detail that will be required to accommodate the qualifying matter of historic heritage - cultural, archaeological and built.	<p>Include new provision (Policy 4.4.2.2(d)) as follows:</p> <p>"Building densities and design should not detract from the important values of qualifying matters, either on the site of development or adjacent"</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.33	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter considers that assessment criteria that assess the impact of development on historic heritage values on adjacent sites at the time of more intensive development are required to ensure that the impacts on historic heritage are avoided or as minimal as possible because reliance on the historic heritage provisions is not sufficient.	Introduction of additional assessment criteria related to site layout and context.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.34	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter is concerned that the advice note relating to consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for the Frankton Historic Railway Area, contained in Chapter 5 that is proposed to be deleted, has not been carried over to the revised Chapter 19, that now includes the previous character areas as historic heritage areas because the proposed and existing advice notes will not cover off the need for consultation relating to built heritage or historic heritage areas in particular the Frankton Historic Railway Area.	<p>Include a note under 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas Activity Table, as follows:</p> <p>"Consultation with Heritage New Zealand - A notified resource consent application will be served on Heritage New Zealand by Council for any application which affects any historic area registered under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere taonga Act 2014 (Previously the Historic Places Act 1993). The Frankton Railway's Village is registered as an historic area. For any non-notified resource consent application, any development relating to a historic heritage area registered under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere taonga Act 2014 (previously the Historic Places Act 1993) consultation is recommended with Heritage New Zealand before the application is submitted to Council and Council may then require that written approval be obtained from Heritage New Zealand."</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.35	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Table 19.3.2 because it seems to be inconsistencies between the table as notified in Plan Change 12 and Plan Change 9.	Review Table 19.3.2 to provide clarity on Historic Heritage Area Activity Status Table.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.36	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to activity m - Detached dwelling' being a restricted discretionary activity because a new dwelling has the potential to disrupt the uniformity of an HHA.	Amend item m -detached dwelling to a discretionary activity.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.37	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Oppose	The submitter opposes to rear site being 400m ² as a permitted activity because previously the Plan provided for permitted rear sites in the Frankton Railway Village of 600m ² . The submitter understands that larger size would ensure that a single level house can be provided which is better suited to the single level nature of this nationally recognised historic heritage area.	<p>Amend Table 19.4.3(b) as follows:</p> <p>Single dwellings - rear site (including relocated dwellings) (per unit) - 400m² (except in the Frankton Village Railway HHA where it is 600m²).</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.38	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the proposed building height rules for the historic heritage areas (HAA) and the impact that this rule may have of the important characteristics of the historic heritage areas, in particular the Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area (Frankton HHA) because the height of the buildings in an HHA should be no higher than the building types for which the HHA was originally recognised.	<p>Amend Rule 19.4.5 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Front corner and through site (maximum height unless otherwise stated) - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All buildings shall have a maximum height of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The original height of the heritage building on the subject site: or The average of existing heights of buildings on adjacent sites, being the three sites on either side of the subject site or six sites on one side of the subject site whichever is higher. Rear site (maximum height unless otherwise stated) 8m and maximum two storeys. Except in the Frankton Railway Village HHA maximum height on front, corner, through and the related rear sites, where all buildings shall be no higher than the original height of recognised heritage building.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	153.39	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the retention of the existing and proposed qualifying matters and the related amended controls, as outlined in the Assessment report as follows:</p> <p>2.2 - Waikato River and Gully Hazard and Waikato Bank Stability</p> <p>2.11 -0 Open Space Zones, as Open Space often contains historic heritage sites, and</p> <p>3.2 - Built Heritage, as notified in Plan Change 9, and</p> <p>3.3 - Archaeological and Cultural sites, as notified in Plan Change 9 (and subject to submission points to that Plan Change), and</p>	<p>Retain the following sections of the Assessment report:</p> <p>2.2 - Waikato River and Gully Hazard and Waikato Bank Stability, .</p> <p>2.11 - Open Space Zones,</p> <p>3.2 - Built Heritage,</p> <p>3.3 - Archaeological and Cultural Sites, and</p> <p>3.4 - Historic Heritage Areas</p> <p>Note: the submission and relief sought are not related to Appendix 2.4</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					3.4 - Historic Heritage Areas (as notified in Plan Change 9),as this will assist to give effect to enable the Plan to provide for the RMA matters of national importance found at s6(e): the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga: and s6(f): the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Andrea Miller	154.1	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	Hamilton's Operative District Plan does not include a definition relating to community corrections activities. Correction facilities play a vital role in improving communities to address the purpose of the RMA. The Plan change will enable more housing which will bring upon an increase in population. The need for such facilities is important to correlate with future population growth. The addition of a definition of “community corrections activity” consistent with the National Planning Standards definition is needed.	<p>Insert a new definition of “community corrections activity” as follows:</p> <p>Community corrections activity: Means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programme administration, and a meeting point for community works groups.</p>
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Andrea Miller	154.2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Correction facilities play a vital role in improving communities to address the purpose of the RMA. The Plan change will enable more housing which will bring upon an increase in population. The need for such facilities is important to correlate with future population growth. Ara Poutama supports communities living in zones mentioned in the relief sought and will look at locating sites within these areas to support offenders in that community. Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Business 1, 3, 5 & 7, Central City, Industrial, Ruakura Industrial Park and Community Facilities zones to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity.	<p>The submitter suggests amending the Activity Status Tables in the following zones / areas to enable “community corrections activities” to be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business 1 (Commercial Fringe) Zone (6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table) Business 3 (Sub-Regional Centre) Zone (6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table) Business 5 (Suburban Centre) Zone (6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table)
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Andrea Miller	154.3	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status	Oppose	Correction facilities play a vital role in improving communities to address the purpose of the RMA. The Plan change will enable more housing which will bring upon an increase in population. The need for such facilities is important to correlate with future population growth. Ara Poutama supports communities living in zones mentioned in the relief sought and will look at locating sites within these areas to support offenders in that community. Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Central City to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity.	<p>Amend the Activity Status Tables in the following zones / areas to enable “community corrections activities” to be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Centre Zone, Precinct 1 (Downtown Precinct) (7.3 Rules – Activity Status Table)
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Andrea Miller	154.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Business and Industry	Oppose	Correction facilities play a vital role in improving communities to address the purpose of the RMA. The Plan change will enable more housing which will bring upon an increase in population. The need for such facilities is important to correlate with future population growth. Ara Poutama supports communities living in zones mentioned in the relief sought and will look at locating sites within these areas to support offenders in that community. Ara Poutama requests the amendment of the rules for the Business 1, 3, 5 & 7, Central City, Industrial, Ruakura Industrial Park and Community Facilities zones to enable “community corrections activities” as a permitted activity.	<p>Amend the Activity Status Tables in the following zones / areas to enable “community corrections activities” to be undertaken as a permitted activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial Zone (9.3 Rules – Activity Status Table) Ruakura Industrial Park Zone (11.3 Rules – Activity Status Table) Community Facilities Zone (16.3 Rules – Activity Status Table)
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections - Andrea Miller	154.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The proposed changes to the Residential Zones Chapter and the retention of the residential definitions will enable Ara Poutama to provide for a range of residential activities with support in residential zones as it is important to meet community needs to achieve the purpose of the RMA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the existing definitions related to “residential activities”, “residential unit”, “household” and “managed care facilities”. Retain as notified the PC12 ‘All Residential Zones’ Chapter, including the provisions relating to “residential activities”, “residential units” and “managed care facilities”. Retain all provisions throughout the HCDP and PC12 chapters relating to “residential activities”, “residential unit”, “household” and “managed care facilities”.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.1	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.10 Rules Having Early or Delayed	Support in part	The submitter partially supports provision 1.1.10.2 because more clarity should be provided for plan users regarding what has immediate legal effect and what 'qualifying matters' apply.	Review plan provisions to provide more clarity regarding what has immediate legal effect and what 'qualifying matters' apply.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Legal Effect			
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about the lack of transition between Medium and High Density Residential Zones (5 and 6 storeys respectively) against both HH items and HHAs because this effects the context and setting and will have additional issues such as overshadowing.	Add a buffer to reduce the impact on HH and HHAs sites and adjacent to the sites.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter is concerned that there are no control rules for density, height, and setback for HH items within residential areas. Such controls only apply in HHAs.	Rule set that match HHA, for any scheduled building no rules within chapter that modify the underlying zone for density, heights and setbacks; and rules in Chapter 19.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter is concerned about submissions on PC9 that seek extents of HHA modified and other HH added to the schedule. It is unclear what mechanism is in place to ensure proposed historic heritage in intensification residential zones are held until decisions. This may include archaeological sites.	Clarification of status on historic heritage proposed in PC9 submissions.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 5	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter opposes having historic heritage adjacent to no limits height zones because the effect of the scale of development may impact on heritage values.	Add height or storey limit in the High-Density Residential Zone to be constant with other residential zones.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.1.2.6 because it also needs to refer to the existing and planned urban environment, to recognise that urban environments consistent of existing dwellings that were constructed prior to Plan Change 12 and that do not always reflect the densities now provided for or desired. It is also consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, to sustainability manage resources (including physical resources, being existing buildings). And will assist with retaining heritage values with HH.	Amend the policy to refer to existing and planned urban environment.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 7	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about the lack of transition between Medium and High Density Residential Zones (5 and 6 storeys respectively) against both HH items and HHAs because this effects the context and setting and will have additional issues such as overshadowing.	Add a buffer to reduce the impact on HH and HHAs sites and adjacent to the sites.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Provision 4.2.3.1(b) because ancillary residential structures can have significant impact on adjoining properties, and should be subject to a consent process and assessment criteria.	Provide for Ancillary residential structures as Restricted Discretionary activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes to 4.2.5.4 because if these are included then in Chapter 19 there should be a control rule for HH, as intrusive.	Clarification on whether building heights include aerials, satellite dishes and similar structures.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 10	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General		The submitter understands that there should be height controls and density for HH in Business 1 to 7 zones.	Include Rules that control heights above HH and setbacks and density as per HHAs
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 11	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General		The submitter is concerned that there appear to be no rules to protect heritage values of historic heritage items and areas in the Central City Zone because placing new storeys above these buildings will negatively impact on heritage values. Apartments can be provided but based on appropriate consistent setback that does not visually impact on two storey and its heritage values in terms of materials and design.	Rule to protect two storey scale of existing historic heritage items and historic heritage areas overlay in Victoria Street. Specific rule frame work for non residential HHAs including Height control to be limited on top of existing historic heritage items and area to original with setback for additional storeys that retains historic two storey scale.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 12	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Chapter 7 Central City Zone because of the lack of height, density, and setback control for the Victoria Street HHA. Two storey HHA is part of heritage values and therefore height directly above should retain two storey status - like Petone.	Rules specifically in terms of density for Victoria Street HHA that protects predominantly two storey scale and form and visuals from street including original heights [not average], setbacks.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 13	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Chapter 7 Central City Zone because the predominantly one and two storey hh buildings have no height controls. Additional storeys will impact negatively. Original and not average should be used.	Rules specifically in terms of density for HH that protects predominantly one and two storey scale and form and visuals from street including original heights [not average], setbacks.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 14	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General		It is unclear how historic heritage and historic streets are protected on transport corridor zone.	Seek appropriate rule.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter considers a buffer zone is needed within boundaries of HHAs and scheduled items to protect from inappropriate development on adjacent sites from extreme heights and high boundary walls particularly in Residential zones.	Introduce buffer zones around historic heritage areas and scheduled items with associated rules.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter considers a buffer zone is needed on edges and boundaries of HHAs and scheduled items to protect from development on adjacent sites.	Introduce buffer zones around historic heritage areas and scheduled items with associated rules.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitters understands that a bufer zone is needed on edges and boundaries of HHAs and scheduled items to protect from development on adjacent sites.	Introduce buffer zones around historic heritage areas and scheduled items with associated rules.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter is concerned about the lack of modifying rules for HH except HHAs because control on density, height etc is important and should be as per HHAs.	Rules for density, setbacks and heights as per HHA
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas because infill in historic heritage areas will cumulatively diminish heritage values and it is unclear how site and overall values are retained.	Rules for duplex should be the same across the various HHA areas. Should be discretionary activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 20	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas because infill in historic heritage areas will cumulatively diminish heritage values and it is unclear how site and overall values are retained.	Rules are needed for rear site duplexes (appears to be an omission).
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 21	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas because infill in historic heritage areas will cumulatively diminish heritage values and it is unclear how site and overall values are retained. Ancillary residential units can affect the integrity and values of heritage areas. They can also dominate the original buildings on site.	Ancillary residential units should be discretionary activities.
Waikato Heritage Group -	155. 22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic		There are existing layers within other historic heritage and there is a level of significance in the proposed historic areas. This would assist with a higher level of control for retaining integrity and authenticity and overall heritage values.	Specific rule for higher level of control for regional and national historic heritage areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Laura Kellaway			Heritage Areas			
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports 19.3.2 q.	No relief sought.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 24	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports 19.3.2 r.	No relief sought.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 25	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports 19.3.2 s.	No relief sought.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 26	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.2.(m) because infill in historic heritage areas will cumulatively diminish heritage values and it is unclear how site and overall values are retained.	Non complying for historic heritage areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 27	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.2.(l) because infill in historic heritage areas will cumulatively diminish heritage values and it is unclear how site and overall values are retained.	Non complying for historic heritage areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 28	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	Support Restricted Discretionary for accessory buildings.	No relief sought.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 29	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.[2] (m) because an artificial distinction between front, corner and through site and rear is not supported.	Rules same for front, corner, through site and rear. Rules should be made the same for duplex dwellings. Rule should be Non complying activity status for all duplexes.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 30	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.[2] (n) because an artificial distinction between front, corner and through site and rear is not supported.	Rules same for front, corner, through site and rear. Rules should be made the same for duplex dwellings. Rule should be Non complying activity status for all duplexes.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 31	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.[2] (o) because an artificial distinction between front, corner and through site and rear is not supported.	Rules same for front, corner, through site and rear. Rules should be made the same for duplex dwellings. Rule should be Non complying activity status for all duplexes.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 32	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.2 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.33	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Site Coverag e	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.3 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.34	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permea ble Surface and Planting	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.4 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.35	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.5 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.36	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundar y	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.6 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.37	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.7 as notified because it should provide planning controls for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B) and be consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMA and Part 2 RMA.	Apply all rules to Historic Heritage Areas (as per Plan Change 12) and Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings, structures and associated sites) and Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.38	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.2. Lot size are different in different proposed HHAs and there should be a clear understanding of the general size in each. Increasing density by infill and/or subdivision with infill diminishes the significance of consistent pattern, and will have a cumulative effect. At national level retaining the 'one cottage in a 1/5' visually and as a group is important.	Clarify historic size of each HHA and protect with a rule that does not support infill including ancillary buildings. At two tier is recommended for national compared to local significance HHAs to protect integrity and authenticity. Density to be reduced subject to above.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.39	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Support in part	The submitter opposes Table 19.4.3 as notified because the table allows for a range of density that may infill buildings including a self contained unit infill and an additional building and this will impact on integrity and setting. Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values. An accessory building could be another house i.e. infill. Size should be defined by floor area. Generally accessory buildings are not supported in HHA of national significance due to the above.	Amend rules to decrease density and reduce issues of infill to: Table 19.4.3 Density, a) Minimum 800 square metres Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values. Size should be defined by floor area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.40	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Table 19.4.3 as notified because the table allows for a range of density that may infill buildings including a self contained unit infill and an additional building and this will impact on integrity and setting.</p> <p>Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values.</p> <p>An accessory building could be another house i.e. infill.</p> <p>Size should be defined by floor area.</p> <p>Generally accessory buildings are not supported in HHA of national significance due to the above.</p>	<p>Amend rules to decrease density and reduce issues of infill to: Table 19.4.3 Density, c) 800 square metres with 400 per duplex</p> <p>Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values.</p> <p>Size should be defined by floor area.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.41	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Table 19.4.3 as notified because the table allows for a range of density that may infill buildings including a self contained unit infill and an additional building and this will impact on integrity and setting.</p> <p>Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values.</p> <p>An accessory building could be another house i.e. infill.</p> <p>Size should be defined by floor area.</p> <p>Generally accessory buildings are not supported in HHA of national significance due to the above.</p>	<p>Amend rules to decrease density and reduce issues of infill to:</p> <p>Table 19.4.3 Density, d) Increase size to 800 square metres</p> <p>Seek a maximum size for accessory buildings, as this is infill, and new building may be bigger, wider, and higher than the original building, and effect overall heritage values.</p> <p>Size should be defined by floor area.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.42	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Table 19.4.3 as notified because the table allows for a range of density that may infill buildings including a self contained unit infill and an additional building and this will impact on integrity and setting.</p>	<p>Include rule to a maximum size for ancillary building so that it is smaller than the original and in scale, style and portion.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.43	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Site Coverag e	Oppose	<p>The rules do not allow for non residential HH including non residential HHA protection.</p>	<p>Rules required for non residential HH.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.44	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting	Support	<p>Re 19.4.4 (a): For most HHA [residential] permeability within the HHA Permeability front yard is very appropriate. However in a few cases there maybe historic garages that are on the street frontage- these should be allowed to be repaired and replaced like with like.</p>	<p>Support rule but seek additional rule may be needed for historic structures such as garages and historic landscape (neither have been assessed in PC9).</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.45	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes 19.4.5(a) as notified because heights rule allow for visual issues in residential HHAs.</p>	<p>For all HHAs Building height should be the lower, and 'original'.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.46	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes 19.4.5 a because it considers Victoria St HHA should be separate to residential HHAs and retain predominantly two storey with set backs at upper levels for new floors.</p>	<p>HHA Victoria- rule to retain predominantly two storey and to retain streetscape vistas.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group -	155.47	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes 19.4.5(a) as notified because heights rule allow for visual issues in residential HHAs.</p>	<p>Adjacent to a non HHA zone then rule and bufer zone.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Laura Kellaway			Areas - Building Height			
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 48	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	There is no rule for vacant or demolished site	Rule required for a vacant or demolished site [should include scale and design]
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 49	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.5(b) as notified because of infill issues if a two storey goes in or on a non HHA boundary. Infill can dominate front building.	Rule that HHA building height control is the same height as original.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 50	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.5(b) as notified because there are no specific rules in the commercial HHA which protects integrity and scale of predominantly two storey buildings. Additional new storeys will impact on the buildings heritage value and on the group values.	Separate rule for two storey Victoria Street with an appropriate setback and scale two storey.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 51	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.6 as notified because there is no rule for actual HHA on boundary for subject site.	Rule for HHA on boundary for subject site that provides buffer and protects setting, context and scale.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 52	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.6 as notified because of possible extremes of heights between HHA and adjacent zone such as RHD and RMD. Moderation of scale and impact is important.	Rule for HHA adjacent neighbour on boundary for subject site that provides bufer
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 53	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports provision 19.4.6 - Historic Heritage - Height in Relation to Boundary.	No relief sought.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 54	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4 - HH areas (general) because aerials, hvacs, air conditioning units etc in both residential and commercial are often visual from street and should be limited as far as practical. New elements on roof and facades can be intrusive, including in non residential.	Seek rule on aerials, satellites, telecommunication, hvac units to provide additional controls and reduce impact on form and street faces.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.55	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(a) as notified because it should retain integrity and consistency of historic setbacks within HHA especially if values are one typology.	Rule should just be original and not the average based within HHA.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.56	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(a) as notified because it should retain integrity and consistency of historic setbacks within HHA especially if values are one typology.	Needs new rule when site is adjacent to non HHA.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.57	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(a) as notified because it should retain integrity and consistency of historic setbacks within HHA especially if values are one typology.	Need a bufer ruler
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.58	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(b) as notified because there is no rule for protecting existing historic garage, and replacing like with like (i.e. if on street frontage). There are concerns over attaching garage with garage doors on street façade, and potential changes to historic form.	New rule if replacing historic street garage – like for like.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.59	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(b) as notified because there is no rule for protecting existing historic garage, and replacing like with like (i.e. if on street frontage). There are concerns over attaching garage with garage doors on street façade, and potential changes to historic form.	Rule on whether attached or separate, with preference set at rear of buildings and wording to include appropriate heritage cladding and style in rule.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.60	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 19.4.7(c) as notified because it is unclear why there is variation in side and rear setbacks. Rules should be constant, and the same for residential HHA.	A greater setback on sides and rear should be applied to all residential HHAs
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.61	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(c) because there are no setbacks rule for non residential HHAs including commercial HHA. To retain historic scale should be set back visually to still retain form, n[o]t just façade.	Request setbacks for non residential and specifically proposed Victoria St HHA
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.62	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.7(c) - rear sites - because rear sites should be the same for all except commercial HHA	Rule to be the same for all rear sites except commercial HHA
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.63	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities:	Support in part	The submitter opposes in par 19.6 as notified because if activity in HHA is in line with CP then higher activity status and provides an easier pathway.	Include heritage assessment in assessment criteria [Appendix 1] ; and include that the assessment must be in line with the HHA conservation plans.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria			
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.64	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.6 as notified because this should have been cohesive between PC9 and PC12 and which has immediate effect and qualifying.	Re-issue as not integrated.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.65	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		Cumulative change should be managed.	Rule to review of HH areas regularly every five years to monitor and assess cumulative change and potential loss of heritage values.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.66	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		If activity in HHA is in line with CP then higher activity status, and an easier pathway.	Assessment criteria needs to include heritage assessment. For all HHAs criteria should include a conservation plan for all HHAs in order to assess against.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.67	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		Cumulative change should be managed.	Rule for reporting and monitoring historic heritage every five years including items to address new identifications, degrees of loss of heritage values, and the impact of intensification of historic heritage.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.68	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		Provide assistance to owners.	HCC Heritage Funding increased and include owners of HH Areas owners.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.69	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		A Heritage Landscape Assessment of the city has not been undertaken, and has been requested in Plan Change 9. Rules are building focused, whereas HH includes structures and landscape. Other chapters such as Residential and Urban zones and Infrastructure should be linked where historic streets and landscaping are identified.	Rules to be inclusive for historic streets and historic landscape to be included including incorporating reference to HHA Conservation Plans.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.70	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		Conservation Plan should be integrated and assist owners and council staff including streets and reserves.	Include streets, landscape design and trees in Conservation Plans provided by specialist Heritage Landscape Architect
Waikato Heritage Group -	155.71	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes chapter 25.15 as notified because good urban design includes respecting and including specific historic heritage and the The chapter should consider historic heritage as it makes a contribution, includes place markers and provides continuity of sense of place.	Include within urban design rules that HH is part of urban design and contributes values and should be addressed in any plans to modify existing neighbourhoods.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Laura Kellaway						
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 72	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes chapter 25.15 as notified because good urban design includes respecting and including specific historic heritage and the The chapter should consider historic heritage as it makes a contribution, includes place markers and provides continuity of sense of place.	A baseline neighbourhood report on historic heritage should be included in the neighbourhood urban plans.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 73	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes chapter 25.15 as notified because good urban design includes respecting and including specific historic heritage and the The chapter should consider historic heritage as it makes a contribution, includes place markers and provides continuity of sense of place.	Objective and policies should include existing and assessment of the neighbourhood in residential and other zones in terms of heritage prior to high density developments on site and the neighbourhood.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 74	25.15 Urban Design	General		Re Chapter 25.15: A Heritage Landscape Assessment of the city has not been undertaken, and has been requested in Plan Change 9. It also applies more widely in Plan Change 12 when more intensive and wider neighbourhood change is proposed at the level of neighbourhood and streets.	Rules for historic streets and historic landscape to be included in Urban Design Chapter, including incorporating reference to HHA Conservation Plans
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 75	25.15 Urban Design	General		There has been no identification in Historic Heritage Items of historic streets and landscaping. This should be considered in Urban Design and Historic Heritage to have an integrated approach.	Review of HCC Heritage Landscape by specialist Heritage Landscape Architects and placement of identified into Schedule 8A Historic Heritage items for Neighbourhood Plans
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 76	25.15 Urban Design	General		Redevelopment and removal of existing neighbourhoods is an extreme change, and can remove sense of place and existing place markers. There should be objectives and rules in urban design assessments in terms of historic heritage and the identification of new historic heritage. HCC PC09 has not been a city wide identification survey and places will have been missed.	Request rules associated with Urban design within the chapter
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 77	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General		ICOMOS Charter is recognised as the national heritage charter and gives guidance in terms of historic heritage	Include within Assessment criteria for historic heritage the ICOMOS NZ Charter
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 78	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General		Each proposed HHA should have a Conservation [Plan] which covers the full area, buildings, spaces and landscape. This forms a base for assessment and identification of heritage values.	Include within Assessment criteria for historic heritage Conservation Plans for all HH Areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 79	1.4 Design Guides	General		No Heritage Guidelines have been provided, but are important and supported.	Provide Heritage Design guidelines and HHA Conservation Plans within Appendix 1
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 80	1.4 Design Guides	General		No new Urban Guidelines have been provided, but are important and supported.	Provide Heritage Design guidelines and HHA Conservation Plans within Urban Design Guidelines Appendix 1
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155. 81	Appendix 4 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	Retain Character Areas as an overlay for lower level heritage, and as a transition between zones and proposed HHAs.	Retain Appendix for Special Character Areas

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.82	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.[2] p because an artificial distinction between front, corner, through site and rear is not supported.	Seeks the same rules no matter the location of the site (front, corner or rear).
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.83	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	How HHAs of National significance integrity are retained has not been addressed. There should be a higher threshold.	Non complying for historic heritage areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.84	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting	Support	Re 19.4.4 (b): For most HHA (residential) permeability within the HHA Permeability front yard is very appropriate. However in a few cases there maybe historic garages that are on the street frontage- these should be allowed to be repaired and replaced like with like.	Support rule but seek additional rule may be needed for historic structures such as garages and historic landscape (neither have been assessed in PC9).
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.85	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.4.5(b) as notified because of infill issues if a two storey goes in or on a non HHA boundary. Infill can dominate front building.	Combine 19.4.5 a and b [see above].
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway	155.86	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height		The submitter opposes 19.4.5(b) as notified because of infill issues if a two storey goes in or on a non HHA boundary. Infill can dominate front building.	Request Buffer and rules control between non HHA and HHA.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitters opposes to Plan Change 12 as notified because of the complexity of PC12, the broad-brush effects on the future of our city, the feedback they have received indicating a lack of understanding amongst the citizenry, and particularly some alarming unintended consequences.	That HCC delay Plan Change 12 with the objective of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing more time for targeted public consultation; Providing more finely grained zoning requirements and overlay extents; Mitigating unintended consequences.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to remove the clauses related to amenity because amenity equates to attractiveness and pleasantness of a place and so, by logic, no amenity equates to unattractiveness and unpleasantness of a place.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.3	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the Business Zone Chapter as notified because (i) there appears a disconnect between building intensity (6.4.4) or floor area ratios and raised height limits; (ii) on the assumption that floor area ratio takes precedence over height limits, so the potential of building/land owners to be frustrated is extremely high as they cannot maximise the opportunity that is afforded by a raised height limit; (iii) “encouraging” above-ground residential is meaningless when no incentive or disincentive is outlined.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.4	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the Central Centre Zone Chapter as notified because the removal of some requirements (e.g. service area requirement per residential unit, residential density increases with no minimum floor areas for residential units etc) can lead to poor living standards and well-being outcomes.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.5	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the minimal requirements in the plan for provision of residential accommodation suited to people with disabilities, or the elderly because the move from single houses to a proliferation of 3 x 3 walk up units will worsen what is already a dire lack of suitable accommodation for this sector, especially for those in wheelchairs. The proposal to require 10% of accommodation to be accessible where 10 or more units are built can be expected to provide a minimal amount of suitable housing , as it can be expected that developments of 10 or more units on a site will continue to form only a small part of the total new build.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter states that it appears that there is a maximum height limit of 21m (plus a portion of roof) as per 4.4.5.4a and an aspiration for 6 stories height. 21m height limit barely works for 6 storeys unless we are unconcerned about the quality of outcomes. Concern is that we will have a plethora of 6-storey, minimum floor to floor height, relatively flat-roof estate projects, akin to the Projects/Social Housing Estates of the 1950s to 1970s in UK/USA, especially if there is no Urban Design quality standard to be achieved.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.7	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the MDRS introduction of a range of height, density and amenity standards, such as a maximum permitted height of 11m, 50% site coverage, minimum 1m x 1m outlook space for habitable rooms, minimum site setbacks and so on because some of these, such as the outlook space requirements, severely compromise amenity and risk creating ‘slum’ developments.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes to 11m high houses that can be built throughout General Residential zones ‘as of right’ because this will undoubtedly result in property owners having views and sun blocked, with no recourse to appeal against the development.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.9	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to not explicitly note wellbeing of the community as a qualifying matter as they have been identified based on the values, purposes and environmental risks perceived because the quality of an urban environment determines to a great degree the quality of life and wellbeing by way of reduced crime, recreation, accessibility, neighbourhood connectivity, transport options, social relationships, residential satisfaction, physical health etc.	Add Urban Quality as a qualifying matter.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.10	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to not explicitly note wellbeing of the community as a qualifying matter as they have been identified based on the values, purposes and environmental risks perceived because the quality of an urban environment determines to a great degree the quality of life and wellbeing by way of reduced crime, recreation, accessibility, neighbourhood connectivity, transport options, social relationships, residential satisfaction, physical health etc.	Urban Design may be incorporated into Assessment Criteria.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.11	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the required three Waters Capacity Assessment will incur increased time requirements and costs, both for HCC and for private developers.	No specific relief sought.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.12	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the removal of the chapter because as a result of removal there is no option of character which in other councils remain.	It could be modified to an overlay.
NZIA Registered Architect Practices - Brian Squair	156.13	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Plan Change 12 as notified because the proposed changes and their support documents appear to contain a number of ideologies that increasingly aim to restrict liberty and will necessitate sacrifice and the primary objective of the NPS-UD is to de-restrict the processes for developing (mainly) intensified residential stock, so that greater efficiencies can be achieved in the infrastructure and services of cities, and so that housing can be made available more rapidly to alleviate the current shortage.	Some strategies for displacing these unwanted outcomes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritising the upgrading of underground infrastructure in selected areas within general residential zones (to be identified) so as to facilitate and accelerate higher density development than the 3x3 infill concept (through more comprehensive design, and using higher quality construction methodology beyond minimum standards, to break up the 3x3 ‘carpet’ that would otherwise result;

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council takes responsibility for developing stormwater treatment features on public land, not individual sites, which creates public open space of meaningful scale, is more reliable, and is easier to maintain (or maintenance-free), and keeps individual sites drier; Council sponsoring or incentivising the expression and utilisation of culturally diverse design, visual symbols, typologies and amenity values, in order to acknowledge and promote everyone in a conscious, explicit and inclusive manner. <p>The primary recommendation therefore, is that the pace of implementation of this seemingly hurried plan be paused or reigned in, so that a more thorough and transparent process can be undertaken both in the communities and among the team steering these plan changes, and, so that the the people into whose hands this process will be entrusted, can be interrogated and verified.</p>
Melissa Hackell	157. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports intensification provided greater public space and green space is provided.	Increase public spaces in intensification areas.
Melissa Hackell	157. 2	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support in part	The submitter supports wider footpaths, safe cycling and removal of car parking requirements.	Remove car parking from Central City.
Melissa Hackell	157. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter seeks greater greenspace and protection of established trees on development sites, protection of permeable surfaces and urban soils.	Provide greenspace and protection of established trees on development sites, protection of permeable surfaces and urban soils.
Rodney Peter Lewis	158. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks greater resistance against the governments intensification directive.	Refuse the government directive.
Judy Patterson	159. 1	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that life style options that are healthy and offer opportunities are not being provided for in the plan change.	Enable lifestyle options which are healthy and assist to sustain people and offer opportunities for all citizens.
Judy Patterson	159. 2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impact of proposed building heights on sunlight for neighbouring properties.	The the height of new developments be limited to two storeys.
Judy Patterson	159. 3	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	That each multi-storey apartment block should have one off-street vehicle park per apartment and one berm-crossing per apartment block to ensure off street parking, avoid parked vehicle congestion in streets and associated hazards.	The submitter is concerned about street parking and related hazards.
Judy Patterson	159. 4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about the visual integration of new developments in suburbs.	New developments should provide plans to prove the level of visual integration with the style of the surrounding suburb.
Judy Patterson	159. 5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitted notes the inconsistent application of a 400m medium density catchment around Chartwell's suburban area.	That the 400-meter limit be adhered to around the Chartwell suburban centre with all streets within the 400-metre limit to be included in the medium density zone.
Judy Patterson	159. 6	General	General		The submitter is concerned about the provision of public amenities and swimming facilities in intensification areas including the CBD.	That public amenities, particularly swimming pools, be planned for and provided in intensification areas including the CBD, South City (Peacocks), and suburban centres including Chartwell and Five Cross Roads.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160. 1	General	General	Support in part	The Kāinga Ora submission relates to PC12 in its entirety. Where proposed amendments to the operative district plan are not included in this submission table, those provisions are supported in part, subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its primary submission.	The Kāinga Ora submission relates to PC12 in its entirety. Where proposed amendments to the operative district plan are not included in this submission table, those provisions are supported in part, subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its primary submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160. 2	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 1.1.2. While Kāinga Ora is not opposed in principle to the proposed amendments (to incorporate reference to the new statutory requirements under the Housing Supply Act); for the reasons outlined within the Kāinga Ora submission it is questioned whether the Plan does in-fact ‘meet’ those statutory obligations based on the as-notified PC12 provisions.	Retain as-notified, subject to the relief sought in the overall Kāinga Ora submission being sufficiently addressed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.3	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support	Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional strategies.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.4	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments as-notified, to the extent they remain consistent with the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on the ‘three waters’ and ‘financial contributions’ chapters.	Retain as-notified, to the extent the policy remains consistent with the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on the ‘three waters’ and ‘financial contributions’ chapters
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.5	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	General	Support in part	<p>1.1.9 Notification / Non-notification Rules</p> <p>The following flowchart is used to determine the notification, limited notification, or non-notification of a resource consent application, except where identified specifically in a chapter.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the operative notification process diagram as it needs to be updated both to reflect the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission (relating to notification exclusions in residential zones) and to account for the required notification preclusions under Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. This is particularly important as the subdivision chapter contains no rules relating to notification (either within the operative District Plan or under PC12).</p>	Amend the notification process diagram and/or include notification exclusions as-required by Clause 5 of Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, and in relation to the Kāinga Ora submission on the General, Medium and High-Density Residential zones. The notification diagram must also include the required notification exclusions for subdivision activities.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.6	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.11 Local Authority Cross-boundary Issues	Support	Kāinga Ora supports ongoing engagement with mana whenua.	Retain 1.1.11 Local Authority Cross-boundary Issues as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional strategies.	Include the proposed provisions 2.1 (a) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional strategies.	Include the proposed provisions 2.1 (b) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.9	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendment to clarify the City’s strategy to encourage a compact and sustainable city by increasing residential development densities.	Include the proposed provisions 2.1 (d) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.10	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendment as it clarifies the relationship between the MDRS requirements and how they might be modified by certain ‘qualifying matters’ – consistent with the intent of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (‘HSAA’).	Include the proposed provisions 2.1 (e) as- notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.11	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	Objective 2.2.1 Kāinga Ora supports the amendments which refer to the broader concept of ‘mana whenua’ rather than a particular Iwi. This is consistent with how actual and/or potential effects on ‘mana whenua values’ are dealt with in other statutory planning documents throughout New Zealand.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as- notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.12	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua	Support	Policy 2.2.1a - 2.2.1d: Kāinga Ora supports the amendments which refer to the broader concept of ‘mana whenua’ rather than a particular Iwi. This is consistent with how actual and/or potential effects on ‘mana whenua values’ are dealt with in other statutory planning documents throughout New Zealand.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.13	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 2.2.2 (a) and deletion of Policy 2.2.10b as-notified, giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as- notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.14	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 2.2.2b as-notified, giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. This includes the consequential deletion of existing objective 2.2.8 and associated policies in order to include these under the proposed provisions.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.15	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Oppose	Policy 2.2.2a - Whilst Kāinga Ora support giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is considered that a financial contribution as required by Chapter 24, that is proposed to be levied for the purpose of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana as notified is opposed. It is noted that the Section 32 analysis for financial contributions implies that the fund will go to the Hamilton City Council ‘Nature in the City’ programme. Kāinga Ora notes that the policy for this fund is related to biodiversity and is not underpinned by or seeks to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. It is considered that the financial contribution must be deleted in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana. Further, it is considered that this approach does not acknowledge the role that the Waikato River Authority plays in the management of the Waikato River, and the ties between that authority and local iwi through board representation. Kāinga Ora notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ in Policy 2.2.2a.viii is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company. Amendments are proposed to qualify its use in the context of the stated effects.	<p>1. Retain policy as notified with amendments subject to relief sought under chapter 24 and amendments shown in column.</p> <p>2. Include the proposed policies as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora, while making the tracked amendments to qualify the use of the term ‘avoid’.</p> <p>3. Amendments sought below.</p> <p>....</p> <p>iv. Require financial contributions from developments to fund works to restore and protect the Waikato River</p> <p>....</p> <p>viii. Managing activities to avoid, <u>and where that is not possible, remedy and/or mitigate</u>, river and stream bank erosion, river and stream bed scouring and deposition.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.16	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 2.2.2b. Kāinga Ora supports [Policy 2.2.2b] as-notified, giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, and enabling papakāinga housing across all residential zones.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.17	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Policy 2.2.2c Kainga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Include the proposed provisions [Policy 2.2.2c] as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh						
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.18	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Re "Explanation": Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Include the proposed provisions [the Explanation below Objective 2.2.2] as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.19	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	Re Objective 2.2.3: Kāinga Ora generally supports the stated goal of urban intensification and the land use efficiency that results from redevelopment of existing urbanised areas in realising a ‘compact’ model of urban development.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.20	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	Re Policies 2.2.3a to 2.2.3c: Kāinga Ora generally supports the stated goal of urban intensification and the land use efficiency that results from redevelopment of existing urbanised areas in realising a ‘compact’ model of urban development.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.21	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	Re Objective 2.2.4: Kāinga Ora generally supports the stated goal of urban intensification and the land use efficiency that results from redevelopment of existing urbanised areas in realising a ‘compact’ model of urban development. As such Kāinga Ora also supports the proposed amendments to objective 2.2.4 which reframes the largely-existing objectives and policies to focus on greenfield development.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.22	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	Kāinga Ora also supports the proposed amendments to policies 2.2.4a to 2.2.4d which give effect to objective 2.2.4 which reframes the largely-existing objectives and policies to focus on greenfield development.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.23	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part the Explanation under Objective 2.2.4 Kāinga Ora considers that the reference in the explanation requiring that the full cost of development be borne on the developer is misleading and does not relate to the effects of development.	<p>Delete the reference to developers bearing the full costs of infrastructure provision, as-shown in the tracked amendments.</p> <p>2.2.4 Explanation</p> <p><i>.... Council’s Long Term Plan or Annual Plan sets out the programme for providing infrastructure to service growth. Where a developer wishes to pursue development ahead of Council’s programmes a development agreement will need to be entered into with Council to ensure that the infrastructure is provided in a way which is efficient and sustainable from a city-wide perspective. In these cases it is anticipated that developers will bear the full costs of infrastructure provision....</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.24	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the provisions [Objective 2.2.5], as they account for the recognition of changing amenity values in urban environments. This is consistent with Policy 6(b) of the National Policy Statement of Urban Development 2020 (‘NPS-UD’).	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.25	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Support	Policies 2.2.5a-d Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the provisions [Policies 2.2.5a to 2.2.5d], as they account for the recognition of changing amenity values in urban environments. This is consistent with Policy 6(b) of the National Policy Statement of Urban Development 2020 (‘NPS-UD’).	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.26	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Support in part	[Re Objective 2.2.6:] Ora supports enabling policies that provide support for residential land use activities within business zones.	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) [Re Objective 2.2.6:] as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.27	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Support in part	[Re Policies 2.2.6a to 2.2.6d]: Kāinga Ora supports enabling policies that provide support for residential land use activities within business zones.	[Re Policies 2.2.6a to 2.2.6d]: Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.28	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that policy 2.2.6d requires amendment to refer to ‘enabling’ residential activities, given that apartments are proposed to be ‘permitted’ (subject to compliance with standards) under Chapter 6.3yy ‘apartments’.	Amend policy 2.2.6d as shown in the tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.29	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports housing bottom lines as-required by the NPS-UD, noting that these are ‘minimum’ targets. Kāinga Ora seeks that the required objectives and policies under Schedule 3A of the RMA (as-modified by the Housing Supply Act) are included. Those objectives and policies apply to all relevant residential zones and therefore it is appropriate they are included in the ‘strategic framework’ section of the District Plan.</p> <p><u>Objective 2</u></p> <p><u>a relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to—</u></p> <p><u>(i) housing needs and demand; and</u></p> <p><u>(ii) the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.</u></p> <p><u>Policy 2</u></p> <p><u>Apply the MDRS across all relevant residential zones in the district plan except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga):</u></p>	Amend the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) to reflect the other mandatory objectives and policies that must be included under schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, which do not appear to have been included in relevant residential zones under PC12. Refer to the tracked amendments
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.30	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support	<p>Objective 2.2.9 <i>A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the housing needs and demand and a neighbourhood's planned urban built character.</i></p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to the provisions, as they account for the recognition of changing amenity values in urban environments. This is consistent with Policy 6(b) of the National Policy Statement of Urban Development 2020 (‘NPS-UD’).</p>	Include the proposed provisions (objectives, policies and explanation) as- notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.31	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments [Policies 2.2.9a and 2.2.9b and the Explanation] as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission on the spatial extent of the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential zone. Kāinga Ora consider the policies as notified are consistent with the Kāinga Ora position on those zones.	Include the proposed provisions [Policies 2.2.9a and 2.2.9b and the Explanation] as- notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.32	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton’s Identity, Character and Heritage	Oppose	Re Objective 2.2.10: Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to the objectives and associated policies. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.33	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton’s Identity, Character and Heritage	Oppose	Re Policies 2.2.10a to 2.2.10d: Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendments to the objectives and associated policies. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.34	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Support	Re Objective 2.2.12: Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments as they are consistent with the NPS-UD requirements under Policy 1(e).	Include the proposed provisions as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.35	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Support	Re Policies 2.2.12 a to 2.2.12d: Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments as they are consistent with the NPS-UD requirements under Policy 1(e).	Include the proposed provisions, Policies 2.2.12 a to 2.2.12d, as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.36	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	Re Objective 2.2.13: Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments as they are consistent with the NPS-UD requirements under Policy 1(e) as well as promoting alternative transport modes.	Include the proposed provisions as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.37	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	Re Policies 2.2.13a to 2.2.13f: Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments as they are consistent with the NPS-UD requirements under Policy 1(e) as well as promoting alternative transport modes.	Include the proposed provisions as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.38	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	Re Objective 2.2.14: The submitter is opposed in part to Objective 2.2.14. Kāinga Ora generally supports the inclusion of the objective and associated policies, being reflective of the requirements of the NPS-UD and prioritisation of accessibility to public transport and alternative transport modes. However, Kāinga Ora considers that the walkable catchments proposed, represent a reduction in generally-accepted distances. The 400m and 200m distances being applied are very small and unduly reduce the opportunities for the level of intensification otherwise required under the NPS-UD, particularly in relation to ‘metropolitan centres’ which are similar to ‘sub-regional centres’ under the ODP. There is insufficient justification or analysis within the s32 assessment as to the walkable catchments that have been applied, and the effect that consequentially has on the spatial extent of intensification under relevant zones. As such the provisions should be amended to provide for high density development of ‘at least’ 6 storeys within 1200m of the Central City (policy 3(C)(ii)), 800m of the sub-regional centre of Chartwell and 800m surrounding key public transport spines (Ulster Street, Te Rapa Road, Peach Grove, Hukanui and the Orbiter routes). Additionally, high density development should be provided for within 400-800m of the following Town Centres: Rototuna (North) Ruakura, Rotokauri, Peacocke, Five Crossroads, Thomas Road, Frankton, Hamilton East (Grey Street), Dinsdale. An additional policy should be drafted to refer to the application of Medium Density developments, consistent with schedule 3A of the RMA (As-modified by the Housing Supply Act).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the objective, associated policies and explanation to reflect accepted walkable catchments so as to ensure an appropriate spatial- enablement of intensification opportunities in accordance with the NPS-UD. Reconsider the ‘zone equivalency’ analysis undertaken and whether sub-regional centres are more-appropriately classified as ‘metropolitan zone-equivalents’ for the purposes of application of the NPS-UD and MDRS requirements, and walkable catchments. Amend the provisions to reflect the maps supplied under Appendix 2 to Kāinga Ora's submission
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.39	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	<p>The submitter is opposed in part to Policies 2.2.14a to 2.2.14i and Explanation. Kāinga Ora considers that the walkable catchments utilised, particularly in relation to the City Centre and larger suburban centres are small and unduly reduce the opportunities for the level of intensification otherwise required under the NPS-UD, in the most accessible areas of Hamilton. There is no justification or analysis within the s32 assessment as to the walkable catchments that have been applied, or two any assessment of an area’s accessibility. The proposed amendments to zone extents and height overlays have taken into account several factors which contribute to the level of accessibility of a given area consistent with the objectives and policies of the NPS- UD. In particular to giving effect to and enabling higher forms of residential living and density in the Hamilton urban environment. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Rototuna Town centre. Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre. 	<p>Amend the objective, associated policies and explanation to reflect accepted walkable catchments so as to ensure an appropriate spatial- enablement of intensification opportunities in accordance with the NPS-UD and the mapping provided within Appendix 2 of their submission. Delete and replace the spatial extent of all operative residential zones1 and all operative special character zones2 with the General Residential, Medium Density Residential, and High Density Residential zoning and height variation controls as shown in the planning maps provided within Appendix 2 of their submission. Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Rototuna Town centre. Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Thomas Road centre. Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Chartwell. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Chartwell centre. Apply HDRZ along the Hukanui/Peachgrove spine.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Thomas Road centre. Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Chartwell. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Chartwell centre. Apply HDRZ along the Hukanui/Peachgrove spine. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Five Cross Roads centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Five Cross Roads centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Dinsdale centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of Dinsdale centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of the Hillcrest centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Hillcrest centre. Apply HDRZ with a height variation control of up to 10 storeys (36m) within 400m walkable catchment of the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine and apply HDRZ to a 400m-800m walkable catchment of this spine recognizing its future role as a rapid transport corridor. Apply a height variation control of up to 12 storeys (43m) within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre zone. Apply a height variation control of up to 8 storeys (29m) within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the city centre zone. Apply additional height of 6-12 storeys within Hamilton East along Clyde Street. Apply MDRZ within a 400m- 800m walkable catchment of the HDRZ around Clyde Street. <p>Amendments are sought to reflect the above principles and ensure consistency in relation to the proposed spatial extent of zones (and heights-enabled) in Hamilton and the District Plan. The spatial changes are outlined in Appendix 2 of Kāinga Ora's submission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Five Cross Roads centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Five Cross Roads centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Dinsdale centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of Dinsdale centre. Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of the Hillcrest centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Hillcrest centre. Apply HDRZ with a height variation control of up to 10 storeys (36m) within 400m walkable catchment of the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine and apply HDRZ to a 400m-800m walkable catchment of this spine recognizing its future role as a rapid transport corridor. Apply a height variation control of up to 12 storeys (43m) within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre zone. Apply a height variation control of up to 8 storeys (29m) within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the city centre zone. Apply additional height of 6-12 storeys within Hamilton East along Clyde Street. Apply MDRZ within a 400m- 800m walkable catchment of the HDRZ around Clyde Street. Accept the planning maps and changes sought in Appendix 2 [of Kāinga Ora's submission]. <p>Retain all other zoning as notified that is not subject to any change sought from Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p><i>Policy 2.2.14b</i> <i>Provide for high-density residential developments within a nominal 800m1200m walking distance of the Central City Zone, allowing for up to 12 storeys within a nominal 400m walking distance of the city centre, and 8 storeys within a nominal 400m-800m walking distance of the city centre.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 2.2.1ba</i> <i>Provide for high density residential developments of up to 10 stories within a nominal 400m walking distance and up to 6 stories within a nominal 400m-800m walking distance of the Ulster Street / Te Rapa Spine to recognise the corridor's link from the city to Te Rapa as a sub-regional centre and its future use as a rapid transit corridor.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 2.2.14bb</i> <i>Provide for high density residential developments of up to 12 storeys along Clyde Street and Claudelands Road – Hamilton East to recognise the ease of accessibility and close proximity to the city centre, including amenities such as schools and frequent bus routes to the university.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 2.2.14c</i> <i>Provide for high densitymedium-density residential developments within a nominal 400m walking distance and medium density residential developments of a nominal 400m-800m walking distance of the Sub-regional Centre at Chartwell and the Suburban Centres at Thomas Road, Lynden Court, Five Cross Roads, Clyde Street East, Hamilton East, Glenview, Frankton, Hillcrest and Dinsdale.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 2.2.14d</i> <i>Enable higher density residential development within a nominal 200m400m walking distance of Nawton Suburban Centre.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.40	3.5 Rototuna	3.5.2 Structure Plan Components	Support in part	All of Chapter 3.5 Rototuna Structure Plan Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed provisions as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the relevant residential and town centre zone provisions that apply to the Rototuna Structure Plan Area. Notably the additional heights proposed within the Rototuna Town Centre, HDRZ within 400m walking catchment of the centre and MDRZ within 400-800m walking catchment of the centre.	Retain the provisions as-notified, subject to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on underlying zone and relevant city-wide provisions that apply, including the additional heights requested as shown in Appendix 2 of their submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.41	3.6 Rotokauri	General	Support in part	All of Chapter 3.6 Rotokauri Structure Plan . Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the relevant residential zone provisions that apply to the Rotokauri Structure Plan Area.	Retain the provisions as-notified, subject to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on underlying zone and relevant city-wide provisions that apply.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.42	3.7 Ruakura	General	Support in part	All of Chapter 3.7 Ruakura Structure Plan Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the relevant residential zone provisions that apply to the Ruakura Structure Plan Area.	Retain the provisions as-notified, subject to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on underlying zone and relevant city-wide provisions that apply.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.43	3.8 Te Awa Lakes	General	Support in part	All of Chapter 3.8 Te Awa Lakes Structure Plan : Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the relevant residential zone provisions that apply to the Te Awa Lakes Structure Plan Area.	Retain the provisions as-notified, subject to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on underlying zone and relevant city-wide provisions that apply.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh						
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.44	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	<p>Planning Maps - Spatial Extents of the General, Medium Density and High-Density Residential zones</p> <p>1. Kāinga Ora generally supports the approach to implement the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act by incorporating an intensification provisions into the district plan. The Kāinga Ora submission as a whole seeks improvements to better align with national direction.</p> <p>2. Amendments are sought to spatial extent and heights enabled. It is noted that Council have not reviewed the business zones to respond to the Centres Hierarchy required by the National Planning Standards. Kāinga Ora acknowledge this and seek to work with Council when such a plan change is undertaken.</p> <p>3. Heights and spatial extents of zones as sought by Kāinga Ora are shown within the maps shown as Appendix 2 [of Kāinga Ora's submission].</p> <p>4. Delete and replace the spatial extent of all operative residential zones and all operative special character zones with the General Residential, Medium Density Residential, and High Density Residential zoning and height variation controls as shown in the planning maps provided within Appendix 2 of this submission.</p> <p>5. Kāinga Ora seek that these maps are incorporated within the District Plan Maps, including the business zone height variations for ease of reference. More detail in regard to the business zone heights is provided within the Chapter 6 and 7 submission.</p> <p>6. Kāinga Ora seek the following principles to be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Thomas Road centre. Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre. - Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Chartwell. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Chartwell centre. - Apply HDRZ along the Hukanui/Peachgrove spine. - Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Five Cross Roads centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Five Cross Roads centre. - Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Dinsdale centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of Dinsdale centre. - Apply HDRZ with a height variation control of up to 10 storeys (36m) within 400m walkable catchment of the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine and apply HDRZ to a 400m-800m walkable catchment of this spine recognizing its future role as a rapid transport corridor. - Apply a height variation control of up to 12 storeys (43m) within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre zone. Apply a height variation control of up to 8 storeys (29m) within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the city centre zone. - Apply additional height of 6-12 storeys within Hamilton East along Clyde Street. Apply MDRZ within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the HDRZ around Clyde Street. - Apply HDRZ and MDRZ around Hamilton Lake and north of Waikato hospital. 	<p>Kāinga Ora seek that these maps are incorporated within the District Plan Maps, including the business zone height variations for ease of reference. More detail in regard to the business zone heights is provided within the Chapter 6 and 7 submission.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seek the following principles to be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) between 400m-800m of the centre. • Apply the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) around a 400m walkable catchment of the Thomas Road centre • Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Chartwell. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Chartwell centre. • Apply HDRZ along the Hukanui/Peachgrove spine. • Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Five Cross Roads centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of the Five Cross Roads centre. • Apply HDRZ around a 400m walkable catchment of Dinsdale centre. Apply the MDRZ between 400m-800m of Dinsdale centre. • Apply HDRZ with a height variation control of up to 10 storeys (36m) within 400m walkable catchment of the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine and apply HDRZ to a 400m-800m walkable catchment of this spine recognizing its future role as a rapid transport corridor. • Apply a height variation control of up to 12 storeys (43m) within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre zone. Apply a height variation control of up to 8 storeys (29m) within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the city centre zone. • Apply additional height of 6-12 storeys within Hamilton East along Clyde Street. Apply MDRZ within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the HDRZ around Clyde Street. • Apply HDRZ and MDRZ around Hamilton Lake and north of Waikato hospital.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.45	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	Re 4.1.1 All Residential Zones: Kāinga Ora supports the overall purpose on the residential zones as notified.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.46	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	Re 4.1.1 Vision and Strategy (Te Ture Whaimana): Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional strategies.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.47	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Oppose	Re 4.1.1 Historic Heritage: Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed referencing to historic heritage areas for the reasons outlined in its submissions on PC9. Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”), which Kāinga Ora opposed the approach of establishing ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ in its entirety. As such the amendments proposed by Kāinga Ora in this submission to PC12 seek to ensure the operative District Plan provisions are retained and not amended as part of PC9 or PC12 until Council undertakes a full analysis and evaluation of existing ‘character’ areas as a ‘qualifying matter’ rather than inappropriately identifying large areas of the city as ‘historic heritage’. Any such assessment (as historic heritage or character) requires a site-by-site analysis as per the legislative requirements of ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act, and any protections should be managed by way of an overlay, rather than ‘downzoning’ land contrary to the NPS-UD intent. All of which needs to and should form part of a s32 evaluation to support any such proposed change to the District Plan.	<p>Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p> <p>District Plan identifies a number historic heritage buildings and historic heritage areas within the residential areas that will have specific rules for the development of these area to ensure the retention of their historic values(see Chapter 19: Historic Heritage). These areas are identified through an overlay rules within Chapter 19 take preference over Chapter 4.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.48	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	Re 4.1.1 Residential Precincts: Kāinga Ora supports area-based precinct plans, to the extent they are consistent with the relief sought in the overall Kāinga Ora submission and give effect to the minimum density requirements and standards of MDRS	Include the proposed provisions [4.1.1] as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.49	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Re Objective 4.1.2.1: Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa o Waikato - The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, regional strategies.	Include the proposed provisions [4.1.2.1] as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.50	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	Re Policy 4.1.2.1a: Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submissions on the ‘strategic framework’ chapter, Kāinga Ora notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ in Policy 4.1.2.1a is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. As the policy uses ‘avoid’, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity and the policy is unclear as to what would be appropriate mitigation. Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework and is not-contrary to other enabling provisions.	Include the Policy as-notified with the tracked amendments sought. Avoid development where the direct or cumulative effects on the three waters infrastructure network cannot be mitigated to <u>an acceptable level</u> .
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.51	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the intent of Policy 4.1.2.1b but considers that it can be amended to better-relate to individual developments and their ‘contribution’ to the overall health of the Waikato River. Kāinga Ora also consider that this policy should include the need for betterment as directed by Te Ture Whaimana.	<p>Include the Policy as notified with the tracked amendments sought.</p> <p><i>Policy 4.1.2.1b</i> <i>Developments and activities in the Residential Zones must give effect to the outcomes in the The Vision and Strategy - Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato through developments and activities by being designed and <u>operated to contribute to the overall</u> protection and restore<u>restoration of</u> the health and wellbeing of the River <u>and betterment of the Awa</u>.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.52	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	Re Policy 4.1.2.1c : Kāinga Ora does not support the use of terminology which requires certain features to be both ‘maintained and enhanced’. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time. While it is accepted that this is terminology used within the RMA, Kāinga Ora consider it appropriate to amend the proposed wording. Kāinga Ora also consider that the health and well-being of the Waikato River can be restored and protected without the need to control density, but rather through a focus on ensuring appropriate infrastructure measures are incorporated, including stormwater quality measures to protect the Awa.	<p>Include the Policy as-notified with the tracked amendments sought.</p> <p><i>Policy 4.1.2.1c</i> <i>The health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected by controlling density, building size, site permeability and appropriate mitigation of earthworks, and by maintaining, and <u>where appropriate</u> enhancing access to the Waikato River.</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.53	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Re Policy 4.1.2.1d: Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana through managing potential effects ‘at source’.	Include the Policy as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.54	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Re Policy 4.1.2.1e: Kāinga Ora supports giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana through managing potential effects ‘at source’.	Include the Policy as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.55	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	Re Explanation under Objective 4.1.2.1: Kāinga Ora supports the explanation, subject to any consequential amendments being made to reflect submissions on the associated objectives and policies.	Include the explanation as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.56	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.1.2.2.	Include the objective as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.57	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policies 4.1.2.2a to 4.1.2.2c . Kāinga Ora does not support policy 4.1.2.2a (ii) as the information threshold that would be required to prove such a requirement is inappropriate through a resource consent process. It is also speculative as to the exact nature and extent of future development which is unknowable to the public. Council is required to ensure a level of infrastructure provision to accommodate permitted levels of development in exercising its duties under the Local Government Act 2002 (‘LGA’). Kāinga Ora considers that the balance of policies appropriately deal with infrastructure capacity issues. Kāinga Ora seek that alternative means to service the development should be allowed so that innovative services can be incorporated which can often have increased environmental benefits i.e. stormwater ponds in larger developments.	<p>Include the policies with amendments sought and delete policy 4.1.2.2a (ii). Consequential renumbering of policies will be required.</p> <p><i>Policy 4.1.2.2a Any development must:</i></p> <p><i>i. Provide an adequate level of infrastructure and services appropriate for the proposed development.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Takes into account and will not compromise the infrastructural needs of anticipated future development.</i></p> <p><i>iii. Not occur unless appropriate infrastructure and/or infrastructure capacity is available to service the proposed development, or it can be satisfactorily serviced through an alternative means where existing three waters infrastructure capacity and/or level of service is insufficient.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.58	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed ‘at source’ as far as practicable.	Delete Policy 4.1.2.2d as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.59	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Re Policy 4.1.2.2e: Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed ‘at source’ as far as practicable.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. As the policy uses ‘avoid’, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity and the policy is unclear as to what would be</p>	<p>Delete Policy 4.1.2.2e as notified.</p> <p>Policy 4.1.2.2e Residential land uses should be managed to avoid potential effects, such as noise, from arterial transport corridors and state highways.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					appropriate mitigation. Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework and is not-contrary to other enabling provisions.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.60	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that Policy 4.1.2.2f is effectively a repeat of 4.1.2.2a and should therefore be deleted. The Ruakura reference can be included in the former policy.	<p>Delete Policy 4.1.2.2f as-notified.</p> <p>4.1.2.2f New residential development must be able to be adequately serviced in terms of Three Waters infrastructure, with the exception of the Ruakura Structure Plan area Large Lot Residential Zone.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.61	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora supports the explanation, the final paragraph should be deleted until the associated policies are also removed, or re-drafted in response to the Kāinga Ora submission. Kāinga Ora seek that alternative means to service the development should be allowed so that innovative services can be incorporated which can often have increased environmental benefits i.e. stormwater ponds in larger developments.	<p>Include the Explanation below Objective 4.1.2.2 as-notified with the tracked amendments sought.</p> <p>4.1.2.2 Explanation</p> <p><u>Alternative or innovative means to service development shall also be considered where these means achieve the same or better standards when compared to traditional servicing requirements under the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications.</u></p> <p><i>The use of land can be affected by the presence of infrastructure. Not only does residential development need to have an adequate level of servicing available, but it needs to respond to regionally significant infrastructure, such as telecommunication infrastructure or the national electricity grid, either existing or planned.</i></p> <p>The policies recognise the need to manage residential land uses around regionally significant infrastructure, both existing and proposed — both to manage the effects that residential activities and structures can have on the infrastructure, as well as the adverse effects that the infrastructure can have on residential uses.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.62	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Re Objective 4.1.2.3: Kāinga Ora supports the policies as they are required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include the policies as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.63	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Re Policies 4.1.2.3a to 4.1.2.3d: Kāinga Ora supports the policies as they are required under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Include the policies as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.64	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.1.2.4 and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	Include the objective as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.65	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policies 4.1.2.4a to 4.1.2.4e and the need to ensure that non-residential activities within residential zones are appropriate and do not conflict with the amenity values to be expected in such zones.	Include the policies as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.66	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.1.2.5 and associated policies, being consistent with the requirements of the NP-SUD and reduction if greenhouse gas emissions.	Include the objective and associated policies as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh			Policies: All Resident ial Zones			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 67	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the efficient use of energy and water, being consistent with the requirements of the NPSUD and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Kāinga Ora seek that alternative means to service the development should be allowed so that innovative services can be incorporated which can often have increased environmental benefits i.e. stormwater ponds in larger developments. Policies 4.1.2.5a-b Policy 4.1.2.5a vi. Considering alternative means to service development that are innovative and serve for the betterment of the Awa.	Amendments sought for an additional policy matter. Include the policies, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora. <i>Policy 4.1.2.5a vi. Considering alternative means to service development that are innovative and serve for the betterment of the Awa.</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 68	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.1.2.6 as-notified.	Include the policies [Objective] as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 69	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the requirement to design development to essentially ‘mimic’ adjacent development is overly restrictive and does not allow for context-driven design response. The policy also needs to be consolidated as it reads as two policies.	Include Policy 4.1.2.6a as-notified with the tracked amendment sought. Policy 4.1.2.6a Ensure that all development achieves a legible public ‘front’ for access, and a private ‘back’ so as to positively contribute to a well-defined hierarchy of public and private spaces. Ensure that all development has a public ‘front’, where neighbours and visitors will access and primarily experience the development from and a private ‘back’, where public access is restricted and by invitation only. Require development to compatibly configure its fronts and backs with those of adjacent development so as to positively contribute the amenity of well-defined public and publicly accessible spaces, and private spaces.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 70	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 4.1.2.6b as-notified.	Include the Policy 4.1.2.6b as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 71	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	Kāinga Ora considers that the policies can be amended to ensure greater design flexibility where site context may requires it.	Include the Policy 4.1.2.6c as-notified with the tracked amendments sought. Policy 4.1.2.6c Building and development design achieves quality on-site amenity by providing: ii. Visually obvious <u>Legible</u> front doors and habitable room windows facing the public front. v. Appropriate levels of <u>A-g</u> access to sunlight and daylight throughout the year. x. Avoidance <u>where practical</u> , of the visual dominance of site and building frontages by garages or parking areas.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 72	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 4.1.2.6d as-notified.	Include Policy 4.1.2.6d as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 73	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora is opposed to provisions concerning reverse sensitivity, that require mitigation for effects generated by other activities (whether infrastructure or otherwise). Effects should be managed ‘at source’ as far as practicable. The policy is directed at managing effects which are otherwise managed through Chapter 25.8 Noise and Vibration.	Delete Policy 4.1.2.6e as-notified. Policy 4.1.2.6e Ensure development is designed to avoid unreasonable adverse noise effects occurring between residential units or from non-residential activities on the site or from adjoining sites.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.74	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The policy reads as a form of general tree protection which is contrary to established caselaw on the matter. Kāinga Ora consider it appropriate to delete the policy, as the need for ‘landscaping’ and its inherent contribution to amenity values is acknowledged in Policy 4.1.2.6g.	Delete Policy 4.1.2.6f as-notified. Policy 4.1.2.6f Vegetation and trees should be retained wherever possible.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.75	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The policy is a function of giving effect to the various other design-related policies under 4.1.2.6 as therefore should be deleted. Policy 4.1.2.6g Encourage the siting of buildings to take advantage of aspect, topography and site conditions.	Delete the Policy 4.1.2.6g as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.76	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 4.1.2.6h and the need to ensure landscaping is incorporated into development to ensure amenity values.	Include Policy 4.1.2.6h as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.77	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the policy as the issue is managed through Chapter 14-Transport, and may conflict with the number of crossings otherwise enabled per-site under 25.14.4.1 (Quantity of vehicle crossings).	Delete the Policy 4.1.2.6i as-notified. Policy 4.1.2.6i Ensure vehicle crossings are minimised on road frontages where narrow dwellings are proposed and where shared paths and separated cycle ways are located.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.78	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter opposes Policy 4.1.2.6j in part. The policy is too-subjective in its requirement for ‘any’ development to be ‘well-designed’. Kāinga Ora consider the policy should be amended to avoid such a reference.	Include the Policy 4.1.2.6j as-notified with the tracked amendment. Policy 4.1.2.6j Ensure any development is well-designed and minimises building bulk and visual dominance effects on adjoining sites, including minimising opportunities for overlooking adjoining properties.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.79	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	4.1.2.6 Explanation Kāinga Ora supports the explanation, subject to any consequential amendments to give effect to the Kāinga Ora submission on the associated policies.	Include the 4.1.2.6 Explanation as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.80	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.1.2.7 as-notified.	Include Objective 4.1.2.7 as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.81	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 4.1.2.7a as-notified.	Include Policy 4.1.2.7a as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.82	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed objectives and associated policies. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of proposed Objective 4.1.2.8 sought Objective 4.1.2.8 Buildings and activities within a Historic Heritage Area will be managed to ensure the heritage values of these areas are retained.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.83	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed objectives and associated policies. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA. Policy 4.1.2.8a Non-residential activities shall only be established within any identified historic heritage area when the activity maintains the heritage values of the area through built form and scale. Explanation Non-residential uses within identified historic heritage areas should be discouraged unless they can retain the historic value of the area through the design of the built form and scale of the proposed activities.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of proposed Policy 4.1.2.8a and Explanation is sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.84	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter opposes 4.2.1 in part. Kāinga Ora considers that the purpose statement places an emphasis on the amenity values of existing residents, which is in-part contrary to Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD which recognises that intensification and development may detract from the existing amenity values enjoyed by some persons.	Amend the 4.2.1 Purpose of the general residential zone to be consistent with the NPS-UD and consistent with the mandatory objectives and policies under schedule 3A of the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act (‘Housing Supply Act’). Amendments to 4.2.1 Purpose are sought. <i>4.2.1 Purpose The General Residential Zone is the most common residential zone in Hamilton. Its purpose is to provide for housing supply and choice, <u>while enabling up to three dwellings per site up to three storeys high in a manner that balances the amenity values of existing residents with the needs of new members of the community.</u> These provisions are primarily derived from the Government’s requirements including through its National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standard.</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.85	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	Objective 4.2.2.1 Kāinga Ora supports the objective as-notified.	Include the Objective 4.2.2.1 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.86	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.2.2.1b. Kāinga Ora opposes universal access requirements within the District Plan. Universal access requirements are already managed through the Building Act. It is onerous and unjustified to require a minimum number of universally accessible units for all development and this is better provided in response to market demand. There is insufficient s32 analysis on the compliance costs of such a requirement for all residentially-zoned development across the City.	Amend the policies as-notified to delete Policy 4.2.2.1b. 4.2.2.1b Incorporate universal access principles into residential development.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.87	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.2.2.2 as-notified, being consistent with the requirements of the Housing Supply Act.	Include Objective 4.2.2.2 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.88	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	Policy 4.2.2.2a Kāinga Ora supports the policy as-notified, being consistent with the requirements of the Housing Supply Act.	Include the Policy 4.2.2.2a as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.89	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora acknowledge that future development will result in changes to the existing environment. However, the policy overstates the potential effects of such changes in a manner contrary to Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD. This policy recognises that intensification and development may detract from the existing amenity values enjoyed by some persons, and that such changes in built form are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.</p> <p>The policy infers that development beyond permitted standards will have an adverse effect and is speculative as to what level of amenity can ‘reasonably’ be anticipated to be achieved on adjacent sites under the permitted standards. Issues of site context are highly-relevant to what is ‘reasonable’ in such circumstances and cannot be generalised in a policy. As such the policy as-notified places too-great an emphasis on permitted development as a measure of effects, and should focus on the broader design principles and outcomes that are referenced in the objectives and policies applying to all residential zones under Chapter 4.1.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora do not support reference to the ‘avoidance’ of effects, for the reasons outlined in Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”).</p>	<p>Include the Policy 4.2.2.2b with the tracked amendments sought. Include the</p> <p>Policy 4.2.2.2b Recognise that development in accordance with the General Residential Zone will have adverse effects, in some instances substantial, on existing development and neighbours, and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):</p> <p>i. Subject to (ii) below, ensure that development with that generates adverse effects, greater than those enabled by the General Residential Zone on a neighbour, will achieve an equivalent or greater overall standard of on-site amenity <u>for that neighbour that is consistent with the objectives and policies for all residential zones under 4.1.2, for that neighbour compared to development in accordance with what the General Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in.</u></p> <p>ii. Where a proposal cannot satisfy (i) above, avoid adverse effects beyond those that could result from development in accordance with what the General Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in except where substantial off-setting positive effects are proposed.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.90	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	Policy 4.2.2.2c Kāinga Ora supports the policy as-notified, being consistent with the requirements of the Housing Supply Act.	Include the Policy 4.2.2.2c as-notified
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.91	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	4.2.3.1 Activity Status Table Kāinga Ora supports the proposed activities which are generally consistent with the level of development and nature of activities encouraged under the Operative District Plan frameworks. In particular, Kāinga Ora supports the activities mandated under the Housing Supply Act for up to three dwellings as a permitted activity, and four or more dwellings being restricted discretionary. Kāinga Ora also supports the similar activity status’ that apply to Papakāinga housing, and the restricted discretionary status for Marae provided as part of Papakāinga housing development.	Include the activities and associated activity status’ in 4.2.3.1 Activity Status Table as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.92	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.2.3.1 Activity Status Table . Kāinga Ora opposes reference to historic heritage areas. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘historic heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	<p>Amendments to 4.2.3.1 Activity Status Table are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p> <p>nn. Relocated buildings within a Historic Heritage Area See Chapter 19</p> <p>oo. Demolition or removal of existing buildings (except heritage buildings scheduled in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage and buildings within any Historic Heritage Areas scheduled in Volume 8, Schedule 8D)</p> <p>pp. Demolition or removal of heritage buildings scheduled in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage and buildings within any Historic Heritage Area, scheduled in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8D</p> <p>qq. Maintenance, repair and alterations and additions to existing buildings (except heritage buildings scheduled in Volume 2, Appendix 8A, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage and buildings within any Historic Heritage Area scheduled in Volume 8, Schedule 8D)</p> <p>rr. Maintenance, repair and alterations and additions to heritage buildings scheduled in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage or buildings within any Historic Heritage Area, scheduled in Volume 8, Schedule 8D</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.93	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	Re 4.2.3.1 Activity Status ss to yy: Kāinga Ora supports the activities as-notified.	Retain 4.2.3.1 Activity Status ss to yy as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.94	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the notification provisions as they do not give effect to the notification preclusions that are required under schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. The notification exclusions are required in order to enable residential intensification.</p> <p>In addition, the provisions set a percentage threshold for where the degree of infringement will or will not be subject to limited or mandatory public notification. This is not considered appropriate as the use of a percentage value in reference to notification assessments may conflate the effects of a non-compliance through the degree or extent of infringement. Whether a proposal or an infringement is appropriate or not needs to be subject to an assessment that is particular to the locational characteristics of a development.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora appreciates the intent of the ‘percentages’ approach, however, ‘boundary activities’ are already provided for as a process in the RMA.</p>	<p>1. Amend the notification provisions 4.2.4 Rules Notification to be consistent with (at least) the notification exclusions under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act and remove references to ‘infringements’ and ‘percentages’.</p> <p>2. Kāinga Ora has suggested an approach in the tracked amendments to 4.2.4 – notification. Such changes ensure consistency with the Housing Supply Act and the added ‘note’ provides clarity in administration of those provisions.</p> <p>3. Kāinga Ora considers that any application which involves resource consents under other parts of the plan (i.e. earthworks, vegetation removal, flooding etc) should not result in the ‘bundling’ of activities that otherwise meet the requirements of 4.2.4. Such an approach provides elevated Commercial risk to redevelopment and intensification. The suggested ‘note’ seeks to account for this situation.</p> <p>4.2.4 Rules - Notification</p> <p><i>Except as set out below, all proposals for consent will be subject to the normal notification tests of the RMA 1991 as set out in Chapter 1.1.9:</i></p> <p><u>i. Any application for resource consent involving 1, 2 or 3 dwellings per site which complies with the following is precluded from being publicly notified:</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.2 Building Coverage</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping (only in relation to b)</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.4 Building Height</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.5 Height in relation to Boundary</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks (only in relation to a, c and e)</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.8 Public Interface</u></p> <p><u>• 4.2.5.9 Outlook Space</u></p> <p><u>ii. Any application for resource consent involving four or more dwellings per site, that comply with the standards listed in 4.2.4.i is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p> <p><u>iii. Any application for resource consent involving up to three, or four or more dwellings per site, which does not comply with the standards listed in 4.2.4.i, but complies with 4.2.5.4 Building Height and 4.2.5.3 Building Coverage is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>Note 1: For the avoidance of doubt, any application for resource consent identified in 4.2.4 which does not comply with those standards under 4.2.5 not otherwise listed above, would be subject to the exclusions provided the requirements of either i, ii or iii are met.</u></p> <p><u>Note 2: Any application qualifying under 4.2.4 i, ii or iii that requires resource consent/s under other sections on the District Plan shall be considered in an ‘unbundled’ manner for the purposes of notification assessment and determination under s95 of the RMA.</u></p> <p><i>i. Proposals for 1 to 3 dwellings on a site that infringe no more than two of the standards set out in 4.2.5 excluding the height in relation to boundary standard, and where the degree of infringement of each of the standards is no greater than 10% of the standard(s) in question, shall be processed without public or limited notification.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Proposals for 1 to 3 dwellings on a site that infringe no more than two of the standards set out in 4.2.5 excluding the height in relation to boundary standard but to an extent greater than specified in (i) above, or that infringe the height in relation to boundary standard, or that otherwise infringe three or more of the standards set out in 4.2.5 (including the height in relation to boundary standard), may be limited notified to the owners and occupants of adjoining sites.</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						Proposals for 4 or more dwellings that do not comply with one or more of the standards set out in 4.2.5, but where the extent of infringement is greater than 10% of the standard(s) in question and less than 25% of the standard(s) in question may be limited notified to the owners and occupants of adjoining sites. iii. Proposals for 4 or more dwellings that do not comply with one or more of the standards set out in 4.2.5, but where the extent of infringement is greater than 25% of the standard(s) in question may be publicly notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.95	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5 Rules – General Standards – General Residential Zone.	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to historic heritage areas. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.</p> <p>4.2.5 Rules – General Standards – General Residential Zone The following standards apply in the General Residential Zone, except where sites are located within a: i. Historic Heritage Area then any standards in Chapter 19 will take preference.</p>	Amendments are sought to 4.2.5 Rules – General Standards – General Residential Zone for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.96	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.1 Density	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora support there being no density standard for residential units and activities.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay consistent with relief sought under chapter 25 of the proposed plan change.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also opposes the reference to Historic Heritage Areas. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA</p>	<p>1. Remove reference to historic heritage areas, consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>2. Delete the note 4.2.5.1 Density, consistent with Kāinga Ora submission. Note: Refer to Chapter 25.13 – Three Water Infrastructure Capacity Overlay relating to density requirements. Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to density requirements.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.97	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.2.5.2.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the building coverage standard being in accordance with the MDRS requirements, and the greater level of coverage enabled under 4.2.5.2.b.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora opposes the reference to Historic Heritage Areas. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.</p>	<p>Include the standard 4.2.5.2 Building Coverage as-notified subject to the deletion of the note, consistent with Kāinga Ora submission on PC9.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p> <p><i>Rainwater tanks with a capacity of <10,500 litres are exempt from the calculation of building coverage (Refer to Chapter 25.13).</i></p> <p>Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to site coverage.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.98	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.2.5.3.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of a permeable surface standard, and the requirements for landscaped area in accordance with the MDRS.</p> <p>However, Kāinga Ora does not support the additional inclusion of front yard landscaping requirements and considers the landscaping requirements of the MDRS to be sufficient in ensuring the delivery of amenity.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora does not support the reference in the ‘note’ section to historic heritage areas, consistent with its overall submission on both PC12 and PC9.</p>	<p>Include the provisions 4.2.3.5 (a) and (b) as-notified and delete the front yard landscaping provisions (c)i to (c)iii. Amendments sought:</p> <p>c. On front, corner sites and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required forward of the front building line.</p> <p>i. Single residential units and duplex residential units and apartment buildings – Minimum 50%</p> <p>ii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width 7.5m or greater – Minimum 40%</p> <p>iii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width of less than 7.5m – Minimum 30%</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.99	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the requirements for urban trees and minimum planting sizes across the residential zones. The standard is not an efficient or effective method in achieving the objectives of the zone, as there will be ongoing compliance costs associated with ensuring that trees are retained post-development. This will likely require consent notices and/or covenants on titles which is costly and has not been sufficiently accounted for in Council’s s32 analysis. The standard may also be difficult to enforce and monitor for permitted activity development where a resource consent is not required.</p>	<p>Delete the urban trees standard and associate ‘notes’ as-notified, and any other changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>4.2.5.3 Urban Trees d. Urban trees Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site, clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, at the rate set out below: i. Detached residential unit – Two per residential unit. ii. Duplex residential unit – Two per residential unit. iii. Terrace housing unit – One per residential unit. iv. Apartment buildings – Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. v. All other activities – Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. e. Specimen trees shall be planted as per 4.2.5.3d at a planted size of at least 80L.</p> <p>Note:</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>• Requirements set out in 4.2.5.3 a can include the area required in 4.2.5.3 d Requirements set out in 4.2.5.3 b can include the area required in 4.2.5.3 c and d</p> <p>• If the development retains an existing mature tree (or trees) of at least 6m in height within the design, then this can be traded in place of a tree or trees required under 4.2.5.3 d. at a ratio of 1:1.</p> <p>• The management of stormwater generated from impermeable surfaces is controlled by Rule 25.13.4.2A in the Three Waters Chapter.</p> <p>• Rainwater tanks with a capacity of <10,500 litres are exempt from the calculation of permeable surface (Refer to Chapter 25.13).</p> <p>• Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to permeability requirements.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.100	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the height standard in accordance with the MDRS requirements. Kāinga Ora does not support the reference in the ‘note’ section to historic heritage areas, consistent with its overall submission on both PC12 and PC9.	<p>Included the provisions as-notified with the proposed amendments identified. Delete note.</p> <p>Notes: Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to building height.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.101	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of 4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary - General Residential Zone standard in accordance with the MDRS requirements.	Include the standard as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.102	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of those the building setback standards in accordance with the MDRS requirements, subject to deletion of the reference in the ‘note’ section to historic heritage areas, consistent with its overall submission on both PC12 and PC9.	<p>Include the standard 4.2.5.6 as-notified with the proposed amendments, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p><i>Note: iv. Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to building setback.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.103	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls - Rules. Kāinga Ora supports the standard as-notified, subject to deletion of the reference in the ‘note’ section to historic heritage areas, consistent with its overall submission on both PC12 and PC9.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora does not support retaining walls above 3.5m as a discretionary activity being listed in the standard. This should be accounted for in the zone activity table as a non-compliance with a general standard.</p>	<p>Include the standard as-notified with the proposed amendments identified.</p> <p>Delete 4.2.5.7 (d) (iii): iii. More than 3.5m: discretionary activity</p> <p>Delete 4.2.5.7 Note 1 (4): 4. Refer to Chapter 19 – For activities within any Historic Heritage Areas relating to boundary fences and walls.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.104	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the standards, being consistent with the MDRS requirements. However, in accordance with the submission relating to 4.2.5.8.b, Kāinga Ora request that reference to 1-3 units be removed and the standard applied to any level of residential development.	<p>Include the standard as-notified with the proposed amendments identified.</p> <p>4.2.5.8 Public Interface for one to three residential units on a site</p> <p><i>a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have: A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.105	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	Kāinga Ora generally supports the need to ensure development of 4+ units manage effects in relation to outlook and the broader design-related issues regarding interface and engagement with the public streetscape; however, consider the public interface standard of the MDRS, as imposed for up to 3 units, is sufficient.	<p>Delete 4.2.5.8 b in accordance with the relief sought under 4.2.5.8a.</p> <p>4.2.5.8 Public Interface for four or more residential units on a site</p> <p>b. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:-</p> <p>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</p> <p>ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear-glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building.</p> <p>iii. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door).</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.106	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 4.2.5.8 c – e as they are overly-prescriptive as general development standards. There are a range of site-contextual factors that would determine whether such requirements are appropriate. These are general design principles that are better-accommodated within non-statutory design guidelines (which sit outside of the District Plan) or assessment criteria.	Delete 4.2.5.8 c-e and include in non-statutory design guidelines or assessment criteria.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.107	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support	Re 4.2.5.9 Outlook Space: Kāinga Ora supports the standard and clarification under ‘j’, being consistent with the MDRS requirements.	Include the standard as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.108	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the standard, 4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area , being consistent with the MDRS requirements	Include the standard as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.109	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider 4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Area to be assessment criteria rather than a standard to provide for flexibility.	Delete the standard in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.110	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.12 Storage Areas	Support	Re 4.2.5.12 Storage Areas - For apartment developments containing four or more residential units: Kāinga Ora consider this to be assessment criteria rather than a standard to provide for flexibility	Delete the standard in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.111	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.2.5.13. Kāinga Ora generally supports the need to manage the number of vehicle crossings and garages to public streets.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora does not however, support the requirement for a consent notice (which can only be imposed under a subdivision consent) under a s9 land use rule. The reference to a consent notice should therefore be deleted.</p> <p>The duplication of standards relating to permeable surfaces and public interface is not required and Kāinga Ora request that this be deleted.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of planting requirements associated with vehicle parking spaces on-site. This is overly onerous and the landscaping requirements for a site, as imposed through the MDRS, are sufficient.</p>	<p>Include the standard as-notified, subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add "<i>can be provided</i>" to the end of 4.2.5.13 c as follows: <i>Where the residential unit has a frontage width facing a street or a publicly accessible on-site access way (for pedestrians) greater than 7.5m but less than 12m: one single-width garage or car port space, and one driveway / parking pad up to 3.5m wide <u>can be provided</u>.</i> 2. Amend 4.2.5.13 e i as follows: <i>It must be an unenclosed parking pad and shall not be enclosed into a carport or garage at any time. Any relating subdivision consent shall record this on the record of title as a consent notice,</i> 3. Delete standards 4.2.5.13 e iii and iv and rely upon these standards as included under 4.2.5.3 and 4.2.5.8 subject to the relief sought. 4. Delete standard 4.2.5.13 f.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.112	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Support	Kāinga Ora supports standard 4.2.5.14 Built Form and the need to ensure that the increased built form enabled by the MDRS height in relation to boundary standard is not exacerbated through excessive unrelieved building length.	Include 4.2.5.14 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.113	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	4.2.5.15 Universal Access Kāinga Ora opposes the standard. Universal access requirements are already managed through the Building Act. It is onerous and unjustified to require a minimum number of universally accessible units for all development and this is better provided in response to market demand. There is insufficient s32 analysis on the compliance costs of such a requirement for all residentially-zoned development across the City.	Delete 4.2.5.15 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.114	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Relocated Buildings	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the standard 4.2.6.6 Relocated Buildings as requirements of the standard can all be addressed appropriately under the Building Act.	Delete the standard 4.2.6.6 Relocated Buildings as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.115	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.8 Rest Homes	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of a density requirement for rest homes, which is an inefficient requirement for a permitted activity. Where a maximum of 10 persons can be accommodated as a permitted activity in compliance with all relevant standards, would be sufficient to ensure an appropriate level of amenity and to sufficiently-enable housing associated with aged-care.	Amend the standard as-notified to remove the density requirement. Amendments sought: 4.2.6.8 Rest Homes b—The maximum density for rest homes shall be one person per 75m² of net site area.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.116	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.9 Visitor Accommodation	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the standard as-notified	Include the standard as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.117	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.10 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of the Significant Natural Area in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9).	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the standard as it is already an activity identified in Chapter 25.2 – Earthworks and Vegetation removal. Specifically, 25.2.3K Rules – Activity Status Table as-proposed under PC9. An additional standard achieving the same outcome is therefore not required.	Delete the standard as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.118	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.2.7. Kāinga Ora generally supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions – to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity that is prescribed, Kāinga Ora consider that the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this when assessing enabled residential development.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also propose an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for four or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion</p>	<p>1. Amend the matters of discretion for residential dwellings, to refine the scope of any assessment and ensure assessment relates to the planned urban built-form character of the zone consistent with the NPS-UD and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>2. Insert an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for four or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.</p> <p>3. Include the balance of provisions as-notified to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>i. Four or more residential units on a site but complying with the standards*</i></p> <p><i>B – Design and Layout</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u> <p><i>C – Character and Amenity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form character of the neighbourhood.</u><u>• The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape.</u> <p><u><i>J – Three Waters Capacity and Techniques</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The effects on three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u> <p><i>ii. Infringements of one or more standards – up to 3 residential units on a site*</i></p> <p><i>B – Design and Layout</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u> <p><i>C – Character and Amenity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form character of the neighbourhood.</u><u>• The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape.</u> <p><i>Except in relation to non-compliance with Rule 4.2.5.3 a., where matters of discretion will be limited to JJ - Stormwater Quantity and Quality</i></p> <p><i>iii. Infringements of one or more standards – 4 or more residential units on a site.</i></p> <p><i>B – Design and Layout</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale.</u> <p><i>C – Character and Amenity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The extent to which the scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form character of the neighbourhood.</u><u>• The extent to which the development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape.</u> <p><u><i>J – Three Waters Capacity and Techniques</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• The effects on three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.119	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora considers that the purpose can be refined by removing the reference to what the District Plan previously-provided for, and distinguishing between what the General Residential Zone proposes to enable. Past development intensities are not relevant in reference to what the Plan now seeks to enable.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also seek changes in accordance with the maps in Appendix 2 showing the MDRZ within 400m-800m walkable catchment of the centres listed. AS a result of the proposed expansion of the HDRZ and its spatial application, consequential changes to the notified extent of the MDRZ are also proposed under the Kāinga Ora submission.</p>	<p>Amend the purpose statement for the zone as shown in the tracked amendments, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>4.3.1 Purpose</p> <p><i>Its purpose is to provide for housing supply and choice in a manner that meets the future needs of the community. The Medium Density Residential Zone is a reasonably high-intensity zone enabling a greater intensity of development than the General Residential Zone, previously provided for. Medium density development This provides a number of benefits, including a more efficient use of land and infrastructure and the ability to foster walkable communities, which provide for access to services, jobs and daily needs within a walkable or cyclable distance. The thresholds of what is anticipated are primarily derived from the Government’s requirements including through its National Policy Statements.</i></p> <p><i>Over time, the appearance of the medium density neighbourhoods will change, with development typically up to five storeys in a variety of sizes and forms, including detached dwellings, terrace housing and apartments. It also provides for more housing options, such as one or two person homes, smaller families and opportunities for retirees to downsize. Increased density supports public transport and viable commercial centres, increasing the number of people within a walkable catchment.</i></p> <p><i>The Medium Density Residential Zone applies to existing residential areas that have been identified as suitable to accommodate higher <u>(medium)</u> density development. These areas are located to the north of the Central City and <u>within 400m-800m walkable catchment</u> adjacent to the following Business Centres:</i></p> <p>• Chartwell • Hamilton East • Five Cross Roads • University • Thomas Road • Dinsdale • Glenview • Newton</p> <p><i>The zone also provides for residentially-compatible business activity including home businesses and other commercial or community activities.</i></p> <p><i>Where resource consent is required for <u>4 Z</u> or more dwellings, the plan places particular emphasis on achieving the anticipated urban built character of the Medium Density Residential Zone while achieving attractive and safe street and public open spaces. As well as managing the effects of development on adjoining neighbouring sites, including visual amenity, privacy and access to daylight, and ensuring a high quality on-site living environments.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.120	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.3.2.1 as-notified, however seeks a change to reflect that up to 6 dwellings should be permitted within the MDRZ.	<p>Include the objective as-notified with amendments as follows:</p> <p>Objective 4.3.2.1 Promote comprehensive and integrated development for the development of 4 Z or more residential units within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.121	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policies 4.3.2.1a to 4.3.2.1f . Whilst Kāinga Ora supports comprehensive developments, master planning can only be undertaken where greenfield or larger scale developments are possible and does not account for smaller sites. Kāinga Ora opposes universal access requirements within the District Plan. Universal access requirements are already managed through the Building Act. It is onerous and unjustified to require a minimum number of universally accessible units for all development and this is better provided in response to market demand. There is insufficient s32 analysis on the compliance costs of such a requirement for all residentially-zoned development across the City.	<p>Amend the policies as-notified and delete 4.3.2.1b. Amendments sought:</p> <p>Policies</p> <p>4.3.2.1a The development achieves higher density in conjunction with high quality amenity through a masterplanning approach that is informed by the relevant structure plan and related rules.</p> <p>4.3.2.1b Incorporate universal access principles into any development.</p> <p>....</p> <p>4.3.2.1d Land is used in accordance with structure and master planning, including coordination with staging and provision of infrastructure <u>where applicable to greenfield developments or large scale brownfield developments.</u></p> <p>....</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.122	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Objective 4.3.2.2. Kāinga Ora does not support the reference to ‘three’ storey buildings in policies that refer to the heights of buildings enabled in the zone. This is inconsistent with the intent of the NPS-UD and the Kāinga Ora submission on the maximum building heights enabled in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Amend Objective 4.3.2.2 (ii) as follows to reflect the level of development enabled within the zone and consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on maximum building heights enabled in the Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <p>Objective 4.3.2.2 The Medium Density Residential Zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: i. Housing needs and demand; and ii. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including <u>3 up to 5</u> storey buildings.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.123	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.3.2.2a . Kāinga Ora does not support the reference to ‘three’ storey buildings in policies that refer to the heights of buildings enabled in the zone. This is inconsistent with the intent of the NPSUD and the Kāinga Ora submission on the maximum building heights enabled in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Amend the objective as follows to reflect the level of development enabled within the zone and consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on maximum building heights enabled in the Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <p>Policy 4.3.2.2a</p> <p><i>Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3 to 5 storey terrace residential units and <u>up to 5 storey</u> apartment buildings.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.124	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora acknowledge that future development will result in changes to the existing environment. However, the policy overstates the potential effects of such changes in a manner contrary to Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD. This policy recognises that intensification and development may detract from the existing amenity values enjoyed by some persons, and that such changes in built form are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.</p> <p>The policy infers that development beyond permitted standards will have an effect and is speculative as to what level of amenity can ‘reasonably’ be anticipated to be achieved on adjacent sites under the permitted standards. Issues of site context are highly-relevant to what is ‘reasonable’ in such circumstances and cannot be generalised in a policy. As such the policy as-notified places too-great an emphasis on permitted development as a measure of effects, and should focus on the broader design principles and outcomes that are referenced in the objectives and policies applying to all residential zones under Chapter 4.1.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora do not support reference to the ‘avoidance’ of effects, for the reasons outlined in Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”).</p>	<p>Amend the policy as-shown in the tracked amendments.</p> <p>Policy 4.3.2.2b</p> <p>Recognise that development in accordance with the Medium Density Residential Zone will have adverse effects, in some instances substantial, on existing development and neighbours, and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):</p> <p>i. Subject to (ii) below, ensure that development with which generates adverse effects greater than those enabled by the Medium Density Residential Zone on a neighbour, will achieve an equivalent or greater overall standard of on-site amenity for that neighbour that is consistent with the objectives and policies for all residential zones under 4.1.2. compared to development in accordance with what the Medium Density Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in.</p> <p>ii. Where a proposal cannot satisfy (i) above, avoid adverse effects beyond those that could normally result from development in accordance with what the Medium Density Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in except where substantial off-setting positive effects.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.125	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Ruakura Residential Precinct	Support in part	Re Ruakura Residential Precinct - Objective 4.3.2.3 : Kāinga Ora supports the objective as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	<p>1. Include Objective 4.3.2.3 as-notified.</p> <p>2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.126	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Ruakura Residential Precinct	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports Policies 4.3.2.3a to 4.3.2.3c as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	<p>1. Include Policies 4.3.2.3a to 4.3.2.3c as-notified.</p> <p>2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.127	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora supports the objective but seeks that any reference to affordable housing and associated policies and rules, are removed from the District Plan.</p> <p>While Kāinga Ora understand such provisions have ‘rolled over’ from the operative District Plan, the inclusions of affordability requirements is not appropriate now that the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act (‘HASAA’) has been repealed. The NPS-UD seeks to enable housing supply to promote affordability across the full spectrum of residential development, such that the ‘affordability’ requirements of HASAA are no longer appropriate and may in fact frustrate the development sector’s ability to deliver housing.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the policies as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.</p>	<p>1. Delete the reference to affordable housing.</p> <p>2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.</p> <p>Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct - Objective 4.3.2.4 <i>The Medium-Density Residential Zone within the Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct area enables a comprehensively designed residential development incorporating a component of affordable housing and integrated with the adjacent adventure park tourist and recreation attraction, the Waikato River, and nearby communities, all contributing to an attractive gateway to the city.</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.128	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the policies but seeks that any reference to affordable housing and associated policies and rules, are removed from the District Plan. While Kāinga Ora understand such provisions have ‘rolled over’ from the operative District Plan, the inclusions of affordability requirements is not appropriate now that the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act (‘HASHAA’) has been repealed. The NPSUD seeks to enable housing supply to promote affordability across the full spectrum of residential development, such that the ‘affordability’ requirements of HASHAA are no longer appropriate and may in fact frustrate the development sector’s ability to deliver housing.	Delete Policies 4.3.2.4c and 4.3.2.4d : <i>4.3.2.4c The development provides affordable housing through the higher density and by specifying that a minimum percentage of new homes do not exceed a maximum purchase price.</i> <i>4.3.2.4d Development is sensitive to the Waikato River interface through lower density development and building setbacks.</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.129	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Rototuna Town Centre Precinct	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.3.2.5 as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	1. Include Objective 4.3.2.5 as-notified. 2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.130	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Rototuna Town Centre Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supportsas-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	1. Include Policies 4.3.2.5a to 4.3.2.5c as-notified. 2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.131	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Rotokauri North Residential Precinct	Support	Re Rotokauri North Residential Precinct - Objective 4.3.2.6 : Kāinga Ora supports the objective as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	1. Include Objective 4.3.2.6 as-notified. 2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.132	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Rotokauri North Residential Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policies 4.3.2.6a to 4.3.2.6i as-notified however notes that the objectives and policies mandatory under the MDRS need to be included within all residential zones.	1. Include Policies 4.3.2.6a to 4.3.2.6i as-notified. 2. Include the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within the Precinct chapter.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.133	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed activities which are generally consistent with the level of development and nature of activities encouraged under the Operative District Plan frameworks. However, Kāinga Ora seeks an increased threshold at which point resource consent is required for residential development in the MDRZ. Aligned with and giving effect to the planned urban built environment in the Medium Density Residential Zone is providing a greater intensity of buildings than anticipated in the General Residential Zone. A difference in enabled permitted residential units is required between the GRZ and MDRZ to incentivise and enable more residential units at a higher-form. The propose approach also seeks to ensure that the MDRZ and its spatial applications around centres (both as-notified and proposed in the Kāinga Ora submission) make an efficient use of land in accordance with the NPS-UD. Kāinga Ora also seeks similar activity status’ that apply to Papakāinga housing, and the restricted discretionary status for Marae provided as part of Papakāinga housing development.	1. Amend 4.3.3.1 e to 4.3.3.1h to provide an increased threshold at which point resource consent is required for residential and papakāinga development in the MDRZ. Aligned with and giving effect to the planned urban built environment in the Medium Density Residential Zone is providing a greater intensity of buildings than anticipated in the General Residential Zone. 2. Include the balance of activities under 4.3.3.1 and associated activity status’ as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. 4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table <i>e. 1 to 3 residential units on a site Up to <u>6 dwellings on a site</u></i> <i>P</i> <i>f. <u>4</u> or more residential units on a site</i> <i>RD*</i> <i>g. Papakainga containing 1 to 3 residential units up to 6 residential units</i> <i>P</i> <i>h. Papakainga containing <u>4</u> or more residential units</i> <i>RD*</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.134	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed activities which are generally consistent with the level of development and nature of activities encouraged under the Operative District Plan frameworks.	Include the balance of activities under 4.3.3.1 and associated activity statuses as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.135	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the notification provisions, 4.3.3.2 , as they do not give effect to the notification preclusions that are required under schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. The notification exclusions are required in order to enable residential intensification.	1. Amend the notification provisions to be consistent with (at least) the notification exclusions under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act and remove references to ‘infringements’ and ‘percentages’.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh					<p>In addition, the provisions set a percentage threshold for where the degree of infringement will or will not be subject to limited or mandatory public notification. This is not considered appropriate as the use of a percentage value in reference to notification assessments may conflate the effects of a non-compliance through the degree or extent of infringement. Whether a proposal or an infringement is appropriate or not needs to be subject to an assessment that is particular to the locational characteristics of a development.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora appreciates the intent of the ‘percentages’ approach, however, ‘boundary activities’ are already provided for as a process in the RMA.</p>	<p>2. Kāinga Ora has suggested an approach in the tracked amendments to 4.2.4 – notification. Such changes ensure consistency with the Housing Supply Act and the added ‘note’ provides clarity in administration of those provisions.</p> <p>3. Kāinga Ora considers that any application which involves resource consents under other parts of the plan (i.e. earthworks, vegetation removal, flooding etc) should not result in the ‘bundling’ of activities that otherwise meet the requirements of 4.2.4. Such an approach provides elevated Commercial risk to redevelopment and intensification. The suggested ‘note’ seeks to account for this situation.</p> <p><i>4.3.3.2 Rules - Notification</i></p> <p>⌘ Except as set out below, all proposals for consent will be subject to the normal notification tests of the RMA <u>as set out in Chapter 1.1.9:</u></p> <p><u><i>i. Any application for resource consent involving up to six dwellings per site which complies with the following is precluded from being publicly notified:</i></u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.2 Building Coverage</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.3 Permeability and Landscaping (only in relation to b)</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.4 Building Height</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.5 Height in relation to Boundary</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks (only in relation to a, b and d)</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.8 Public Interface</u></p> <p><u>• 4.3.4.9 Outlook Space</u></p> <p><u><i>ii. Any application for resource consent involving seven or more dwellings per site, that comply with the standards listed in 4.2.4.i is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>iii. Any application for resource consent involving up to six, or seven or more dwellings per site, which does not comply with the standards listed in 4.2.4.i, but complies with 4.2.5.4 Building Height and 4.2.5.3 Building Coverage is precluded from being publicly notified.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Note 1: For the avoidance of doubt, any application for resource consent identified in 4.3.3.2 which does not comply with those standards under 4.3.4 not otherwise listed above, would be subject to the exclusions provided the requirements of either i, ii or ii are met.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Note 2: Any application qualifying under 4.3.3.2 i, ii or iii that requires resource consent/s under other sections on the District Plan shall be considered in an ‘unbundled’ manner for the purposes of notification assessment and determination under s95 of the RMA.</i></u></p> <p><i>i. Proposals for 1, 2 or 3 dwellings on a site that infringe no more than two of the rules in 4.3.3, excluding the height in relation to boundary standard, and where the degree of infringement of each of the standards is no greater than 10% of the standard(s) in question, shall be processed without public or limited notification.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Proposals for 1, 2 or 3 dwellings on a site that infringe no more than two of the rules in 4.3.3, excluding the height in relation to boundary standard but to an extent greater than specified in (i) above, or that infringe the height in relation to boundary standard, or that otherwise infringe three or more of the rules in 4.3.3. (including the height in relation to boundary standard), shall be limited notified to the owners and occupants of adjoining sites.</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>iii. Proposals for 4 or more dwellings that do not comply with one or more of the rules in 4.3.3, but where the extent of infringement is greater than 10% of the standard(s) in question and less than 25% of the standard(s) in question shall be limited notified to the owners and occupants of adjoining sites.</p> <p>iv. Proposals for 4 or more dwellings that do not comply with one or more of the rules in 4.3.3, but where the extent of infringement is greater than 25% of the standard(s) in question shall be publicly notified.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.136	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone		Submitter does not provide reasoning.	The submitter does not seek any relief.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.137	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.1 Density	Support	Kāinga Ora support there being no density standard for residential units and activities.	<p>Remove reference to historic heritage areas, consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission. Delete note, as per reasons stated previously:</p> <p>Note: Refer to Chapter 25.13 – Three Waters relating to density requirements within the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.138	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.2 Building Coverage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the building coverage standard 4.3.4.2 being in accordance with the MDRS requirements, and the greater level of coverage enabled under 4.3.4.2.b.	Include the standard 4.3.4.2 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.139	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.3.4.3 . Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of a permeable surface standard, and the requirements for landscaped area in accordance with the MDRS. However, Kainga Ora does not support the additional inclusion of front yard landscaping requirements and considers the landscaping requirements of the MDRS to be sufficient in ensuring the delivery of amenity.	<p>Included 4.3.4.3 as-notified subject to the deletion of front yard landscaping provisions ci to ciiii. Amendments sought:</p> <p>4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping</p> <p>....</p> <p>c. On front, corner and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required forward of the front building line (except sites within the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct). ———</p> <p>i. Single residential unit and duplex residential units and apartment buildings Minimum — 50% ———</p> <p>ii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width 7.5m or greater Minimum — 40% ———</p> <p>iii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width of less than 7.5m Minimum — 30%</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.140	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requirements for urban trees and minimum planting sizes across the residential zones. The standard is not an efficient or effective method in achieving the objectives of the zone, as there will be ongoing compliance costs associated with ensuring that trees are retained post-development. This will likely require consent notices and/or covenants on titles which is costly and has not been sufficiently accounted for in Council’s s32 analysis. The standard may also be difficult to enforce and monitor for permitted activity development where a resource consent is not required.	<p>Re 4.3.4.3: Delete the urban trees standard, 4.3.4.3 d, and associated ‘notes’ as-notified, and any other changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping</p> <p>d. Urban Trees</p> <p>Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements set out in 4.3.4.3 a can include the area required in 4.2.5.3 d. Requirements set out in 4.3.4.3 b can include the area required in 4.2.5.3 c and d. If the development retains an existing mature tree (or trees) of at least 6m in height each within the design, then this can be traded in place of a tree or trees required under 4.3.4.3 d at a ratio of 1:1. The management of stormwater generated from impermeable surfaces is controlled by Rule 25.13.4. 2A in the Three Waters Chapter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Rainwater tanks with a capacity of <10,500 litres are exempt from the calculation of permeable surface (Refer to Chapter 25.13).</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.141	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Support in part	<p>Re 4.3.4.4: While Kāinga Ora support the inclusion of a greater height limit to distinguish the zone from the General Residential zone, a 18m height limit (plus the 1m roof form allowance) is more-accommodating of typical 5 storey development when building and inter-floor services are taken into consideration.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora considers that such a height limit should be applied across the zone, and that there is insufficient justification (in light of the NPS-UD) as to why heights should be reduced in Rotokauri North. In addition, Kāinga Ora does not consider it relevant or appropriate to restrict the number of ‘storeys’ a building may contain, when the built-form outcome remains the same in reference to the height otherwise provided for.</p>	Re 4.3.4.4: Amend the standards to provide for a 18m maximum height limit with the notified 1m roof form allowance and remove references to the maximum number of ‘storeys’ in the standard itself.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.142	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks a more enabling Height In Relation To Boundary control, 4.3.4.5, to reflect the higher density outcomes sought for the zone and for national consistency across Tier 1 authorities.	Amend the Height In Relation To Boundary standard, 4.3.4.5, as shown in the tracked amendments - see the original submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.143	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of those the building setback standards in accordance with the MDRS requirements.	Include the standard as-notified with the proposed amendment, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission. [No amendment were shown in the original submission].
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.144	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.3.4.7 . Kāinga Ora does not support retaining walls above 3.5m as a discretionary activity being listed in the standard. This should be accounted for in the zone activity table as a non-compliance with a general standard.	<p>Include the standard as-notified with the proposed amendments, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>Amendments sought: deletion of 4.3.4.7 d iii:</p> <p>iii. More than 3.5m: discretionary activity.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.145	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the standards, being consistent with the MDRS requirements, and the need to ensure development of 4+ units manage effects in relation to outlook and the broader design-related issues regarding interface and engagement with the public streetscape; however, consider the public interface standard of the MDRS, as imposed for up to 3 units, is sufficient.	Include 4.3.4.8 as-notified but delete the public interface standard, i.e., 4.3.4.8 b , and amend the heading for 4.3.4.8 a as follows: <i>Public interface for one to three residential units on a site</i> .
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.146	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.9 Outlook Space	Support	Kāinga Ora supports 4.3.4.9 , being consistent with the MDRS requirements.	Include 4.3.4.9 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.147	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	Kāinga Ora supports 4.3.4.10 , being consistent with the MDRS requirements.	Include 4.3.4.10 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.148	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that 4.3.4.11 is better suited as assessment criteria to allow for design flexibility.	Delete 4.3.4.11 in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.149	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that 4.3.4.12 is better suited as assessment criteria to allow for design flexibility.	Delete 4.3.1.12 in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.150	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.3.4.13 . Kāinga Ora generally supports the need to manage the number of vehicle crossings and garages to public streets. The duplication of standards relating to permeable surfaces and public interface is not required and Kāinga Ora request that this be deleted. Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of planting requirements associated with vehicle parking spaces on-site (and associated consent notice requirements). This is overly onerous and the landscaping requirements for a site, as imposed through the MDRS, are sufficient. Amendments sought.	<p>1. Include 4.3.4.13 as-notified, subject to deletion of the ‘consent notice’ reference.</p> <p>2. Delete standards 4.3.4.13 e iii and iv and rely upon these standards as included under 4.2.5.3 and 4.2.5.8 subject to the relief sought.</p> <p>3. Delete standard 4.2.5.13.f [4.3.4.13 f].</p> <p>4. Delete onerous consent notice requirement under 4.2.5.13.g.i [4.3.4.13 g i] as follows:</p> <p><i>g. i. Each residential unit within the duplex unit may only have one car parking space. It must be an unenclosed parking pad and shall not be enclosed into a carport or garage at any time. The related subdivision consent shall record this on the record of title as a consent notice.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.151	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.14 Built Form	Support	Kāinga Ora supports 4.3.4.14 and the need to ensure that the increased built form enabled by the height in relation to boundary standard is not exacerbated through excessive unrelieved building length. A small amendment is sought to align with the relief sought by Kāinga Ora within its submission.	<p>Include 4.3.4.14 as-notified with amendments as follows:</p> <p>4.3.4.14 Built Form</p> <p>For any terrace housing or apartment development containing four <u>seven</u> or more residential units</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.152	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.15 Universal Access	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 4.3.4.15 . Universal access requirements are already managed through the Building Act. It is onerous and unjustified to require a minimum number of universally accessible units for all development and this is better provided in response to market demand. There is insufficient s32 analysis on the compliance costs of such a requirement for all residentially-zoned development across the City.	Delete 4.3.4.15 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.153	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.16 River Interface Overlay in Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the existing requirements, 4.3.4.16 , and need to ensure an appropriate interface with the Waikato River.	Retain 4.3.4.16 as-notified, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.154	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.17 Affordable Housing	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora understand 4.3.4.17 has ‘rolled over’ from the operative District Plan, the inclusion of affordability requirements is not appropriate now that the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act (‘HASHAA’) has been repealed. The NPSUD seeks to enable intensification and a consequential increase in housing supply to promote affordability across the full spectrum of residential development, such that the ‘affordability’ requirements of HASHAA are no longer appropriate and may in fact frustrate the development sector’s ability to deliver housing.	Delete 4.3.4.17 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.155	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.18 Development Rules in the Ruakura Residential Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora support the specific precinct standards that apply (4.3.4.18), which account for the place-based planning processes that have already taken place.	Retain as-notified, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.156	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.19 Development Rules in Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora support the specific precinct standards that apply (4.3.4.19), which account for the place-based planning processes that have already taken place.	Retain 4.3.4.19 as-notified, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.157	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.7 Rest Home (Except in the Ruakura and Rotokauri North Residential Precinct)	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of a density requirement for rest homes, which is an inefficient requirement for a permitted activity. Where a maximum of 10 persons can be accommodated as a permitted activity in compliance with all relevant standards, would be sufficient to ensure an appropriate level of amenity and to sufficiently-enable housing associated with aged-care.	Amend 4.3.5.7 as-notified to remove the density requirement, which is inconsistent with the principles of the NPS-UD. Amendments sought. Delete 4.3.5.7 b: b. The maximum density for rest homes shall be one person per 50m² of net site area.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.158	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.9 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of a SNA in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the standard 4.3.5.9 as it is already an activity identified in Chapter 25.2 – Earthworks and Vegetation removal. Specifically, 25.2.3K Rules – Activity Status Table as-proposed under PC9. An additional standard achieving the same outcome is therefore not required	Delete the standard 4.3.5.9 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.159	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.6 Controlled Activities: Matters of Control	Support	Kāinga Ora support the provision 4.3.6 Controlled Activities: Matter of Control.	Retain provision 4.3.6 Controlled Activities: Matter of Control as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.160	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.3.7. Kāinga Ora supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions – to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission including the amendments to allow for up to 6 dwellings as a permitted activity.</p> <p>However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity that is prescribed, Kāinga Ora consider that the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this when assessing enabled residential development of up to 6 dwellings per site where standards are infringed as sought by Kāinga Ora.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also propose an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for seven or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.</p>	<p>1. Amend 4.3.7 the matters of discretion for residential dwellings, to refine the scope of any assessment and ensure assessment relates to the planned urban built-form character of the zone consistent with the NPS-UD and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>2. Insert an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for seven or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). As a consequence, assessment criterion (iii) is a duplication and sought to be deleted as it is no longer required.</p> <p>3. Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.</p> <p>4. Include the provisions as-notified to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>Refer to original submission for amendments.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.161	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports the purpose statement. Being consistent with the NPSUD Policy 3(c) requirement to provide for ‘at least’ six storey development.</p> <p>In that context and consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the Strategic Framework and spatial extent of the Residential Zones, Kāinga Ora submits that it is appropriate to provide for greater than 6 storey development. Kāinga Ora considers that the walkable catchments proposed, represent a reduction in generally-accepted distances. The 400m and 200m distances being applied are very small and unduly reduce the opportunities for the level of intensification otherwise required under the NPS-UD, particularly in relation to ‘metropolitan centres’ which are similar to ‘sub-regional centres’ under the ODP. There is insufficient justification or analysis within the s32 assessment as to the walkable catchments that have been applied, and the effect that consequentially has on the spatial extent of intensification under relevant zones.</p> <p>As such the provisions should be amended to provide for high density development of ‘at least’ 6 storeys within 1200m of the Central City (policy 3(C)(ii)), 800m of the sub-regional centre of Chartwell and 800m surrounding key public transport spines (Ulster Street, Te Rapa Road, Peach Grove, Hukanui and the Orbiter routes). Additionally, high density development should be provided for within 400-800m of the following Town Centres: Rototuna (North), Ruakura, Rotokauri, Peacocke, Five Crossroads, Thomas Road, Frankton, Hamilton East (Grey Street), Dinsdale. Appendix 2 to Kāinga Ora's submission provides the proposed spatial extent of the HDRZ, consequential changes to other affected zones, and height overlay sought by Kāinga Ora.</p>	<p>Amend the 4.4.1 Purpose statement to reflect the Kāinga Ora submission seeking ‘greater than 6 storeys’ height within 800m of the City Centre through and additional height overlay, and the proposed extended spatial extent of the zone as shown on the maps within Appendix 2 to Kāinga Ora's submission. Amendments sought.</p> <p>Amend the second paragraph of 4.4.1 as follows:</p> <p><u>The Zone is applied in areas that are within a walkable catchment of the edge of the Central City Zone as well as identified centres, to ensure that High Density development and residents therein have convenient access housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces and open spaces by way of public transport or active transport modes. Greater height is enabled where there is walkable access to the Central City Zone and/or ease of access through active transport modes and public transport.</u></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.162	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support	<p>Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.4.2.1 as-notified, being consistent with the requirements of the NP-SUD.</p>	<p>Include Objective 4.4.2.1 as-notified.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.163	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora supports Policies 4.4.2.1a and 4.4.2.1b as-notified, being consistent with the requirements of the Housing Supply Act.</p>	<p>Include Policies 4.4.2.1a and 4.4.2.1b and Explanation as-notified, with the proposed amendment to reflect Kāinga Ora's submission. Amendments sought.</p> <p>Amend 4.4.2.1b as follows:</p> <p><u>Require the height, bulk, density and appearance of development to contribute to a high density urban character of at least 6 storeys, with greater height enabled in identified locations that are in proximity to the Central City.</u></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and	160.164	4.4 High Density	4.4.2 Objectiv	Support	<p>Kāinga Ora supports Objective 4.4.2.2 as-notified, and the need to ensure ‘well-functioning environments’ to accommodate the level of intensity anticipated in the zone.</p>	<p>Include Objective 4.4.2.2 as-notified.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Communitie s - Gurv Singh		Residential Zone	es and Policies: High Density Resident ial Zone			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 165	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectiv es and Policies: High Density Resident ial Zone	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policies 4.4.2.2a to 4.4.2.2c as-notified, and the need to ensure ‘well-functioning environments’ to accommodate the level of intensity anticipated in the zone	Include Policies 4.4.2.2a to 4.4.2.2c as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 166	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.4.3.1. Kāinga Ora opposes 4.4.3.1 e and f as-notified. While the intent of discouraging lower-density residential development in a High-Density Residential Zone (‘HDRZ’) is understood, it is contrary to the NPS-UD and purpose of the Housing Supply Act to preclude, rather than enable, up to at least three dwellings per site in relevant residential zones.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks an increased threshold at which point resource consent is required for residential development in the HDRZ, consistent with the approach proposed in the MDRZ. The proposed approach also seeks to ensure that the HDRZ and its spatial application around the City Centre (both as-notified and proposed in the Kāinga Ora submission) make an efficient use of land in accordance with the NPS-UD and maximises opportunities for intensification. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed amendments to the MDRZ and HDRZ provide a clear spatial hierarchy to those zones.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also seeks similar activity status’ that apply to Papakāinga housing, and the restricted discretionary status for Marae provided as part of Papakāinga housing development for consistency across the residential zones.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora considers that clarification should be provided for the ‘relocated buildings’ (4.3.3.1.ss) activity to ensure it does not apply to off-site manufacturing of modular-style buildings, which are an increasingly common construction approach. While Kāinga Ora is opposed to restrictions of relocated buildings in lower intensity residential zones, the proposed NC status is supported in the context of a high-density residential zone that seeks to enable the greatest opportunities for intensification and land use efficiency.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports in part the balance of activities and associated activity status’ as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p>	<p>1. Amend 4.4.3.1 e to 4.4.3.1 h to delete activities for 1 and 2 dwellings on a site, and provide an increased threshold at which point resource consent is required for residential and papakāinga development in the HDRZ.</p> <p>2. Include the balance of activities under 4.4.3.1 and associated activity status’ as-notified (with proposed tracked amendment to 4.3.3.1 ss, to the extent they are consistent with the overall relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>Amendments sought to 4.4.3.1: e. One residential unit on a site NC</p> <p>f. 2 Up to 6 residential units on a site DP</p> <p>g. 3-7 or more residential units on a site RD*</p> <p>[new activity] Papakāinga containing up to 6 residential units P</p> <p>h. Papakāinga containing 4-7 or more residential units RD*</p> <p>ss. Relocated buildings (not including off-site manufacturing of modular buildings) NC</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 167	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.4 Rules - Notificat ion	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the notification provisions as they do not give effect to the notification preclusions that are required under schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act. The notification exclusions are required in order to enable residential intensification. Kāinga Ora proposed similar provisions to those with the GRZ and MDRZ for consistency.	<p>1. Amend 4.4.4 Rules - Notification to be consistent with the notification exclusions under Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act.</p> <p>2. Kāinga Ora has suggested a consistent approach across the residential zones for PC12 in the tracked amendments to 4.2.4 – Rules notification. Such changes ensure consistency with the Housing Supply Act and the added ‘note’ provides clarity in administration of those provisions.</p> <p>3. Kāinga Ora considers that any application which involves resource consents under other parts of the plan (i.e. earthworks, vegetation removal, flooding etc) should not result in the ‘bundling’ of activities that otherwise meet the requirements of 4.2.4 – Rules notification. Such an approach provides elevated Commercial risk to redevelopment and intensification. The suggested ‘note’ seeks to account for this situation.</p> <p>Refer to Kāinga Ora's original submission for the amendments.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie	160. 168	4.4 High Density	4.4.5.1 Density	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.4.5.1 . Kāinga Ora does not consider it appropriate to apply a density standard to terrace housing. There is sufficient design control through all new residential building requiring consent, and the proposed residential standards, to ensure that appropriate	Include the standard 4.4.5.1 Density with the terrace housing density 4.4.5.1 a) requirement deleted.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh		Residential Zone			onsite amenity is achieved. Imposition of such a restrictive density control is not consistent with the intent of the NPS-UD or the Housing Supply Act.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.169	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.2 Building Coverage	Support	Kāinga Ora supports a greater level of building coverage being permitted in comparison to the MDRS requirements, reflective of enabling a higher intensity of development.	Include the standard 4.4.5.2 Building Coverage as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.170	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.4.5.3 . Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of the landscaping requirement of the MDRS; however, oppose the additional inclusion associated with individual ground level units.	Included the provisions 4.4.5.3 as-notified with the proposed amendments identified to deleted 4.4.5.3 b. <u>b. A residential unit at ground floor must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 10% of the total site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of a tree regardless of the ground treatment below them.</u>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.171	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requirements for urban trees and minimum planting sizes across the residential zones. The standard is not an efficient or effective method in achieving the objectives of the zone, as there will be ongoing compliance costs associated with ensuring that trees are retained post-development. This will likely require consent notices and/or covenants on titles which is costly and has not been sufficiently accounted for in Council's s32 analysis. The standard may also be difficult to enforce and monitor for permitted activity development where a resource consent is not required.	Delete 4.4.5.3 c and d and the associated 'Notes' as-notified, and any other changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought. Amend the Notes as follows: <i>Note:</i> Requirements set out in 4.4.5.3 a can include the area required in 4.4.5.3 b. Requirements set out in 4.4.5.3 b can include the area required in 4.4.5.3 c. If the development retains an existing mature tree (or trees) of at least 6m in height within the design, then this can be traded in place of a tree or trees required under 4.4.5.3 c at a ratio of 1:1.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.172	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support in part	Consistent with the overall submission, Kāinga Ora submits that it is appropriate to provide for greater than 6 storey development as-follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply HDRZ with a height variation control of up to 10 storeys (36m) within 400m walkable catchment of the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine and apply HDRZ to a 400m-800m walkable catchment of this spine recognizing its future role as a rapid transport corridor. Apply a height variation control of up to 12 storeys (43m) within a 400m walkable catchment of the Central City zone. Apply a height variation control of up to 8 storeys (29m) within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the city centre zone. Apply additional height of 6-12 storeys within Hamilton East along Clyde Street. Apply MDRZ within a 400m-800m walkable catchment of the HDRZ around Clyde Street. Kāinga Ora seeks a minor amendment to the notified maximum height (for buildings outside of the overlay as-sought by Kāinga Ora) to allow for varying roof and floor designs. 	1. Include the amended standard 4.4.5.4 as-shown to allow for varying roof and floor designs. 2. Include the additional height overlay shown on the proposed planning maps in Appendix 2 to Kāinga Ora's submission. Refer to Kāinga Ora's original submission for amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.173	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks a more enabling Height in Relation to Boundary control to reflect the higher density outcomes sought for the zone and for national consistency across Tier 1 authorities.	Amend the standard 4.4.5.5 . as shown in the tracked amendments. Refer to Kāinga Ora's submission for amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.174	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	Kāinga Ora supports standard 4.4.5.6, noting that there is an exclusion for common walls between two buildings.	Include the standard 4.4.5.6 as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.175	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support retaining walls above 3.5m as a discretionary activity being listed in the standard. This should be accounted for in the zone activity table as a non-compliance with a general standard.	Include the standard 4.4.5.7 as-notified with the proposed amendment - deletion of 4.4.5.7 d iii as follows: iii. More than 3.5m: Discretionary activity
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.176	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the standards, being consistent with the MDRS requirements, and the need to ensure development of 4+ units manage effects in relation to outlook and the broader design-related issues regarding interface and engagement with the public streetscape.	Include 4.4.5.8 a as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.177	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 4.4.5.8b to 4.4.5.8d as they are overly-prescriptive as general development standards. There are a range of site-contextual factors that would determine whether such requirements are appropriate. These are general design principles that are better-accommodated within design guidelines or assessment criteria – particularly in the case of the high-density zone where development involving residential units all require resource consent.	Delete 4.4.5.8b to 4.4.5.8d and include in design guidelines or assessment criteria.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.178	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the standards in part but requests amendments to reflect the built form anticipated in the zone.	Include the standard 4.4.5.9 as-notified with amendments identified to 4.4.5.9 c as follows: c. All other habitable rooms must have an outlook space of 1m in depth and 1m in width.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.179	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the standards, being consistent with the MDRS requirements and will support residential living at higher intensities of development.	Include the standard 4.4.5.10 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.180	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that this standard, 4.4.5.11 , is better placed as an assessment criteria to allow for design flexibility.	Delete 4.4.5.11 in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.181	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider that this standard, 4.4.5.12 , is better placed as an assessment criteria to allow for design flexibility.	Delete 4.4.5.12 in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.182	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 4.4.5.13 . Kāinga Ora generally supports the need to manage the number of vehicle crossings and garages to public streets. The duplication of standards relating to permeable surfaces and public interface is not required and Kāinga Ora request that this be deleted. Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of planting requirements associated with vehicle parking spaces on-site. This is overly onerous and the landscaping requirements for a site, as imposed through the MDRS, are sufficient. Amendments sought.	1. Include 4.4.5.13 as-notified with amendments identified. 2. Delete 4.4.5.13 d iii and 4.4.5.13 d iv and rely upon these standards as included under 4.4.5.3 and 4.4.5.8 subject to the relief sought. 3. Delete standard 4.4.5.13.f
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.183	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the standard in part and the need to ensure that the increased built form enabled by the height in relation to boundary standard is not exacerbated through excessive unrelieved building length, however considers that 4.4.5.14(b) and (c) are unnecessary as these are controlled appropriately by the other development and performance standards.	Include 4.4.5.14 as-notified with amendments as follows: 4.4.5.14 Built Form For any terrace housing or apartment development containing four-seven or more residential units a. no wall which is parallel to or up to an angle of 30o to any external boundary except the road frontage shall exceed 15m in length without there being a step in (or out) plan of at least 1.8m depth and 4m in length. b. All parts of a building less than 11m in height (or up to 3 storeys) shall be setback from the side and rear boundary a minimum of 1 meter as required by Rule 4.4.5.6 b & c;

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						c. All parts of a building greater than 11m in height (or greater than 3 storeys) shall be setback from the side and rear boundary a minimum of 4 meters.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.184	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 4.4.5.15 . Universal access requirements are already managed through the Building Act. It is onerous and unjustified to require a minimum number of universally accessible units for all development and this is better provided in response to market demand. There is insufficient s32 analysis on the compliance costs of such a requirement for all residentially-zoned development across the City.	Delete 4.4.5.15 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.185	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.5 Rest Homes	Support in part	Kāinga Ora does not support the inclusion of a density requirement for rest homes, which is an inefficient requirement for a permitted activity. Where a maximum of 10 persons can be accommodated as a permitted activity in compliance with all relevant standards, would be sufficient to ensure an appropriate level of amenity and to sufficiently-enable housing associated with aged-care.	Amend the standard as-notified to remove the density requirement for rest homes. Amendments sought: delete 4.4.6.5 b : b. The maximum density for rest homes shall be one person per 50m² of net site area
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.186	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.6 Visitor Accommodation (Outside of the Visitor Facilities Precinct)	Support	Kāinga Ora supports 4.4.6.6 as-notified.	Include 4.4.6.6 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.187	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.7 Dairy	Support	Kāinga Ora supports 4.4.6.7 as-notified.	Include 4.4.6.7 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.188	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.8 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of a Significant Natural Area in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 4.4.6.8 as it is already an activity identified in Chapter 25.2 – Earthworks and Vegetation removal. Specifically, 25.2.3K Rules – Activity Status Table as-proposed under PC9. An additional standard achieving the same outcome is therefore not required.	Delete 4.4.6.8 as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.189	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 4.4.7.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora supports the referencing of the established assessment criteria under the operative provisions – to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission including the amendments to allow for up to 6 dwellings as a permitted activity.</p> <p>However, in light of the NPS-UD and acknowledgement that existing environments will change in response to the planned urban built form character and amenity that is prescribed, Kāinga Ora consider that the existing matters of discretion need to be reframed to account for this when assessing enabled residential development of up to 6 dwellings per site where standards are infringed, as sought by Kāinga Ora.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also propose an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for seven or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.</p>	<p>1. Amend the matters of discretion for residential dwellings, to refine the scope of any assessment and ensure assessment relates to the planned urban built-form character of the zone consistent with the NPS-UD and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>2. Insert an additional matter of discretion in relation to three waters infrastructure for seven or more dwellings per site. This approach seeks to ensure the appropriate assessment is undertaken (within the scope of the proposed matter of discretion), given Kāinga Ora opposition to, and sought-deletion of, the proposed infrastructure constraint overlay (refer to submission on Chapter 25). As a consequence, assessment criterion (iii) is a duplication and sought to be deleted as it is no longer required.</p> <p>3. Consequential changes to other listed activities and associated matters of discretion may be required should the relief sought in relation to the infrastructure constraint overlay be granted.</p> <p>4. Include the provisions as-notified to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission.</p> <p>See the amendments sought in Kāinga Ora's original submission.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.190	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora supports the proposed large lot residential zone provisions, 4.5.1, being essentially a ‘roll over’ of the operative provisions, and in light of the large lot residential zone not being a ‘relevant residential zone’ under the Housing Supply Act. However, the purpose statement should be corrected to remove reference to its ‘similarly’ to the general residential zone given the purpose of the zone, its spatial application and the density requirements within the zone which set it apart from the General Residential Zone.</p>	<p>Include 4.5.1 as-notified subject to deletion of the second sentence:</p> <p><i>The Large Lot Residential Zone is similar in most respects to the General Residential Zone, with the obvious difference being the size of allotments within the Large Lot Residential Zone.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.191	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. As such, the deletion of the existing provisions concerning Special Character zones is opposed.</p> <p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.</p>	<p>Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”).</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks deletion as per submission on PC9.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.192	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1.1 Special Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. As such, the deletion of the existing provisions concerning Special Character zones is opposed.</p> <p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.</p>	<p>Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.193	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1.1 Special Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. As such, deletion of the existing provisions concerning Special Character zones is opposed.</p> <p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.</p>	<p>Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.194	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.1.1 Special Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. As such, deletion of the existing provisions concerning Special Character zones is opposed.</p>	<p>Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.195	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to 6.1 d to reflect residential activities being provided for in the Business zones.	Include 6.1 d as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.196	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to reflect residential activities being provided for in the Business zones.	Include the objective 6.2.1 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.197	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose Policy 6.2.1f as it does not recognise the higher density residential living suited for the sub-regional centres. Outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation. Subsequent amendments/deletion are sought to reflect this change within the rule framework.	Replace policy 6.2.1f with that proposed and amend relevant rules to clarify this policy. Amendments sought. Replace Policy 6.2.1f with: <u>Achieve a good standard of amenity for upper floor residential activities in the Sub-regional centres by ensuring access to convenient outdoor space.</u>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.198	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to Objective 6.2.2 to reflect residential activities being provided for in the Business zones.	Include Objective 6.2.2 as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.199	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to reflect residential activities being provided for in the Business zones.	Include policy 6.2.2b as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.200	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose Policy 6.2.2h as it does not recognise the higher density residential living suited for the suburban centres. Outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation. Subsequent amendments/deletion are sought to reflect this change within the rule framework.	Replace Policy 6.2.2h with the following and amend relevant rules to clarify this policy: 6.2.2h <u>Upper floor residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit is provided with adequate storage space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.</u> <u>Achieve a good standard of amenity for upper floor residential activities in the suburban centres by ensuring access to convenient outdoor space.</u> Amendments sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.201	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Neighbourhood Centres	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose Policy 6.2.3c as it does not recognise the higher density residential living suited for the neighbourhood centres. Outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation. Subsequent amendments/deletion are sought to reflect this change within the rule framework.	Replace Policy 6.2.3c with the following, and amend relevant rules to clarify this policy: <u>Achieve a good standard of amenity for upper floor residential activities in the neighbourhood centres by ensuring access to convenient outdoor space.</u>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.202	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to Policy 6.2.8a to reflect the planned outcomes of the zone.	Include the policy as-notified to the extent that it gives effect to the relief sought within this submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.203	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora oppose Policy 6.2.8b as it does not recognise the higher density residential living suited for the commercial fringe zone. Outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation.</p> <p>Subsequent amendments/deletion are sought to reflect this change within the rule framework.</p>	<p>Replace Policy 6.2.8b with the following, and amend relevant rules to clarify this policy:</p> <p><u><i>Achieve a good standard of amenity for upper floor residential activities in the commercial fringe zone by ensuring access to convenient outdoor space.</i></u></p> <p>Amendments sought.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.204	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part Policy 6.2.8c. Kāinga Ora notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ in Policy 6.2.8c is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. As the policy uses avoid, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity. Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework of the ODP and not-contrary to other enabling provisions.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks the policy be amended, on the basis that ‘avoidance’ of all reverse sensitivity issues is too-high a threshold in a mixed-use environment, and that the policy relates to residential activities.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 6.2.8c as follows, with any consequential amendments to the District Plan as-required to give effect to the relief sought:</p> <p><i>Mixed use development shall provide a range of uses that complement, and are supportive of, the Hamilton East Suburban Centre which are managed to ensure high levels of amenity for any residential activity and avoid any while ensuring that reverse sensitivity effects are mitigated to ensure an appropriate level of amenity for residential activities</i>issues.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.205	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Frankton Commercial Fringe Zone	Support	<p>Kāinga Ora oppose Policy 6.2.9b as it does not recognise the higher density residential living suited for the commercial fringe zone. Outlook requirements should not be mandatory in a higher density living situation.</p> <p>Subsequent amendments/deletion are sought to reflect this change within the rule framework.</p>	<p>Replace Policy 6.2.9b with the following and amend relevant rules to clarify this policy.</p> <p><u><i>Achieve a good standard of amenity for upper floor residential activities in the Frankton commercial fringe zone by ensuring access to convenient outdoor space.</i></u></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.206	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>While Kāinga Ora supports the proposed activity statuses for residential above ground floor, the table should be formatted to ensure there is no confusion regarding apartment typology and activity status. Separated rows for each activity subset would be appropriate.</p>	<p>Include the activities as-notified with amendments to ensure the formatting of the activity table does not lead to confusion.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.207	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on the residential zones and the need to ensure an appropriate spatial hierarchy and zone height framework, Kāinga Ora seeks that additional height be enabled within business zones to be reflective of both the height increases sought and the spatial extent of the Medium and High-Density Residential zones and is consistent with the height variation maps attached within Appendix 2 of Kāinga Ora’s submission</p>	<p>1. Amend the spatial extent and application of the height overlay to reflect the Kāinga Ora submission to increase enabled heights with any consequential amendments to the District Plan as-required to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>2. Include the height variation controls within the District Plan planning maps. The proposed amendments to the height overlay are provided in Appendix 2 to the Kāinga Ora submission. Proposed heights are annotated therein as well as within tracked amendments to 6.4.1.</p> <p>3. Increase the heights of up to 48.50m within 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre.</p> <p>4. Increase the heights of up to 40.50m within 400m-800m walkable catchment of the City Centre and within 400m of the Ulster Road and Te Rapa Road spine.</p> <p>5. Increase the heights of Business 6 centres where located adjacent to a High Density Zone.</p> <p>6. Increase the heights within the Rototuna Town Centre to 24m.</p> <p>Refer to Kāinga Ora's original submission for amendments.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.208	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Oppose	Re 6.4.1 : Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on the residential zones and the need to ensure an appropriate spatial hierarchy and zone height framework, Kāinga Ora seeks that additional height be enabled within 400m-800m of the City Centre, 400m of the Ulster Road/Te Rapa Road spine and where adjacent to High Density Residential Zones.	<p>1. Amend the spatial extent and application of the height overlay to reflect the Kāinga Ora submission to increase enabled heights with any consequential amendments to the District Plan as-required to give effect to the relief sought.</p> <p>2. Include the height variation controls within the District Plan planning maps. The proposed amendments to the height overlay are provided in Appendix 2 to the Kāinga Ora submission. Proposed heights are annotated therein as well as within tracked amendments to 6.4.1.</p> <p>3. Increase the heights of up to 48.50m within 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre.</p> <p>4. Increase the heights of up to 40.50m within 400m-800m walkable catchment of the City Centre and within 400m of the Ulster Road and Te Rapa Road spine.</p> <p>5. Increase the heights of Business 6 centres where located adjacent to a High Density Zone.</p> <p><u>Figure 6.4c Height Overlay</u></p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p><u>1. The height overlay identified in Figure 6.4c applies to sites within the Business Zone only.</u></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.209	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.2 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the need to manage the transition of higher-intensity development to lower-intensity zones, and the application of the MDRS density control for Height in Relation to Boundary where the business zoned land adjoins the General Residential zone. However, additional provisions should be included to provide for a greater HIRB control where business zoned land adjoins the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend standard 6.4.2 Height in Relation to Boundary as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.210	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.7 Residential Development	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks that the provision of storage areas is provided as a matter of assessment criteria rather than a standard to allow for flexibility and to reflect the higher intensity of development expected within the Business Centre Zones.	Delete the standard 6.4.7 and introduce it as an assessment criteria.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.211	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.7 Residential Development	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the standard as it sets a minimum ‘liveable’ area for apartment sizes, and avoids the establishment of undersized apartments which would not contribute to well-functioning urban environments or provide an adequate minimum level of amenity.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks the standard be maintained, with modifications to ensure typology number requirements are removed (being similar to a density standard), and that the minimum floor area relates to the internal floor area (not including balconies).</p>	Retain the standard with tracked amendments. Amendments sought - see Kāinga Ora's original submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.212	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.7 Residential Development	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete the standard 6.4.7 g Public Interface in its entirety
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.213	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.7 Residential Development	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision (6.4.7h External Outlook Area) as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete the standard 6.4.7 External Outlook Area h. in its entirety
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.214	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.6 Restricted Discretion	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the matters of discretion and assessment criteria under Section 6.6. in its entirety, as-notified	Include the provisions as-notified with the proposed amendments, including any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh			nary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.215	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1 Purpose	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendment to the purpose statement, but considers that residential activity within the central city will support the vitality and vibrancy of the centre. As such this should be recognised.	Amend 7.1 Purpose statement (c) to reflect the tracked changes: <i>(c) This is supported by the themes discussed throughout the City’s strategy documents and provisions within this chapter that encourage residential development, which do not detract from that supports the primary functions of the central city.</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.216	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 7.2.1g and subsequent removal of residential density controls, consistent with the NPSUD requirements.	Include Policy 7.2.1g as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.217	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the explanation as amended, particularly through the removal of reference to high density not occurring where it is not identified or provided for as this is not then consistent with other provisions of Plan Change 12. However, Kāinga Ora see merit in retaining the statement ‘Residential activities within the Central City promote sustainable living environments through the concentrated use of the City’s resources’ as this is an encouraging and enabling statement specifically relating to residential uses within the central area.	Include the Explanation below Objective 7.2.1 as notified and retain the statement as amended. Amendments sought as follows: <i>The Regional Policy Statement sets out high density residential development within and close to the Central City. Residential activities within the Central City promote sustainable living environments through the concentrated use of the City’s resources.</i> <i>This approach ensures stability for established parts of the City, so higher density will not occur where it is not identified and provided for.</i>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.218	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 7.2.6h and the intent to ensure residential activities are supported through appropriate amenities to achieve ‘well-functioning’ environments and residential amenity with the Central City Zone.	Include Policy 7.2.6h as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.219	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	City Living Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 7.2.7e and the intent to ensure residential activities are supported through appropriate amenities to achieve ‘well-functioning’ environments and residential amenity with the Central City Zone.	Include Policy 7.2.7e as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.220	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Ferrybank Precinct	Support	Kāinga Ora supports Policy 7.2.8e and the intent to ensure residential activities are supported through appropriate amenities to achieve ‘well-functioning’ environments and residential amenity with the Central City Zone.	Include Policy 7.2.8e as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.221	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the activity and Non Complying status in 7.3 ii , to ensure that residential development is consistent with the planned outcomes of the zone and does not foreclose more-efficient high-density development of land for residential activity.	Include the activity 7.3 iiSingle detached dwellings as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.222	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.3 Maximum	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the deletion of the Maximum Height Control standard 7.4.3 , being consistent with the NPS-UD requirements.	Maintain deletion of the standard 7.4.3 Maximum Height Control as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought										
s - Gurv Singh			Height Control													
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.223	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.4 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter opposes 7.4.4 in part. Whilst Kāinga Ora supports the need to manage the transition of higher-intensity development to lower-intensity zones, in accordance with the submission on the spatial application of residential zoning, the central area zone should not be adjoining the General Residential Zone and therefore this standard should be amended to reflect this position.	Amend the standard <i>7.4.4 Height in Relation to Boundary</i> as shown										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.224	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter opposes 7.4.6 in part. Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion to the extent it is inconsistent with its submission on Historic Heritage Areas and the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9. Kāinga Ora opposes the setbacks required between buildings within the central city zone and any residential zone. Given the proposed zoning framework, Kāinga Ora considers that this setback should be applied only to the interface of the Central City and Medium and General Residential Zones. Amendments sought.	1. Maintain the operative district plan provisions subject to a revised analysis of existing ‘character’ areas as a ‘qualifying matter’. Where existing character areas warrant retention (subject to the above analysis), apply such a qualifying matter as an overlay. 2. Amend 7.4.6 a ii and iii for Precinct 2 as shown in Kāinga Ora's original Submission. 3. Kāinga Ora seek any consequential amendments to the District Plan as-required to give effect to the relief sought.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.225	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.8 Service Areas	Support	Kāinga Ora supports deletion of the service area requirement, 7.4.8 a ii , which is excessive for residential development at high-intensities	Maintain deletion of the standard 7.4.8 (a) (ii) as-notified.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.226	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Support	Kāinga Ora is supportive of the increase to the minimum number of residential units required per site. This is consistent with NPS-UD requirements under Policy 3(a) to “...to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” as the standard does not place a maximum density requirement on residential units.	Include 7.5.3 b as-notified.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.227	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 7.5.3 e i and iii . Kāinga Ora seeks that the provision of storage areas is provided as a matter of assessment criteria rather than a standard to allow for flexibility and to reflect the higher intensity of development expected within the City Centre Zone.	Delete the standard 7.5.3 e Storage Areas and introduce as an assessment criteria.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.228	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of 7.5.3 f Residential Unit Size as it sets a minimum ‘liveable’ area for inner city apartment sizes, and avoids the establishment of undersized apartments which would not contribute to well-functioning urban environments or provide an adequate minimum level of amenity. Kāinga Ora seeks the standard be maintained, with modifications to ensure typology number requirements are removed (being similar to a density standard), and that the minimum floor area relates to the internal floor area (not including balconies).	Retain the standard 7.5.3 f Residential Unit Size with tracked amendments as shown. Amendments sought: <i>f. Residential Unit Size</i> <i>i. The minimum internal floor area required in respect of each apartment shall be:</i> <table><tr><td><i>Form of Residential Unit</i></td><td><i>Floor Area</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Studio unit</i></td><td><i>Minimum 30m2</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>1 or more bedroom unit</i></td><td><i>Minimum 4540m2</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>2 bedroom unit</i></td><td><i>Minimum 55m2</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>3 or more bedroom unit</i></td><td><i>Minimum 90m2</i></td></tr></table> <i>ii. In any one apartment building containing in excess of 20 residential units, the combined number of one-bedroom units and studio units shall not exceed 50% of the total number of residential units within the building.</i>	<i>Form of Residential Unit</i>	<i>Floor Area</i>	<i>Studio unit</i>	<i>Minimum 30m2</i>	<i>1 or more bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 4540m2</i>	<i>2 bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 55m2</i>	<i>3 or more bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 90m2</i>
<i>Form of Residential Unit</i>	<i>Floor Area</i>															
<i>Studio unit</i>	<i>Minimum 30m2</i>															
<i>1 or more bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 4540m2</i>															
<i>2 bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 55m2</i>															
<i>3 or more bedroom unit</i>	<i>Minimum 90m2</i>															
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.229	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision 7.5.3 f. Daylight Standards as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete the standard 7.5.3 f. Daylight Standards in its entirety.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.230	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this provision 7.5.3. g. External Outlook Area as it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living	Delete the standard 7.5.3. g. External Outlook Area in its entirety.										
Kainga Ora - Homes and	160.231	Chapter 13 Rototuna	General	Oppose	MDRS Objectives and Policies - Whilst Kāinga Ora supports amendments which ensure the zone is consistent with the enabling principles of the NPS-UD and other chapters of the plan that reference	Introduce the mandatory objectives and policies of the MDRS within Chapter 13.										

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Communitie s - Gurv Singh		Town Centre Zone			the Rototuna Town Centre, it is noted that the mandatory objectives and policies of the Enabling Act have not been included where the zone introduces residential activities.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 232	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.5.2 Height in Relation to Boundar y	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 13.5.2. Kāinga Ora considers that the application of a height in relation to boundary control to a Community Facilities zone is overly-restrictive, as the nature of the activities in that zone would be able to accommodate the effects of additional building height and scale.</p> <p>In line with the height and spatial variations proposed within Appendix 2 of this submission, Kāinga seeks changes to the HIRB controls to reflect the HDRZ and MDRZ changes proposed.</p>	<p>1. Amend the standard to remove the height in relation to boundary (HIRB) application where a building is on land that adjoins the Community Facilities Zone.</p> <p>2. Amend the HIRB controls to reflect the height variations sought within Appendix 2 of their submission.</p> <p>Amendments sought as follows:</p> <p>13.5.2 Primary Frontages Height in Relation to Boundary</p> <p>Where a building is on land that adjoins a General Residential Zone, Community Facilities Zone or an adjoining developme nt area, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control plane rising at an <u>angle of 60 degrees beginning at an el</u> <u>evation of 4m above the boundary.</u></p> <p><u>Where a building is on land that adjoins land that is zoned High Density Residential Zone, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control plane:</u></p> <p><i>a. Buildings within 21.5m from the frontage must not project beyond a 60-degree recession plane measured from a point 19m vertically above ground level along the side boundaries; and</i></p> <p><i>b. Buildings 21.5m from the frontage must not project beyond a 60-degree recession plane measured from a point 8m vertically above ground level along the side boundaries.</i></p> <p><u>Where a building is on land that adjoins land that is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control planerising at an angle of 60 degrees beginning at an elevation of 6m above the boundary.</u></p> <p><u>Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way,</u></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 233	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.5.5 Resident ial Activitie s Outdoor Living, Service and Storage Areas	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the standard 13.5.5 (a) Outdoor Living Area as-notified.	Retain the standard 13.5.5 (a) Outdoor Living Area as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160. 234	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.5.5 Resident ial Activitie s Outdoor Living, Service and Storage Areas	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the standard 13.5.5 Service Area b) as it is in conflict with the requirements of the MDRS.	Delete the standard 13.5.5 Service Area b) in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie	160. 235	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.5.5 Resident ial Activitie	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes 13.5.5 c Storage Area and seeks that it is included as assessment criteria.	Delete the standard 13.5.5 c Storage Area and include as assessment criteria.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh			s Outdoor Living, Service and Storage Areas			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.236	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	18.1 Purpose	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to 18.1 Purpose b) i to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12.	Include 18.1 Purpose b i as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.237	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	18.1 Purpose	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to 18.1 Purpose b)ii to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12.	Include 18.1 Purpose b)ii as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.238	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	18.1 Purpose	Support in part	18.1 (b)iii - Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12	Include <i>18.1 Purpose b)iii</i> as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the submission on the transport provisions under PC12.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.239	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures). Kāinga Ora supports the existing Operative District Plan (ODP) provisions and their application in relation to ‘Built Heritage’, to the extent consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9.	Maintain the existing ODP provisions in relation to ‘Built Heritage’, to the extent consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.240	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	<p>1. Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA.</p> <p>2. As such, Kāinga Ora seek that any reference to ‘historic heritage areas’ is deleted and removed from PC12. This includes deletion of 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas.</p> <p>3. Amendments will be required to PC12 to give effect to this relief sought.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.241	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.4.2 sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.242	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Site Coverage	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.243	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.4.4 sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.244	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.4.5 sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.245	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.4.6 sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.246	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.4.7 sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.247	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion of 19.6 (a) (ix) to (xvii) sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.248	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora support the cross reference to Chapter 23A for subdivision within the Peacocke Precinct, consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC5.	Include the amendment as-notified. c. For subdivision within the Peacocke Precinct refer to Chapter 23A.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.249	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the objective 23.3.2. [23.2.2.]	Retain Objective 23.3.2. [23.2.2.] as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.250	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the proposed amendments to the objectives and policies. It is noted that there are existing policies (x and xi) which reference the ‘avoidance’ of effects. While these are operative provisions that have not been proposed to be amended under PC12, consistent with the overall submission, Kāinga Ora do not support reference to the ‘avoidance’ of effects, for the reasons outlined in Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”).	Include Policy 23.2.2a with the amendments as-notified, and remove reference to ‘avoid’. Amendments sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.251	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the Objective 23.2.3.	Retain Objective 23.2.3. as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.252	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 23.2.3a. While Kāinga Ora supports comprehensive planning of subdivisions, the objective and policies imply that all subdivision in the Medium Density Residential zone requires a Comprehensive Development Plan. This is contrary to the enabling land use a subdivision activity required under the Housing Supply Act.	Amend Policy 23.2.3a as-notified to remove the implication that any subdivision in the Medium or High Density Residential zone requires a Comprehensive Development Plan (as shown in tracked amendments).
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.253	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to Policy 23.2.3b and reference to ‘enabling’ subdivision.	Include the amended Policy 23.2.3b as-notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.254	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the <i>Explanation 23.2.3</i> .	Retain 23.2.3 <i>Explanation</i> as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.255	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the objective 23.2.5.	Retain as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.256	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the policy 23.2.5a.	Retain as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.257	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the policy 23.2.5b.	Retain as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.258	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments and proposed subdivision activities, in particular the inclusion of controlled activity subdivision in the General, Medium and High-Density residential zones as required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora seeks that Unit Title subdivision is also provided for as a Controlled Activity within these zones. Kāinga Ora does not support the reference to historic heritage areas under (xiv) in accordance with its submission on PC9 and the reasons outlined in the overall Kāinga Ora submission on PC12. Moreover, Kāinga Ora considers that subdivision of a site containing a scheduled historic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include the activities as-notified, to the extent consistent with the overall submission within the PC9 submission by Kāinga Ora and proposed tracked amendments. 2. Change subdivision of a site containing a scheduled historic building/structure to Restricted Discretionary. 3. Change Unit Title subdivisions within General, Medium and High Density Zones to a Controlled Activity. 4. Include subdivision of a site containing a Significant Natural Area should have an activity status of Restricted Discretionary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					building/structure should have an activity status of Restricted Discretionary, with specific assessment criteria for historic heritage to be considered. Kāinga Ora considers that subdivision of a site containing a Significant Natural Area should have an activity status of Restricted Discretionary, with specific assessment criteria for the natural environment character and amenity to be considered	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.259	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora acknowledges there are specific subdivision requirements that apply to Rototuna Town Centre zones and the Te Rapa industrial zone, the table also addresses residential zones and therefore should provide for controlled activity subdivision in the General, Medium and High-Density residential zones as required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act.	Review the table 23.3b to provide for controlled activity subdivision in the General, Medium and High-Density residential zones as required under Clause 3A of the Housing Supply Act.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.260	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.6.8 Subdivision in the Medium-Density Residential Zones and Rototuna Town Centre Zone (excluding Rotokauri North Medium Density Residential Zone)	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 23.6.8. Kāinga Ora does not support imposing a consent notice on a subdivision to enforce land use conditions as the land use conditions require this compliance in themselves. Consent notices should be limited to matters relating to the subdivision only.	Delete provision 23.6.8(c) as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.261	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 23.7.1. Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of a minimum net site area, and requests that a minimum shape factor as amended, be relied upon instead for General, Medium and High Density Residential Zones. This would sufficiently ensure that smaller vacant lot sizes are not created which might otherwise foreclose multiunit redevelopment of a single site, in accordance with the MDRS and the enabling provisions of the zone. Kāinga Ora does not support the Historic Heritage area requirement, consistent with its submission on PC9 which opposes the historic heritage areas in their entirety. Kāinga Ora does not support (t) and the requirement for shape factor circles to not infringe particular setback standards. This is an onerous requirement that is not consistent with the MDRS, nor is it clear if this has been identified as a ‘qualifying matter’ and assessed accordingly	1. Amend the proposed shape factor for residential allotments in accordance with the tracked changes provided. 2. Remove the requirement as it applies to historic heritage areas, consistent with relief sought through PC9 3. Delete the requirement for shape factor circle to not infringe yard setbacks.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.262	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 23.7.2. While Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments, the proposed changes to 23.7.2.(4 (formerly the ‘note’)) are opposed. The proposed amendment places an onerous requirement (that is not present under the operative plan) to demonstrate every allotment can contain a dwelling as a permitted activity in full compliance with the relevant residential chapter/zone. This is contrary to the intent of the standard which is to acknowledge that an approved land-use outcome is appropriate. Subdivision in accordance with that land use consent should then be a formality, subject to the subdivision giving effect to the land use outcomes being relied upon. Kāinga Ora therefore considers the standard to be neither efficient nor effective in giving effect to the intended outcomes of the MDRS, as it potentially frustrates the consenting and development process. It is observed that the numbering and layout of 23.7.2 is confusing as it is unclear whether clauses 4-6 apply to clause 2, and the numbering is inconsistent.	Include the standards 23.7.2 as-notified, with the proposed amendments (shown tracked) to enable subdivision in accordance with a land use consent consistent with the MDRS and as provided for by controlled subdivision under 27.3 within the residential zones.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.263	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 23.7.3. While existing plan provisions that are not proposed to be amended, it is unclear how minimum boundary lengths have been justified as a qualifying matter (and whether they have been identified as such). Kāinga Ora opposes their inclusion as they place an undue restriction on intensification within higher-density environments, which are likely to have	3. Delete minimum boundary lengths until the appropriate analysis is undertaken in accordance with ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora would support an approach where, like the Medium Density Residential zone, the requirements only apply to the creation of vacant lots. 4. Remove reference to residential units as a trigger for vesting a vehicle access as a road.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh					frontages at lesser widths either pre or post subdivision. Kāinga Ora oppose including the number of ‘residential units’ as a trigger for when a vehicle access must be formed as a legal road as this does not account for multi-unit developments like apartment blocks and is unnecessarily onerous.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.264	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support in part	It is unclear how minimum boundary lengths have been justified as a qualifying matter (and whether they have been identified as such). Kāinga Ora opposes their inclusion as they place an undue restriction on intensification within higher-density environments, which are likely to have frontages at lesser widths either pre or post subdivision	Delete minimum boundary lengths until the appropriate analysis is undertaken in accordance with ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora would support an approach where, like the Medium Density Residential zone, the requirements only apply to the creation of vacant lots
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.265	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.5 High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 23.7.5. It is unclear how minimum boundary lengths, urban block lengths and maximum urban block perimeters have been justified as a qualifying matter (and whether they have been identified as such). Kāinga Ora opposes their inclusion as they place an undue restriction on intensification within higher-density environments, which are likely to have frontages at lesser widths either pre or post subdivision	1. Delete minimum boundary lengths, urban block lengths and maximum urban block perimeters until the appropriate analysis is undertaken in accordance with ss77J-L of the Housing Supply Act. Kāinga Ora would support an approach where, like the Medium Density Residential zone, the requirements only apply to the creation of vacant lots 2. Delete the note in accordance with the relief sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.266	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.8 Within a Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the spatial application of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ and associated provisions are opposed in their entirety.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.267	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the extent consistent with the overall submission. In accordance with relief sought, Kāinga Ora suggest the additional assessment criteria be included in relation to subdivision of land associated with an identified heritage building or structure and Significant Natural Areas.	Include the amended assessment criteria, to the extent consistent with the overall submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.268	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.1 Background	Support	Kāinga Ora support the addition of these statements, particularly noting that a financial contribution taken is for a different purpose to any development contribution.	Retain background statement as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.269	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 24.2.1. Kāinga Ora support the general purpose of Financial Contributions; however, reiterates that development contributions apply to developments to contribute towards three waters/transport network improvements and capacity upgrades and additional contributions should not be sought for these aspects of development, except where required to create capacity within the local catchment, at the point of connection, for the development. Kāinga Ora oppose the inclusion of a financial contribution relating to parks/reserves/open space network and streetscape amenity. Whilst the intensification of Hamilton City will contribute to a change in character and amenity, this is not considered to be an adverse effect that requires	1. Delete points 24.2.1(a)(iv) and (v). [Track change shows ii to v. deleted] 2. Delete the Te Ture Whaimana Financial Contribution and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately. 3. Seeks that the full set of provisions proposed on the Financial Contributions is deleted, reviewed and proposed in a separate plan change process. Alternatively, this could be undertaken through a pre-hearing mediation process with submitters and Waikato-Tainui and the Waikato River Authority prior to the hearing of PC12.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which:		<p>offsetting through financial payments.</p> <p>Whilst Kāinga Ora support giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is considered that a financial contribution that is proposed to be levied for the purpose of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana as notified is opposed. It is noted that the Section 32 analysis for financial contributions implies that the fund will go to the Hamilton City Council ‘Nature in the City’ programme. Kāinga Ora notes that the policy for this fund is related to biodiversity and is not underpinned by or seeks to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. It is considered that the financial contribution must be deleted in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>Further, it is considered that this approach does not acknowledge the role that the Waikato River Authority plays in the management of the Waikato River, and the ties between that authority and local iwi through board representation.</p>	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.270	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.3 Objectives and Policies	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 24.3.1. Kāinga Ora support the objective stating the purpose of financial contributions; however, emphasise that these should only be required to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of a development that cannot be appropriately managed on-site.</p> <p>Consistent with the above submission points, Kāinga Ora seek the deletion of the Te Ture Whaimana financial contribution in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana</p>	<p>1. Amend the objective 24.3.1 as shown.</p> <p>2. Delete the Te Ture Whaimana Financial Contribution and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.271	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.3 Objectives and Policies	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally support this policy 24.3.1a; however with respect to subsection iii. Suggest that an ‘either’ option be provided to enable payment to be made either prior to the issue of a Code of Compliance under the Building Act or prior to the issue of the s224c certificate where subdivision consent has been sought. This provides a greater degree of clarity surrounding when payment must be made.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora submits that subsection iv. be amended to provide greater clarity surrounding the deadline for the contribution of land to be made.</p>	Amend the policy 24.3.1a as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.272	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part General Rule 24.4.1 a.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora support the clarity provided through this rule where contributions will be required where resource consent is not required. However, Kāinga Ora consider it necessary to include a specific trigger for the financial contribution to be applied, such as where a development results in the creation of an additional household unit or a new non-residential building</p>	Amend rule as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.273	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 24.4.1 b. General Rules. Kāinga Ora oppose the application of financial contributions in this manner and suggest that an appropriate trigger be applied.</p> <p>Amendments sought.</p>	Amend rule 24.4.1 General Rules b). as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.274	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules	Support in part	<p>24.4.1 c. General Rules - Kāinga Ora support the flexibility applied through this rule in which Council are provided with discretion as to how a financial contribution can be made.</p>	Amend rule c. as follows, and in accordance with the relief sought under rules 24.4.2 and 24.4.3.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.275	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora supports the inclusion of this policy, subject to amendments requested in respect of General Purpose (24.2.1) and Rules 24.4.2, 24.4.4 and 24.4.5</p>	Retain General Rule 24.4.1 d. as notified, subject to the relief sought under 24.2.1 (general purpose) and rules 24.4.2 and 24.4.3.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.276	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential	Support in part	<p>Kainga Ora support the principle use of financial contributions; however consider this only appropriate as a mechanism where there is insufficient capacity at the point of connection, to service the development and any effects of the development cannot be managed on site.</p>	Seek the following amendments to 24.4.2 a. iA & B as shown in addition to the relief sought in relation to general purposes of financial contributions.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh			Develop ment			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.277	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	Kāinga Ora oppose the use of a financial contribution associated with the effects of residential development density. This rule is seeking to address the changing nature of the residential environment that could arise through the application of greater intensification. Kāinga Ora does not consider the potential change in character and amenity associated with this plan change, to be one of adverse nature that is required to be offset through monetary payments.	Delete rule 24.4.2 a)ii as notified
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.278	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Support in part	<p>Whilst Kāinga Ora support giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is considered that a financial contribution that is proposed to be levied for the purpose of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana as notified is opposed. It is noted that the Section 32 analysis for financial contributions implies that the fund will go to the Hamilton City Council ‘Nature in the City’ programme. Kāinga Ora notes that the policy for this fund is related to biodiversity and is not underpinned by or seeks to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. It is considered that the financial contribution must be deleted in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>Further, it is considered that this approach does not acknowledge the role that the Waikato River Authority plays in the management of the Waikato River, and the ties between that authority and local iwi through board representation.</p>	Delete the Rule 24.4.2a iii Te Ture Whaimana: Financial Contribution and all associated provisions and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately in consultation with Waikato-Tainui and the Waikato River Authority.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.279	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Support in part	<p>Kainga Ora consider that the application of a standard contribution towards network renewals (\$106.34 per PUD) is similar to what is required through development contributions rather than being a bespoke contribution that is tailored to address the particular upgrade requirements associated with the development.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora consider that such a contribution needs to be dynamic and responsive to the effect of capacity rather than a flat rate.</p>	Amend provision 24.4.2b.i.B to read as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.280	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	In accordance with the submission relating to 24.4.2.ii, Kāinga Ora oppose the use of a financial contribution associated with the effects of residential development density. Kāinga Ora does not consider the potential change in character and amenity associated with this plan change and giving effect to the NPS-UD and the Enabling Housing Supply Act, to be one of adverse nature that is required to be offset through monetary payments.	Delete the provision 24.4.2b.ii Residential amenity in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.281	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	<p>Whilst Kāinga Ora support giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is considered that a financial contribution that is proposed to be levied for the purpose of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana as notified is opposed. It is noted that the Section 32 analysis for financial contributions implies that the fund will go to the Hamilton City Council ‘Nature in the City’ programme. Kāinga Ora notes that the policy for this fund is related to biodiversity and is not underpinned by or seeks to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. It is considered that the financial contribution must be deleted in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>Further, it is considered that this approach does not acknowledge the role that the Waikato River Authority plays in the management of the Waikato River, and the ties between that authority and local iwi through board representation.</p>	Delete the Rule 24.4.2 b.iii Te Ture Whaimana: Te Ture Whaimana Financial Contribution and all associated provisions and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately in consultation with Waikato-Tainui and the Waikato River Authority.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.282	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.3 Non-residential Development	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 24.4.3 a i A and B. In accordance with the submission under 24.4.2a, Kainga Ora oppose the use of financial contributions for three waters and transport in situations other than where adverse effects cannot be managed on-site. Reference to non-residential development should also be made under this rule.	Amend provision 24.4.3 a.i.A & B as shown and to be consistent with relief sought through submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.283	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.3 Non-residential Development	Support in part	<p>Whilst Kāinga Ora support giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is considered that a financial contribution that is proposed to be levied for the purpose of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana as notified is opposed. It is noted that the Section 32 analysis for financial contributions implies that the fund will go to the Hamilton City Council ‘Nature in the City’ programme. Kāinga Ora notes that the policy for this fund is related to biodiversity and is not underpinned by or seeks to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana. It is considered that the financial contribution must be deleted in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>Further, it is considered that this approach does not acknowledge the role that the Waikato River</p>	Delete the 24.4.3a ii Te Ture Whaimana Financial Contribution and all associated provisions and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately in consultation with Waikato-Tainui and the Waikato River Authority.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					Authority plays in the management of the Waikato River, and the ties between that authority and local iwi through board representation.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.284	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.3 Non-residential Development	Support in part	Kainga Ora consider that the application of a standard contribution towards network renewals (\$106.34 per PUD) is similar to what is required through development contributions rather than being a bespoke contribution that is tailored to address the particular upgrade requirements associated with the development. Kāinga Ora consider that such a contribution needs to be dynamic and responsive to the effect of capacity rather than a flat rate. Consistent with the above submission points, Kāinga Ora seek the deletion of the Te Ture Whaimana financial contribution in its entirety until a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana	1. Amend rule 24.4.3 b. to clearly state the destination of the funding and revise the calculated contribution following engagement with Waikato-Tainui and key stakeholders. 2. Delete the Rule 24.4.3 b ii) e Te Ture Whaimana: Te Ture Whaimana Financial Contribution and redraft when a specific policy is developed to address Te Ture Whaimana appropriately.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.285	25.12 Solid Waste	25.12.2 Objectives and Policies: Solid Waste	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.12.2.1c. Whilst Kāinga Ora supports the reasoning behind why such a policy may be included, it is considered that the policy is overly prescriptive and more in the realms of design guidance. Amendments are sought to remove policies that are inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on associated rules within the residential chapters.	Delete policy 25.12.2.1.c [25.12.2.1c]
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.286	25.12 Solid Waste	25.12.2 Objectives and Policies: Solid Waste	Oppose	Kāinga Ora objects to this as policy 25.12.2.1d , emphasising that the space within the road reserve is outside of the control of a developer and should not be a limiting factor for developments.	Delete policy 25.12.2.1d
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.287	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora support the replacement of ‘tributaries’ with ‘catchment’ in 25.13.1 c , in accordance with the language used within Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the statement as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.288	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.1 Purpose	Support	Kāinga Ora generally supports the principle of the relationship between stormwater management and the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Retain 25.13.1 d. as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.289	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.1 Purpose	Support	25.13.1 Purpose (f) - Kāinga Ora supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato.	Include the statement in 25.13.1 Purpose (f) as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.290	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.1 Purpose	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the principle of resource consents giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, in addition to ensuring that developments are adequately and appropriately serviced by three waters infrastructure. However, Kāinga Ora is of the view that the provision of adequate three waters infrastructure for any development is not sufficient to deliver the purpose of ‘betterment’ that is required by Te Ture Whaimana and rather is just a matter that should be addressed through either the resource or building consent process. Reference to Te Ture Whaimana should be removed from this statement to separate the delivery of adequate infrastructure from the matter of achieving betterment for the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The three waters framework proposed through this plan change is obstructive to achieving intensification of the urban environment, as required by the Resource Management Enabling Housing Supply) Act and the NPS-UD, and is not considered to be necessary to give effect to the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana. As such, limiting provisions associated with three waters that have been applied through this chapter are opposed.	Amend explanatory text in 25.13.1 g) as-shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.291	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the management of stormwater run-off associated with urban development and the impact of this on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Retain Objective 25.13.2.2 as notified

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh			Policies: Three Waters			
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.292	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.2.2a. Kāinga Ora support the principle of the management of increased stormwater run-off associated with urban development; however, in acknowledging what this policy seeks to achieve, Kāinga Ora considers it appropriate to replace this policy with one that refers to hydraulic neutrality in order to allow flexibility in response to stormwater management on a site by site basis, whilst ensuring hydraulic neutrality is achieved.	Replace policy as notified as shown. 25.13.2.2a Subdivision and development shall incorporate on-site stormwater management measures that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>achieve hydraulic neutrality where there is no increase in offsite stormwater peak flows and volumes as a result of subdivision, use and development in urban areas in order to:</u> • <u>protect and improve the water quality of receiving environments; and,</u> • <u>enhance the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River</u>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.293	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.2.2b. Whilst Kāinga Ora support the principle of contributions towards the infrastructure upgrades necessary to service a development, it should be clarified that contributions associated with infrastructure will only be sought to deliver the capacity required to service the development.	1. Amend policy 25.13.2.2b as shown. <p>25.13.2.2b <i>In accordance with Chapter 24, require a financial contribution when off-site stormwater works are needed in a sub-catchment to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects <u>provide sufficient capacity at the point of connection or service a</u> of development or to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.</i></p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.294	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the principle of managing the adverse effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. However, the current drafting of the explanatory text is rigid and does not enable flexibility of response to stormwater management on a site-by-site basis. Kāinga Ora consider it appropriate to refer to detention as well as retention as a solution for stormwater management.	Amend the 25.13.2 Explanation text as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.295	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	Kāinga Ora support the principle of including conservation techniques to reduce the effect a development has on the three waters infrastructure and the surrounding environment.	Amend the provision Policy 25.13.2.3a as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.296	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kāinga Ora consider the policy response suggested for policy 25.13.2.4a appropriately responds to the necessity to adequately service a development, whilst also enabling an alternative solution response. Moreover, Kāinga Ora do not support the inevitable site-by-site assessment that would be required through this policy on trunk and strategic networks; capacity assessments on a site-by-site basis should be directed towards local catchment capacity at point of connection.	Delete Policy 25.13.2.4b in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.297	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	Kāinga Ora generally support the principle of providing adequate three waters infrastructure as a means of managing potential adverse effects of urban development on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Retain Objective 25.13.2.5 as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.298	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Whilst Kāinga Ora generally supports the principle of the effects urban development can have on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River, it is emphasised that this effect can be generated by all urban development and is not limited to areas where there is a constrained three waters network, or as a result of residential development within the general and medium density residential zones. Kāinga Ora oppose the use of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay within the District Plan and request it be deleted. Objectives, policies and standards associated with infrastructure capacity could be retained; however, these should not be used as limiting factors for the application of intensification across the city but rather as a matter to be considered alongside development that	1. Delete policy 25.13.2.5a in its entirety. 2. Delete the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay and any references to the overlay.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					exceeds permitted thresholds of the District Plan (i.e. the number of dwellings). Kainga Ora do not consider the proposed three waters provisions to give effect to the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana and therefore the Strategy should not be used as justification for the inclusion of these provisions.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.299	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kainga Ora consider this policy to be unnecessary alongside inclusion of both policy 25.13.2.4a and policy 25.13.2.5c (as amended) below which both require development to be appropriately serviced.	Delete <i>Policy 25.13.2.5b</i> in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.300	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the enablement of development through the provision of existing or proposed infrastructure capacity. However, consider it appropriate to amend the policy to full address the concept of infrastructure enabled development and to include provision for alternative solutions for servicing a site.	Replace policy 25.13.2.5c as notified as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.301	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this policy particularly in how it relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. Kāinga Ora considers that the responsibility of the provision of adequate three waters infrastructure should be met by the three waters authority (being the Council) and such provision should meet the demand created by a growing population.	Delete policy 25.13.2.5d in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.302	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this policy particularly in how it relates to the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana and the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The policy is obstructive to intensification of the urban environment as required by the Resource Management Enabling Housing Supply) Act and the NPS-UD, and is not considered to be necessary to give effect to the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana. Moreover, as policies have been included relating to infrastructure enabled development, Council will have confidence that urban development cannot proceed in the absence of sufficient three waters infrastructure.	Delete policy 25.13.2.5e in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.303	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kainga Ora considers that infrastructure is a matter that can be addressed through development. Development and intensification should not be constrained or staged in response to the funding of the Long Term Plan. Rather, the proposed policies such as 25.13.2.5c are sufficient to ensure that development will only be able to proceed where it can be appropriately serviced.	Delete <i>Policy 25.13.2.5f</i> in its entirety.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.304	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Kāinga Ora do not support the use of an overlay for infrastructure capacity, particularly in that it has been applied through the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana. Te Ture Whaimana seeks the ‘betterment’ of the Waikato River, whereas the purpose of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay is to manage adverse effects of urban development[.] Kāinga Ora considers that if the Capacity Overlay is to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana, then it would not be something that could be updated and reduced as and when capacity is made available. As such, Kāinga Ora do not consider the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay as a mechanism directly relating to Te Ture Whaimana and request the overlay be deleted, with associated rules and standards amended and applied to both residential and non-residential developments. Lastly, the inclusion of capacity maps within the District Plan maps does not allow for the information to be readily updated to reflect capacity assessments and upgrades that are undertaken. Any updates to the overlay as proposed would have to be done through the schedule 1 plan change process.	Delete policy 25.13.2.5g and associated Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.305	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	Whilst Kāinga Ora support the principle of financial contributions towards the restoration and betterment of the Waikato River, this policy relates to financial contributions for infrastructure rather than the ‘betterment’ of the Waikato River. Infrastructure upgrades should be managed through development contributions and the Council’s LTP funding process.	Delete policy 25.13.2.5h) as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.306	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	Whilst Kāinga Ora support the principle of this policy, it is requested that the means of managing surface water runoff include measures that are within the operative district plan are retained. This enables flexibility in approach whilst ensuring the effect of surface water run off on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is addressed through development.	Amend policy 25.13.2.6a as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.307	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	Kāinga Ora support the alterations to this policy but with amendments made for clarity.	1. Retain policy 25.13.2.6c as notified. 2. Amend policy 25.13.2.6d as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.308	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.3 b and 25.13.3 c. Kainga Ora does not support a separate rule for an Infrastructure Capacity Assessment and consider it more appropriate to include infrastructure capacity as an assessment criteria under the relevant chapter provisions; i.e. chapter 4 for residential development, chapter 6-7 for commercial development.	Delete activities 25.13.3.b and 25.13.3.c .
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.309	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.4.1 a). Kainga Ora do not support the amendments made under 25.13.4.2A and therefore request that the exception added into Rules - General Standards 25.13.4.1 a) relating to this provision, be deleted. 25.13.4.2A (residential stormwater/water sensitive design requirements)	Amend standard Rules - General Standards 25.13.4.1 a) as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.310	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the flexible approach that has been applied to stormwater solutions for non-residential zones. This approach enables the development community to respond to the standard in a way that is feasible whilst still achieving the desired outcome.	Retain standard Rules 25.13.4.2 Stormwater - Non Residential Zones as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.311	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.4.2A f). Whilst Kāinga Ora support the requirement for on-site stormwater management to address the effects of development, it is submitted that the impact of increased stormwater runoff as a result of urban development is consistent regardless of the use of the site; i.e. residential and non-residential activities. On this basis, Kāinga Ora submits that the on-site measures required for development of all new impermeable surfaces and redevelopment of existing impermeable surfaces greater than 20m2 in area be amended to reflect the solutions applied to non-residential development under standard 25.13.4.2 in respect of detention and soakage solution.	1. Amend Standard 25.13.4.2A Stormwater - Residential zones f. as shown. 2. Retain balance of provisions as notified, subject to relief sought under chapter 25
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.312	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.4.2A. With respect to financial contributions relating to stormwater infrastructure, in accordance with the submission relating to policy 25.13.2.1d, Kāinga Ora opposes the requirement of an additional financial contribution towards stormwater infrastructure as a fixed contribution (as-referenced in note 4). It should be clarified that contributions associated with infrastructure will only be sought to deliver the capacity required to service the development, where funding via the LTP will not adequately cover the additional capacity required.	Amend subject to relief sought under chapter 25.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.313	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	Kāinga Ora support the alterations to this policy but with amendments made for clarity. Kāinga Ora support the removal of reference to water metering through this standard on the basis that it has been included under the standard for water conservation measures (standard 25.13.4.5)	Amend provision 25.13.4.4 as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.314	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	Kāinga Ora support the blanket application of the impact of any urban development on water supply. This is consistent with the approach requested under policy 25.13.2.5a with respect to infrastructure capacity.	Retain as 25.13.4.4. Notes notified
Kainga Ora - Homes and	160.315	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules –	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the removal of stormwater references from this standard, acknowledging that this is managed through standard 25.13.4.2 and 2A.	Amend options for water sensitive techniques in 25.13.4.5 Water Conservation Measures as shown.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Communitie s - Gurv Singh			General Standar ds		Kāinga Ora support the principle of water conservation measures and including water sensitive techniques within developments; however, seek clarification on the requirements of the sensitive techniques listed as to whether all of these must be included within a development. Kāinga Ora submits that the standard should retain the option of ‘other equivalent features’ to enable developers and property owners to propose alternative solutions that deliver similar outcomes.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.316	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.4.6 A and B. Whilst Kāinga Ora support the general principle of a standard associated with an infrastructure capacity assessment for development that exceeds the permitted level of development for the respective zone; Kainga Ora oppose the inclusion of density standards as an alternative threshold to trigger an assessment and request these be deleted. Moreover, in accordance with the submission under chapter 4, Kāinga Ora request that the permitted number of dwellings referenced under this standard be increased to 7+ dwellings within the Medium and High-Density Zones. In accordance with the submission under 25.13.3 (activity table), Kainga Ora also request that this requirement be applied through assessment criteria for a Restricted Discretionary Activity where the number of permitted dwellings is exceeded within the zone or where consent is required for a commercial building within the residential zone. Kāinga Ora submits that whilst Infrastructure Capacity must be addressed as part of development, this mechanism does not deliver the purpose of Te Ture Whaimana, being the betterment of the Waikato River and therefore should not be used under the qualifying matter of Te Ture Whaimana to be less enabling of density as required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply) Act.	Amend standard 25.13.4.6A and B to be one standard, reflecting the submission under 25.113.2.5a requesting the deletion of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.317	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.4.6 C. Whilst Kāinga Ora support the retention of the existing Water Impact Assessment requirements for non-residential development for development outside of the residential zones, in accordance with the submission relating to policy 25.13.2.5a and standard 25.13.4.6-, Kāinga Ora does not support the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay and request that reference to this be deleted. Kāinga Ora seeks to understand the threshold of 1000m2 of GFA being the trigger for an industrial building requiring a Water Impact Assessment in comparison to a new building for non-residential uses (other than industrial activities) where the trigger for assessment is 300m².	Amend standard 25.13.4.6 to be consistent with the submission under 25.13.2.5a and 25.13.4.6 as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.318	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.5 Restrict ed Discretio nary Activitie s: Matters of Discretio n and Assessm ent Criteria	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.13.5 a) ii. In accordance with the submission under 25.13.3, Kainga Ora oppose the inclusion of a rule with associated matters of discretion and assessment criteria for an infrastructure capacity assessment. Kainga Ora consider it appropriate to include this assessment criteria under rules in Chapter 4 as part of the assessment of a restricted discretionary consent associated with development that exceeds the permitted number of dwellings within the respective zone.	Amend the provision 25.13.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria a) ii as shown.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.319	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora support end of journey facilities, the policy as-notified implies the requirement applies to ‘all’. Kāinga Ora seeks the policy is clarified as applying to non-residential activities.	Amend the Policy 25.14.2.1 i) as shown in the tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communitie s - Gurv Singh	160.320	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.14.2.1 k). Kāinga Ora supports the principle of encouraging public transport use, mode shift through micro-mobility and active transport modes, as well as the need to manage the effects generated by transportation modes ‘at source’. Kāinga Ora notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. As the policy uses avoid, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity. Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is	Amend the Policy 25.14.2.1k) as shown in the tracked amendments.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					appropriate with the wider policy framework of the ODP and not-contrary to other enabling provisions.	
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.321	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.14.2.1l. Kāinga Ora supports the principle of encouraging public transport use, mode shift through micro-mobility and active transport modes, as well as the need to manage the effects generated by transportation modes ‘at source’. Kāinga Ora notes that the use of the term ‘avoid’ is contrary to the directive under Environmental Defence Society Inc v New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd [2014] NZSC 38 (“King Salmon”) concerning the term ‘avoid’. As the policy uses avoid, there cannot be any exceptions to what is tantamount to a prohibited activity. Council should ensure the use of ‘avoid’ in this context is appropriate with the wider policy framework of the ODP and not-contrary to other enabling provisions.	Amend the Policy 25.14.2.1l) as shown in the tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.322	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the principle of integrated transport assessments to ensure integrated land use planning associated with large-scale developments. The policy should relate to 25.14.4.3 which provides a threshold for such a requirement. This ensures that the policy framework is clear and does not inadvertently require an ITA for all activities.	Include the Policy 25.14.2.1m) with the proposed tracked amendment.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.323	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the principle of travel plans, to ensure integrated land use planning and manage effects on the transportation network. The policy should relate to 25.14.4.3.a which provides a threshold for such a requirement. This ensures that the policy framework is clear and does not inadvertently require an ITA for all activities.	Include the <i>policy 25.14.2.1n)</i> with the proposed tracked amendment.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.324	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the policy, but notes that iii, iv and v read as standards or design guidance.	Include the Policy 25.14.2.1o) as-notified with the amendments shown, to the extent it remains consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Transport provisions and standards.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.325	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the policy as-notified to the extent it is consistent with Te Ture Whaimana.	Include the <i>Policy 25.14.2.1q)</i> as-notified, to the extent it remains consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Transport provisions and standards.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.326	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the policy explanation as-notified to the extent it is consistent with Te Ture Whaimana.	Include the policy [Explanation] as-notified, to the extent it remains consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Transport provisions and standards.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.327	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora acknowledges there are existing provisions in the plan concerning the number of accessible spaces, Kāinga Ora opposes the standard as it does not specify a particular ‘metric’ and therefore, determining compliance with the standard would not be efficient or effective. The matter is better-suited to the Building Act, which manages the provision of accessible spaces and routes to and from car parks under Building Code Clause D1.3.2	Delete the standard 25.14.4.2 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas. n) the standard as the issue is managed by way of the Building Act.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.328	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora acknowledges there are existing provisions in the plan concerning the number of accessible spaces, Kāinga Ora opposes the standard as it does not specify a particular ‘metric’ and therefore, determining compliance with the standard would not be efficient or effective. The matter is better-suited to the Building Act, which manages the provision of accessible spaces and routes to and from car parks under Building Code Clause D1.3.2.	Delete the standard 25.14.4.2 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas n) as the issue is managed by way of the Building Act.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.329	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.14.4.2 ([p]). Kāinga Ora does not support the requirement for a maximum walking distance from residential units to car parks. Parking and access arrangements will depend on the design, layout and context of particular developments. Kāinga Ora also considers that such a requirement is at-odds with the Strategic Framework section of the plan and Transport objectives and policies to promote alternative transport modes and micro-mobility. The standard is not efficient or effective in achieving those objectives, as it places unnecessary compliance and design requirements on provision of such facilities.	Delete standard 25.14.4.2 p) as shown in tracked amendments. p. Any parking space provided for a residential unit must be no more than a 30m walk from a door to the residential unit it serves.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.330	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter is opposed in part to 25.14.4.2. Kāinga Ora does not support the requirement for a maximum walking distance from residential units to micromobility spaces. Parking and access arrangements will depend on the design, layout and context of particular developments. Kāinga Ora also considers that such a requirement is at-odds with the Strategic Framework section of the plan and Transport objectives and policies to promote alternative transport modes and micro-mobility. The standard is not efficient or effective in achieving those objectives, as it places unnecessary compliance and design requirements on provision of such facilities.	Delete the standards 25.14.4.2 Cycle and Micro-Mobility Parking (q) and (r) as shown in tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.331	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora supports the principle of alternative mode provision, 25.14.4.2 (z) is not an efficient, effective or enforceable standard as it would be difficult to determine whether future owners/occupants of a dwelling will utilise cargo bicycles and the like. As such, 1.8m is considered an appropriate minimum width.	Include the standard 25.14.4.2 Cycle Parking Spaces as-notified with amendments shown to 25.14.4.2 (z), to the extent it remains consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Transport provisions and standards.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.332	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	While Kāinga Ora support end of journey facilities, the corresponding policy as-notified implies the requirement applies to ‘all’. Kāinga Ora seeks the policy is clarified as applying to non-residential activities.	Amend the <i>Policy [Standard] 25.14.4.2 a End of Journey Facilities</i> as shown in the tracked amendments
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.333	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the requirement to provide an electric vehicle charging point for each onsite parking space that is provided. This is an onerous and potentially-costly requirement that has not been sufficiently justified in Council’s s32 cost/benefit analysis of the standard and its associated provisions. There are different requirements for a range of vehicles, and it is considered that the market is better placed to determine whether such facilities would be provided given that persons with electric vehicles will be required to make sure arrangements regards. Kāinga Ora otherwise-supports the principle of encouraging public transport use, mode shift through micro-mobility and active transport modes, and the positive effects that will have on Greenhouse Gas emissions under Policy 1(e) of the NPS-UD.	Delete the standard 25.14.4.2 b Electric Vehicle Charging as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.334	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.14.4.3 (a). Kāinga Ora generally support the requirement of travel plans to address any actual or potential effects on a development on the transport network. However, amendments are proposed to account for permitted levels of residential development where a travel plan would not be required. 25.14.4.3.a(v) would effectively require a travel plan for any residential infill development, which is considered onerous in the context of the NPS-UD and PC12 amendments to enable permitted levels of development (and as-sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on the residential chapters).	Amend the standards 25.14.4.3a) Travel Plan Requirements as shown in the tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.335	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part 25.4.4.3b. Kāinga Ora considers that this matter is better suited to assessment criteria rather than a standard to allow design flexibility.	Delete the standard 25.14.4.3b Waste Management in its entirety and redraft as assessment criteria..
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.336	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.1 Purpose	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the inclusion of a reference to key urban design elements sought for development within Hamilton City; however, where reference is made to special features, this should be clarified to refer to features that have been identified through the district plan. This will ensure foe ‘well-functioning urban environments’ as-required under Objective (1) of the NPS-UD.	Include the amended provision 25.15.1 Purpose f. as notified, with the proposed amendments as shown.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.337	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks that the definition is deleted. Distinguishing between various ‘dwelling’ or ‘residential unit’ typologies is irrelevant in the context of the purpose of the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act and the enabling provisions introduced (and as-sought by Kāinga Ora in its submission) across relevant residential zones.	Delete the definition Duplex dwelling or Duplex Residential Unit in favour of a general definition for ‘residential unit’.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.338	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	Consistent with the Kainga Ora submission on 25.14.4.2, deletion of the definition is sought. The associated requirement for a charging point is an onerous and potentially-costly requirement that has not been sufficiently justified in Council’s s32 cost/benefit analysis of the standard and its associated provisions. There are different requirements for a range of vehicles, and it is considered that the market is better placed to determine whether such facilities would be provided given that persons with electric vehicles will be required to make sure arrangements regards.	Delete the definition Electric vehicle charging point as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.339	1.2 Information Requirements	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 1.2, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought, with the exception of those other specific submission points relating to Appendix 1.2 below.	Retain as-notified to the extent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought, with the exception of those other specific submission points relating to Appendix 1.2 below.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.340	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 1.2.1 h. Amendments are sought for consistency the overall Kāinga Ora submission on the residential zones and the permitted levels of development enabled (and sought by Kāinga Ora to be enabled) therein. Kāinga Ora does not support a specific requirement for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (‘CPTED’) assessment. This can be undertaken in reference to the assessment criteria and having such a requirement may frustrate efficient administration of the plan and resource consent process by requiring ‘suitably qualified’ persons to undertake such an assessment.	Amend Appendix 1.2.1 All Applications h) the requirements as-shown in the tracked amendments.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.341	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 1.2.2.5a. Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments. While Kāinga Ora supports the principle of clear requirements for any infrastructure capacity assessment, it is opposed to the proposed requirements as-notified (including those outlined within table 1.2.2.5b) to the extent those matters are inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Chapter 25.13 (Three Waters) and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.	Delete the requirements 1.2.2.5a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments as notified, to the extent those matters are inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Chapter 25.13 (Three Waters) and the overall Kāinga Ora submission.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.342	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on Chapter 25.13 (Three Waters) and the overall Kāinga Ora submission, requirements for a site-specific stormwater management plan are considered onerous and should be deleted (including those outlined in table 1.2.2.5c).	Delete the requirements 1.2.2.5 Site-Specific Stormwater Management Plan as notified.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.343	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	While Kāinga Ora supports the principle of waste management plans, particularly in large scale developments; the proposed information’s requirements are onerous and may frustrate the resource consent process. The necessary information can generally be should on resource consent plans and/or is provided by private waste management contractors. Existing assessment criteria are more than sufficient as an effective method to address this issue.	Delete the requirements 1.2.2.24 Waste Container Management Plan as-notified including Table 1.2.2.24a.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.344	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Appendix 1.3. Whilst Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 1.3 and the additional assessment criteria, the inclusion of assessment criteria that is comparable to a design guide is opposed. Assessment criteria of part B should be retained only so far as high level urban design principles. Criteria B2 – B8b should be deleted in entirety from the appendix and the design guide included as Appendix 1.4 (operative) should be relied upon.	Delete assessment criteria B2-B8b under appendix 1.3.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	160.345	1.4 Design Guides	General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of Design Guides or design guidelines in the Plan, which act as de facto rules to be complied with.	Amendments sought

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
s - Gurv Singh					<p>Kāinga Ora opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora alternatively seeks and supports design guidelines sitting outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool.</p> <p>If there is content of a Design Guide or design guideline that Council wants in the Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment</p>	<p>1. Kāinga Ora seeks the Design Guides and design guidelines are removed from within the District Plan and are treated as non-statutory tool, outside of the District Plan.</p> <p>2. Delete all references to the Design Guides and design guidelines.</p> <p>3. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> <p>4. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the Design Guides and design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are amended, simplified and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, it is considered that there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development.</p> <p>5. Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.346	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 2 to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.	Retain the proposed structure plans as-notified to the extent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its overall submission being granted.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.347	Appendix 4 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed objectives and associated policies. Consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission on PC9, the assessment methodology utilised to identify ‘history heritage areas’ conflates issues of special character and inappropriately elevates existing and proposed areas under PC9 to ‘heritage’ status under section 6 of the RMA.	Amendments are sought for consistency with the Kāinga Ora submission on Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment (“PC9”). Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of any proposed changes in PC12 that seek amendments to historic heritage and special character zones, consistent with the relief sought in PC9. Kāinga Ora considers that the proposed changes across PC9 and PC12 are not qualifying matters, as the assessments in its view, do not meet the requirements under s6, s77I, s77J, s77K, and/or s77L of the RMA. Deletion sought.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.348	Appendix 5 Central City Zone	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 5, which principally involve deletion of Figure 5.2 – Height Overlay Plan.	Retain Appendix 5 as-notified, to the extent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its overall submission being granted.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.349	Appendix 7 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 7 to the extent it is consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.	Retain Appendix 7 as-notified to the extent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in its overall submission being granted.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.350	Appendix 15 Transportati on	General	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed amendments to Appendix 15, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought	Retain Appendix 15 as-notified, subject to the relief sought by Kāinga Ora in relation to proposed amendments to Chapters 18 (transport corridor zone), 23 (subdivision) and 25.14 (transport) being granted.
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh	160.351	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes Appendix 18 in its entirety for the reasons outlined within the Kāinga Ora submission on Chapter 24 – Financial Contributions.	Delete Appendix 18 in its entirety, subject to the relief sought in the Kāinga Ora submission on Chapter 24 (Financial Contributions) being granted and/or sufficiently addressed.
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) -	161.1	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.1 Purpose	Support	Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on urban environments recognising the role urban environments within Hamilton City play in determining both positive and negative health outcomes. There is a strong link between poor quality urban design and planning, and negative health outcomes that place disproportionate burden on our communities and health services. Cities and towns can be designed in ways that will protect and improve health, and reduce demand for health service costs. As an example, positive impacts on health and overall wellbeing or mental wellbeing can come from provision of and access to greenspace, and improved social connectedness. Land use mix can result in issues related to general access to public amenities.	<p>Retain narrative under s24.15.1 [25.14.1] in regard to identified objectives and associated policies to support quality urban design</p> <p>In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City’s economy and vitality.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Greg Morton					Proximity between home, work and community services can also impact on health outcomes. Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific content in Section 25 Urban Design (in particular s25.15.1 narrative and s25.15.2), and Appendix 1.4 Design Guide (in particular, s1.4.1.3 narrative):	
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) - Greg Morton	161.2	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design	Support	Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on urban environments recognising the role urban environments within Hamilton City play in determining both positive and negative health outcomes. There is a strong link between poor quality urban design and planning, and negative health outcomes that place disproportionate burden on our communities and health services. Cities and towns can be designed in ways that will protect and improve health, and reduce demand for health service costs. As an example, positive impacts on health and overall wellbeing or mental wellbeing can come from provision of and access to greenspace, and improved social connectedness. Land use mix can result in issues related to general access to public amenities. Proximity between home, work and community services can also impact on health outcomes. Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific content in Section 25 Urban Design (in particular s25.15.1 narrative and s25.15.2), and Appendix 1.4 Design Guide (in particular, s1.4.1.3 narrative)	Retain narrative under s24.15.1 [25.14.1] in regard to identified objectives and associated policies to support quality urban design In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City's economy and vitality.
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) - Greg Morton	161.3	1.4 Design Guides	1.4.1 Subdivision Design Guide	Support	Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on urban environments recognising the role urban environments within Hamilton City play in determining both positive and negative health outcomes. There is a strong link between poor quality urban design and planning, and negative health outcomes that place disproportionate burden on our communities and health services. Cities and towns can be designed in ways that will protect and improve health, and reduce demand for health service costs. As an example, positive impacts on health and overall wellbeing or mental wellbeing can come from provision of and access to greenspace, and improved social connectedness. Land use mix can result in issues related to general access to public amenities. Proximity between home, work and community services can also impact on health outcomes. Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific content in Section 25 Urban Design (in particular s25.15.1 narrative and s25.15.2), and Appendix 1.4 Design Guide (in particular, s1.4.1.3 narrative)	Retain narrative and identified changes under s1.4.1.3 a), b) c), d), e), f), and g). Retain reference to CPTED design principles, and the specified design elements (1-5) (in s1.4.1.3) In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City's economy and vitality.
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) - Greg Morton	161.4	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	18.1 Purpose	Support	Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on land transport recognising the role land transport policy plays in ensuring people have equal opportunity to fully participate in life through access to the goods, services, and social services they need through transport. Transport is linked directly and indirectly to impacts on health outcomes including but not limited to: road safety risk, and enabling access and accessibility, and for active travel modes - enabling physical activity, and reducing carbon emissions. Te Whatu Ora Waikato advocates for and supports equity in transport planning to ensure those living in urban and rural communities who are more at risk of poor health outcomes have a range of travel options available to them so they can access a full range of health services appointments, including specialist appointments. Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports active travel modes as these have a positive protective impact on health outcomes, particularly for those living with long term health conditions such as diabetes and chronic heart disease. Uptake of these active modes and greater travel options is more likely in areas of quality urban intensification. As a health organisation, Te Whatu Ora Waikato also advocates for and supports transport policy, services and infrastructure that reduce barriers to participation for people living with a disability. An inclusive transport system is critical to enabling participation for all in society which is a basic human right. Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific changes to 18. Transport Corridor Zone (in particular, 18.1 narrative):	Te Whatu Ora Waikato recommends the following specific changes to 18. Transport Corridor Zone (in particular, 18.1 narrative): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusive access be provided for in this narrative i.e. 'accessible travel' which, as one example can be associated with accessible curb cuts, ramp angles and crossings for those travelling with an physical impairment or disability. Amend to read "Including creating <u>accessible</u> public spaces for access and interaction....and parking (<u>including accessible parking</u>)." In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City's economy and vitality.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to ‘Place-based function, and plans and strategies’ and these reflecting where people are located and associated travel. Reference to ‘Including creating public spaces for access and interaction, including providing for human interaction, exercise and enjoyment, facilitating commerce and business, enabling access to buildings, lots and public spaces, and parking.’ 	
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) - Greg Morton	161.5	25.14 Transportation	25.14.1 Purpose	Support	<p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on land transport recognising the role land transport policy plays in ensuring people have equal opportunity to fully participate in life through access to the goods, services, and social services they need through transport. Transport is linked directly and indirectly to impacts on health outcomes including but not limited to: road safety risk, and enabling access and accessibility, and for active travel modes - enabling physical activity, and reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato advocates for and supports equity in transport planning to ensure those living in urban and rural communities who are more at risk of poor health outcomes have a range of travel options available to them so they can access a full range of health services appointments, including specialist appointments.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports active travel modes as these have a positive protective impact on health outcomes, particularly for those living with long term health conditions such as diabetes and chronic heart disease. Uptake of these active modes and greater travel options is more likely in areas of quality urban intensification.</p> <p>As a health organisation, Te Whatu Ora Waikato also advocates for and supports transport policy, services and infrastructure that reduce barriers to participation for people living with a disability. An inclusive transport system is critical to enabling participation for all in society which is a basic human right.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific changes to 25.14 Transportation (in particular, 25.14.1 and 25.14.2 narratives):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to the “Transport network includes all transport corridors and infrastructure for all transport modes”, which is supported. In particular, the inclusion of walking, passenger cycling, micro mobility, and public transport is supported. Clarification is sought as to whether or not micro mobility includes ‘mobility modes’ such as those travelling in a wheelchair - if not, it should as there are human rights obligations on council to provide for those living with a disability (one in four Hamilton residents live with a disability and 40% are contribute to the local economy via being in employment. The Transport Objective (25.14.2.1) and associated policies that link to the “Accessible to all” component of this objective. As an example, the Urban Design policy (25.14.2.1f) which reads “Provide high quality, safe, efficient, convenient, multi-modal connections for everyone moving from place to place.” 	<p>Clarification is sought as to whether or not micro mobility includes ‘mobility modes’ such as those travelling in a wheelchair - if not, it should as there are human rights obligations on council to provide for those living with a disability</p> <p>In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City’s economy and vitality.</p>
Te Whatu Ora Waikato (Waikato District Health Board) - Greg Morton	161.6	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	<p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato has a strong position on land transport recognising the role land transport policy plays in ensuring people have equal opportunity to fully participate in life through access to the goods, services, and social services they need through transport. Transport is linked directly and indirectly to impacts on health outcomes including but not limited to: road safety risk, and enabling access and accessibility, and for active travel modes - enabling physical activity, and reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato advocates for and supports equity in transport planning to ensure those living in urban and rural communities who are more at risk of poor health outcomes have a range of travel options available to them so they can access a full range of health services appointments, including specialist appointments.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports active travel modes as these have a positive protective impact on health outcomes, particularly for those living with long term health conditions such as diabetes and</p>	<p>No specific relief sought</p> <p>In its decision-making, Te Whatu Ora Waikato asks council to consider the range of complex health and social issues affecting the quality of life of those impacted directly and indirectly by poor quality urban forum and limited or inaccessible transport options. This includes broader impacts on particular communities and population groups (positive or negative) in terms of access to essential services, and enabling contributions to the Hamilton City’s economy and vitality.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>chronic heart disease. Uptake of these active modes and greater travel options is more likely in areas of quality urban intensification.</p> <p>As a health organisation, Te Whatu Ora Waikato also advocates for and supports transport policy, services and infrastructure that reduce barriers to participation for people living with a disability. An inclusive transport system is critical to enabling participation for all in society which is a basic human right.</p> <p>Te Whatu Ora Waikato supports the following specific changes to 25.14 Transportation (in particular, 25.14.1 and 25.14.2 narratives):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Transport Objective (25.14.2.1) and associated policies that link to the “Accessible to all” component of this objective. As an example, the Urban Design policy (25.14.2.1f) which reads “Provide high quality, safe, efficient, convenient, multi-modal connections for everyone moving from place to place.” 	
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.14 and Policies 2.2.14(a)-2.2.14(d) as they promote intensification and alternative modes of transport.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports this objective and policy set in principle but seeks a change of wording because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Effects on the Waikato River result predominantly from permeability and density and the river can be sufficiently protected by controlling these matters; Building size is considered to result in changes to amenity and effects on people, rather than the river; (iii) reference to building size should not need to be included in this objective and policy set. 	<p>Amend provision 4.1.2.1(c) as follows:</p> <p>The health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected by controlling density, building size, site permeability and appropriate mitigation of earthworks, and by maintaining and enhancing access to the Waikato River.</p>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Policy 4.1.2.5(a) because the policy set reads as though development must incorporate the matters referenced, such as solar energy, when the explanation suggests development may incorporate such matters.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.5(a) as follows:</p> <p>4.1.2.5(a) - Development must encourage the efficient use of energy and water, <u>for example</u> by:</p>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The Submitter supports this objective and policy set as it promotes a range of housing typologies and allows for higher density development. In particular policy 4.2.2.2b also promotes and effects-based management system where the adverse effects of development can be offset by positives.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports provision for 3 residential units to be established on a site as a permitted activity as it will allow for intensification and a more compact and sustainable city. The submitter also supports 4 or more units on a site as a restricted discretionary activity as it acknowledges such development is provided for within the zone.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of these notification rules as they outline a clear path for a more streamlined planning process for developers without the risk of notification. This same submission point is sought for the corresponding rule in the Medium Density chapter.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.7	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of these notification rules as they outline a clear path for a more streamlined planning process for developers without the risk of notification.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.1 Density	Support in part	The submitter generally supports these provisions and acknowledges that the 3 waters standards largely dictate density; however, this isn't explicitly clear.	Include an advice note (or similar) to direct users to the 3 waters standards so they are made aware that consents could be required if the density exceeds 200m².
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.9	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.1 Density	Support in part	The submitter generally supports these provisions and acknowledges that the 3 waters standards largely dictate density; however, this isn't explicitly clear.	Include an advice note (or similar) to direct users to the 3 waters standards so they are made aware that consents could be required if the density exceeds 200m².
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage	Support in part	The Submitter supports the increase in maximum building coverage because the increase will provide additional flexibility in development design.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports the retention of the 30% minimum permeability for the site; however, the submitter considers the requirements for a specific number of trees to be planted is too prescriptive and too restrictive for the consent stage and should be edited to provide more flexibility for those doing development.	<p>The Submitter seeks the following changes:</p> <p>Urban trees Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site, clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, at the rate set out below: Detached residential unit: Two one per residential unit. Duplex residential unit: Two one per residential unit. Terrace housing unit: One per residential unit. Minimum of one tree per every 200m² of site area. Apartment buildings: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. All other activities: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. Specimen trees shall be planted as per 4.2.5.3d at a planted size of at least 80L</p>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Support	The Submitter supports the increase in minimum height as they allow for more flexibility in building design and potentially more efficient use of land.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.13	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The Submitter supports the changes to the height in relation to boundary standards as they allow for more flexibility in building design and potentially more efficient use of land.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.14	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	The submitter supports the changes to the setback standards as they allow for more flexibility in building design and potentially more efficient use of land.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of points (d) and (e) as they provide clarity for an often-debated issue during the resource consent stage, but opposes point (a) as it is too restrictive because many properties have living courts located to the front of the dwelling and 1.8m high fencing should be allowed for property owners who seek to retain privacy.	<p>Amend 4.2.5.7(a) as follows:</p> <p>a. Front and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building line of the residential unit: Maximum height 1.2m or 1.5m 1.8m provided 50% of that part over 1.2m 1.5m is visually permeable.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.16	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Support in part	The Submitter is generally supportive of providing a public interface the promotes safety and improves amenity but not to the extent that it impedes practicality (standard ‘a’ requires 20% of the ground level to be in glazing but has no restrictions on the upper levels).	The Submitter seeks that point ‘a’ be amended to: a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have: A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at across the ground level and first level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows, balconies or doors. Subclauses ‘c’, ‘d’ and ‘e’ are also too prescriptive. A simple minimum width would suffice(i.e., 1.5m).
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.17	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support	The Submitter supports this standard as it requires an outlook space to be provided for all windows.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.18	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The Submitter supports a reduction in living court size as it enables more development options and can increase yield.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.19	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	The Submitter supports the service area standards for residential units, as the standards acknowledge that a large area is not necessary for most households, and that they provide flexibility for developments to provide service areas and waste management facilities in a way that suits the proposed development.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.20	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The Submitter opposes standard ‘d’ to the extent that garages cannot be provided at the street frontage on sites with a small frontage. The Submitter notes that for many smaller sites a rear access for car parking is not possible, and developers should be able to provide parking for each unit if they wish. Other rules control the portion of windows facing the street (i.e., public interface) and this should dictate whether a garage is able to be provided.	The Submitter seeks that sub-clause ‘d’ be removed.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.21	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The Submitter is not sure what this standard achieves. Walls and fences are already sufficiently controlled by other rules.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.22	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the inclusion of the Medium-Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) in Hamilton City, to the extent that it promotes intensification around urban centres as this will achieve the NPSUD.	The submitter considers that there should be a noticeable increase in density and height allowed in the medium density zone when compared to the General Residential zone as the MDRZ is more appropriately located around urban centres.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.23	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports the increased height of 15m as it differs from that of the General Residential Zone and will allow for more intensification in appropriate areas.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.24	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the inclusion of the High-Density Zone in Hamilton City, however, the submitter considers that the type of buildings that are intended for the zone should be enabled as permitted activities without the automatic need for consent (similar to the medium density and general residential zones).	The Submitter seeks the following change to the proposed purpose: The design and layout of sites and buildings in the High Density Residential Zone are critically important. Resource consent is may be required to ensure that development provides for high quality urban design and visually attractive buildings, and that adequate on-site amenity and privacy consistent with the expected urban built character of the Zone is provided for.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 25	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports the direction for improve amenity in these areas, the lack of provision for permitted activity residential units may discourage development and see it establish in other zones first where consent may not be required.	Reconsider the activity table for the high density zone with this in mind.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 26	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density	Support	The submitter supports the minimum density standards.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 27	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.2 Building Coverag e	Support	The submitter supports the 60% maximum building coverage.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 28	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permea ble Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the permeability and landscaping provisions but seeks that the urban trees provisions are amended because for an apartment building with multiple units on multiple stories it may be impractical to provide a tree for every unit.	That the urban trees provisions (c) are amended as follows: 1. Terraces and/or Apartments: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 150m² of site area.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 29	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports the standards as they promote development options.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 30	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundar y	Support	The submitter supports the standards as they promote development options.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 31	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	The submitter supports the standards as they promote development options.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 32	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter generally supports these provisions but opposes standard a. Units at the ground floor should be able to have fencing to help screen living areas.	The submitter seeks the following change: 1. Transport corridor boundary and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building line of the building: Maximum height 0m <u>1.8m provided the fencing is 50% visually permeable.</u>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 33	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interfac e	Support in part	Amend 4.4.5.8(a)(i) as follows: 1. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at <u>across the</u> ground level and first level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows, <u>balconies</u> or doors.	The submitter supports the intent of this standard but seeks the wording be amended to allow for more flexibility at the ground floor (i.e., garaging).
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 34	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.9 Outlook Space	Support	The Submitter supports the provision for outlook spaces.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.35	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The submitter supports the outdoor living standards as they are suitable for apartment buildings and higher density development.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.36	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support	The submitter supports the service area standards for residential units, as the standards acknowledge that a large area is not necessary for most households (particularly apartment living), and that they provide flexibility for developments to provide service areas and waste management facilities in a way that suits the proposed development.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.37	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Building s, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter opposes the fact that garages cannot be provided at the ground floor for dwellings with a small road frontage because active street fronts and CPTED principles can be included on sites as well as garages and this should not be restricted.	The submitter seeks the following: c. Where the residential unit has a frontage width facing a street or a publicly accessible on-site access way (for pedestrians) greater than 7.5m but less than 12m: One single-width garage or car port space, and one driveway / parking pad up to 3.5m wide may be provided. d. For terrace housing developments containing no more than 6 terrace housing units, where the individual residential units have a frontage width equal to or less than 7.5m, then one external parking pad may be provided in the front yard up to 3.5m wide and no less than 5.5m deep for each residential unit where the following are met: It must be an unenclosed parking pad and shall not be enclosed into a carport or garage at any time. Access to the parking pads shall be restricted to local roads or publicly accessible on-site access ways of no less than 7m in width, The development must comply with the requirements for permeable surface standards in Rule 4.4.5.3 and the boundary fencing and wall standards in Rule 4.4.5.7, and Each residential unit must have at least one habitable room with clear glazed window facing the local road in accordance with Rule 4.4.5.8
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.38	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard sub-clause ‘c’ as a 4m setback is it very restrictive and would potentially consume a relatively large amount of buildable area on smaller sites and other controls of the zone (such as setbacks, outlook space and living area) can sufficiently control the built form.	The Submitter seeks that sub-clause is removed.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.39	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard sub-clause ‘c’ as a 4m setback is it very restrictive and would potentially consume a relatively large amount of buildable area on smaller sites and other controls of the zone (such as setbacks, outlook space and living area) can sufficiently control the built form.	This standard should be acknowledged in the setback standards.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.40	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	The submitter supports this provision to the extent that it promotes an integrated approach to development in the high-density zone.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.41	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	The submitter supports this objective and policy set to the extent that it promotes an effects-based approach to assessing development in the vicinity of HHAs, SNAs or other features.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162.42	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The Submitter supports subdivision being a Controlled activity where they are accompanied by a land use consent or over an existing appropriately designed building because the appropriateness of such subdivisions are determined by the design and function of the underlying or proposed building. Notwithstanding the above, it is not certain how permitted activity MRDS developments are to subdivided in the event than no resource consent is required.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 43	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	The Submitter supports the reduction in minimum lot size for the general residential zone down to 300m², but opposes the HHA minimum lot sizes and considered sites in such areas should retain the underlying lots sizes.	The submitter seeks the following: f. General Residential Zone within Historic Heritage Area (unless otherwise stated): Front, corner or through site – 600m2 and Rear site – 400m2 both with 15m diameter circle
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 44	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter seeks a change to minimum number of users per ROW because it is considered that a ROW should be able to serve up to 10 users without the need for a body corporate.	The Submitter considers that such a standard provides sufficient room for passing. <u>f. Minimum private way width serving 7-10 allotments or residential units: 7m</u> g. Minimum private way width serving 7 <u>11</u> – 20 residential units where access forms common property under a unit title arrangement: 6m h. Minimum width of vehicle access (to be formed and vested as public road) serving 7 <u>11</u> -20 fee simple lots or residential units: 16.8m
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 45	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support	The Submitter supports up to 20 allotments being able to be served by a private way without a common property arrangement.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 46	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the provision for rainwater tanks to be provide for every new residential unit because it is considered that a rainwater tank for every unit including a bathroom or kitchen seems excessive.	One tank per site is considered sensible, or alternatively having a rainwater tank requirement dictated by the floor area of dwellings on site could be considered.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 47	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes to 25.14.4.1(h)(i) because (i) the maximum width is 3.5m, however the minimum legal width for an accessway is 4m, (ii) rear lanes are required to be 7m wide, so therefore provision for a 7m crossing should be provided.	The submitter considers that the maximum with should be moved to 4m for single units. Simply allowing crossings to be 3.5m-7m would simplify this rule.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 48	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter supports provision for travel plans but only where there will be a notable increase in vehicle or people movements but currently, it is considered that the rule is overly restrictive in the ODP, and is unnecessary for many activities, such as single dwellings being constructed on vacant land or basic renovations.	The Submitter considers that travel plans should be kept to where 4 or more units are created, or where vehicle movements are increasing by 30+ movements per day.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 49	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the removal of Special Character Zones.	No specific relief sought.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb	162. 50	General	General	Support in part	The submitter is still unsure as to how such capacity assessments are to be undertaken and by whom and expects that will be made available to industry to meaningfully contribute to Council’s infrastructure connection policies; and furthermore, it is expected that much more information and surety for our Clients will become available on this matter as PC12 progresses through the IPI evaluation and assessment process.	Decision Sought <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PC12 includes guidelines or criteria in regard to infrastructure capacity assessments. 2. PC12 provides linkages to infrastructure connection policy guidelines and criteria. 3. Council adopts a collaborative approach in developing its ‘Three Waters Connection Policy’. 4. Council to work collaboratively with industry and network utility providers to integrate infrastructure connection guidance for all service connections – not limited to only Council owned infrastructure.
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard	163. 1	General	General	Support in part	With respect to Hamilton Home Zone's site, PC12 should be accepted subject to the further amendments requested in this submission on the basis that, provided the requested amendments are made, proposed PC12:	With respect to Hamilton Home Zone's site, PC12 should be accepted subject to the further amendments requested in Table 1 to their submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Hamilton Homezone Limited					<p>1. Is consistent with relevant legislation and will appropriately give effect to applicable higher order policy instruments. In particular it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to housing need and demand; Result in a well-functioning urban environment that enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, now and into the future; Enable housing to be designed to meet the day to day needs of residents. <p>2. Promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, to the extent that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable the social, economic and cultural well-being of the community; Meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; Ensure that potential adverse effects from intensification are appropriately addressed; and Achieve an efficient use and development of the scarce urban land resource. <p>3. Enable quality planning outcomes and efficient use of the submitters site.</p>	For the avoidance of doubt, these submission points include any related or consequential relief that may be necessary to fully give effect to the issues raised, submission points set out and relief sought in this submission.
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard Hamilton Homezone Limited	163.2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	<p>Rule 6.3(yy(ii)) (Apartments above ground floor – permitted activity in Business 1 Zone) The change from restricted discretionary to permitted activity status for apartments above ground floor level is appropriate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It enables an efficient use of land Is in accordance with the higher order policy instruments (including RMA, Enabling Housing Act, and NPS-UD). Will result in a well-functioning urban environments that enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety, now and into the future (Objective 1 of NPS-UD). Will assist in meeting the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. 	Retain rule Rule 6.3(yy(ii)) as notified: (Permitted activity status for apartments above ground floor in the Business 1 Zone)
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard Hamilton Homezone Limited	163.3	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.2 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The increase in height in relation to boundary standard toward General residential land, from 3m + 45 degrees to 4m + 60 degrees is supported because it enables an efficient use of land, greater intensification of Business Land, without compromising residential character and amenity on adjacent sites.	Retain standard 6.4.2 (Height in Relation to Boundary) for General Residential Zone as notified: Where any boundary adjoins a General Residential Zone, no part of any building shall penetrate a height control plane rising at an angle of 60 degrees beginning at an elevation of 4m above the boundary.
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard Hamilton Homezone Limited	163.4	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Oppose	<p>An increase in the maximum height limit from 15 m to 21 m at the HS4 site, by applying the 21m height overlay to the Site and the wider Home Straight Park is appropriate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no rational reason that the 21 m height overlay should not be applied to the Home Straight Park including the HS4 site. The Section 32 Report identifies that PC12 enables taller heights in some business zones to meet the MDRS or 6-storey requirements of NPS- UD policy 32. The 21m height overlay has been applied to land zoned Business 2 (Events Facilities Fringe) and Business 6 (Neighbourhood Centre) Zone approximately 330m south of the Site, and MDRS approximately 1.1km south of the Site but the s32 Report does not explain the criteria used to apply the 21m height overlay only to these locations. The NPS-UD provisions regarding intensification in and around centres, walkable catchments and building heights are minimum standards and not maxima. It would enable building height, density and urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services at the site and surrounds (in accordance with Policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD). The Site is well located next to a major arterial and other amenities and is of a size and shape that can comfortable and appropriately accommodate intensive commercial or mixed use development. 	Amend Standard 6.4.1 (Maximum Building Height) (and Figure 6.4c) to apply the 21 m height overlay to the Home Straight Park including the HS4 Site (at 25 Home Straight, Te Rapa).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would enable apartments or residential development above commercial activity (up to 21m), which is appropriate, in accordance with policy direction, represents an efficient use of land, provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to housing need and demand, and is not expected to undermine the business hierarchy and established centres. It would contribute to a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future (Objective 1 of the NPS-UD). 	
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard Hamilton Homezone Limited	163.5	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>The Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD are concerned primarily with intensification of residential activity. The proposed financial contribution provisions disproportionately impact on commercial and retail activities in comparison with other categories of activities because of the use of vehicle movements as a proxy for demand, which wrongly assumes that vehicle traffic that visits commercial and retail outlets is generated (in wholly or in part) by those activities, rather than by the residential growth that the activities have been developed to serve. There is no rationale for assuming vehicle movements equate to the level of effect which may be generated on the Waikato River and/or the need for renewal of local infrastructure networks.</p> <p>The financial contributions provisions cannot duplicate the matters addressed in the development contributions policy and doing so effectively amounts to double charging.</p> <p>No feasibility analysis has been undertaken regarding the impact of the financial contribution provisions on the development of non-residential activities. A non-retail commercial development of a building of the size consented on the HS4 site would attract a significant financial contribution which would negatively impact on the commercial feasibility of development.</p> <p>New non-residential activities should not be subject to the financial contribution provisions as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide goods and services that are required to meet demand from incoming residential development; and Do not themselves generate the adverse effects that have been identified as requiring mitigation through financial contributions. 	Delete the proposed financial contributions provisions in their entirety.
Boffa Miskell Limited - Nick Pollard Hamilton Homezone Limited	163.6	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>The Enabling Housing Act and NPS-UD are concerned primarily with intensification of residential activity. The proposed financial contribution provisions disproportionately impact on commercial and retail activities in comparison with other categories of activities because of the use of vehicle movements as a proxy for demand, which wrongly assumes that vehicle traffic that visits commercial and retail outlets is generated (in wholly or in part) by those activities, rather than by the residential growth that the activities have been developed to serve. There is no rationale for assuming vehicle movements equate to the level of effect which may be generated on the Waikato River and/or the need for renewal of local infrastructure networks.</p> <p>The financial contributions provisions cannot duplicate the matters addressed in the development contributions policy and doing so effectively amounts to double charging. No feasibility analysis has been undertaken regarding the impact of the financial contribution provisions on the development of non-residential activities. A non-retail commercial development of a building of the size consented on the HS4 site would attract a significant financial contribution which would negatively impact on the commercial feasibility of development.</p> <p>New non-residential activities should not be subject to the financial contribution provisions as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide goods and services that are required to meet demand from incoming residential development; and Do not themselves generate the adverse effects that have been identified as requiring mitigation through financial contributions. 	

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Terra Consultants - Kirsty Moran GMRD Developers	164.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.5.4, alternatively increase height to 28m. The submitter supports no height in relation to boundary rules for High Density Zone.	Retain 21m height permitted or increase to 28m in Rule 4.4.5.4. Such other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy concerns of the submitter.
Te Tuapapa Kura Kainga - Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) - Andrew Crisp (CEO)	165.1	General	General		<p>HUD’s role and responsibilities</p> <p>HUD leads the New Zealand Government’s housing and urban development work programme. We are responsible for strategy, policy, funding, monitoring and regulation of New Zealand’s housing and urban development system. We are working to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• address homelessness• increase public and private housing supply• modernise rental laws and rental standards• increase access to affordable housing, for people to rent and buy• support quality urban development and thriving communities. <p>We work closely with other central and local government agencies, the housing sector, communities, and iwi to deliver on our purpose – thriving communities where everyone has a place to call home – he kāinga ora, he hapori ora.</p> <p>Our work on the planning system – outlined further below – contributes directly to several of the above streams of work (particularly, increasing housing supply and supporting quality urban development) and provides a necessary foundation for the others.</p> <p>Wider Context</p> <p><i>The Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development 2021 (GPS-HUD)</i></p> <p>The GPS-HUD sets a direction for housing and urban development in New Zealand. Its overarching vision is that everyone in New Zealand lives in a home and a community that meets their needs and aspirations.</p> <p>The four main things it sets out to achieve are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Thriving and resilient communities – the places where people live are accessible and connected to employment, education, social and cultural opportunities. They grow and change well within environmental limits, support our culture and heritage and are resilient.• Wellbeing through housing – everyone lives in a home, whether it’s rented or owned, that is warm, dry, safe, stable and affordable, with access to the support they need to live healthy, successful lives. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Māori housing through partnership – Māori and the Crown work together in partnership so all whānau have safe, healthy, affordable and stable homes. Māori housing solutions are led by Māori and are delivered locally. Māori can use their own assets and whenua Māori to invest in and support housing solutions.• An adaptive and responsive system – Land-use change, infrastructure and housing supply is responsive to demand, well planned and well regulated. <p><i>The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the Amendment Act)</i></p> <p>HUD has a particular interest in this Plan Change stemming from its co-lead role in developing the NPS-UD and the Amendment Act and overseeing their implementation.</p> <p>The NPS-UD aims to ensure councils better plan for growth and remove overly restrictive barriers to development to allow growth in locations that have good access to services, public transport networks and infrastructure. The NPS-UD intensification policies require councils to enable greater heights and densities in areas that are well-suited to growth, such as in and around urban centres and rapid transit stops.</p> <p>The Amendment Act introduced the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process for tier 1 councils to implement the intensification policies and additionally required these councils to introduce the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p> <p>Both the Amendment Act and NPS-UD provide for qualifying matters – justified reasons to reduce heights and densities enabled.</p> <p>Together, the NPS-UD and Amendment Act are intended to ensure New Zealand’s towns and cities are well-functioning urban environments that support housing supply and affordability, accessibility to jobs and services, and emissions reduction.</p> <p><i>The benefits of intensification</i></p> <p>In recent years, HUD and the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) have commissioned a series of</p>	No relief sought

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>work to develop an evidence base to inform policy development and to support the evaluation of policies. This evidence base has been bolstered by international evidence that has considered the impacts of intensification. Reports commissioned by HUD and MfE include (but are not limited to) the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The costs and benefits of urban development, 2019, MRCagney: https://environment.govt.nz/publications/the-costs-and-benefits-of-urban-development/ • The cost benefit analysis for the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, 2019: https://environment.govt.nz/assets/Publications/Files/NPS-UD-CBA-final.pdf • The cost benefit analysis for the Medium Density Residential Standards: https://environment.govt.nz/assets/publications/Cost-benefit-analysis-of-proposed-MDRS-Jan-22.pdf <p>As a whole, this evidence base clearly shows the benefits of intensification in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social benefits, resulting from greater availability of a wide range of housing typologies in areas that are close to jobs and services. This can slow or reverse the transfer of wealth from future homeowners and renters to current property owners in areas with heavy restrictions. • Economic benefits, resulting from greater productivity. Agglomeration economies drive productivity growth in areas where higher numbers of firms and people are located near one another, as a result of improved matching between employers and employees and higher levels of innovation (due to ‘knowledge spillovers’). • More efficient use of infrastructure, as infrastructure costs are lower, on average, for medium density developments and developments in inner-city areas. • Environmental benefits relative to greenfields development and to development further from the centre of cities. In particular, intensification is a key mechanism for reducing carbon emissions, enabling shorter commute times and efficient use of infrastructure, while continuing to meet housing and urban development needs. <p>There are a wide range of additional impacts that arise from various types of urban development, including costs such as sunlight loss and congestion. However evidence shows that the benefits outlined above tend to outweigh costs and do so substantially in areas that are well-suited to development. Benefits are also widespread, longstanding and projected to grow substantially over time. Costs are real but tend to be smaller and more narrowly focused, primarily affecting current homeowners.</p> <p>As a result, modelling for both the NPS-UD intensification policies and the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) showed a clear net benefit. This work also highlighted that the costs of any restrictions imposed will be a reduction, to a greater or lesser extent, in the positive impacts outlined above.</p> <p>In its role overseeing the implementation of the NPD-UD and MDRS, HUD is focused on ensuring these benefits are realised, and that restrictions are only put in place where there are genuine qualifying matters that need to be managed.</p>	
Te Tuapapa Kura Kainga - Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) - Andrew Crisp (CEO)	165.2	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	<p>The submission relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure overlay <p>HUD supports in part how this matter is addressed in the plan change 12.</p> <p>The Submission is: Plan Change 12 proposes a ‘three waters infrastructure capacity’ overlay. The overlay would apply across much of the existing, urbanised area of the city and require infrastructure capacity assessments for housing developments of a medium to high density. Sections 77I to 77M of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), and clauses 3.32 to 3.33 of the NPS-UD, place a number of requirements on councils when proposing such restrictions. Section 77I states that: <i>“A specified territorial authority may make the MDRS and the relevant building height or density requirements under policy 3 less enabling of development in relation to an area within a relevant residential zone only to the extent necessary to accommodate 1 or more of the [qualifying matters]”</i> This makes it clear the restrictions can only be for identified purposes, and must be designed in the most efficient way possible – addressing the matter without unnecessarily restricting development. Hamilton City Council (HCC) has developed an infrastructure overlay it considers necessary to fulfil its commitments under Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato/the Vision and Strategy for the</p>	<p>Relief Sought</p> <p>HUD seeks the following decision on the Proposed Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the matter raised in Table 1 is addressed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>Waikato River (Te Ture Whaimana). Te Ture Whaimana establishes significant commitments for HCC and HUD supports the inclusion of restrictions in the District Plan to the extent they are necessary to meet these commitments.</p> <p>Te Ture Whaimana is a listed qualifying matter under section 77I. This means that the requirements of section 77J must be met for it to be justified, but not those of 77L which are necessary for non-listed matters. In contrast, impacts on infrastructure (where there is no direct impact on the river) are not a listed matter and restrictions for this purpose would require additional analysis to meet the more stringent requirements. The council has not attempted to meet the section 77L, clearly intending to justify the overlay on the need to manage impacts on the river.</p> <p>In summary, if water network failure has a genuine impact on the river, then restrictions can be justified if they are sufficiently tightly focused. Such restrictions would ideally enable development to proceed where there are no constraints or these can be mitigated, and would cease to have an effect once infrastructure investment had occurred.</p> <p>In putting in place such restrictions, it is important that evidence be tested thoroughly, as measures would not be costless. HCC has highlighted that these restrictions would result in increased greenfields development to offset the reduction within current urban areas. This would result in a range of negative impacts, particularly resulting from longer commute times and the loss of productive soils.</p> <p>Across a number of documents, HCC has indicated that the purpose of the overlay is to restrict development to certain areas. This could be contrary to section 77I, meaning the restrictions are unjustified, if not based on the impact of the river alone. To that end, HUD has reviewed the overlay and has identified a number of features that suggest it may not be appropriately designed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the General Residential zone, development above a net density of one unit per 200m2 would trigger an infrastructure assessment. This could encourage lower density development and generally could be construed as a density standard. <p>• It only includes certain areas where the council has indicated it would prefer more limited development. It does not cover the CBD, greenfield or commercial/industrial zones. This appears to conflict with the purpose of the overlay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions for the capacity assessment could be clearer regarding what is required with reference to local and trunk capacity. The provisions could be better focused on managing effects on the River rather than just testing wider infrastructure pressures, which, as outlined above, can not be justified if these do not impact the river. <p>HUD requests that the overlay be carefully considered by the panel and changes, if required, are made to bring overlay into compliance with section 77I. It may be appropriate, for example, to have more tightly focused (i.e. limited) measures that cover the whole city and are better aligned with the purpose of the overlay, rather than the current proposal in the specific areas. For instance, if hydraulic neutrality was achieved by a development there is unlikely to be any effect on the Waikato River. HUD considers that the panel should carefully consider the need and evidence for the overlay</p>	
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that some of the changes to the MDRS, in particular the minimum section size of 200m², would have an adverse effect on developments because the proposal contradicts the clear, bi-partisan, intent of the RMA Amendment Act and will directly result in less intensification. Furthermore, the proposal could impact Hamilton’s housing and environmental goals of a compact and liveable city, by reducing new housing supply and harming housing affordability.	That HCC does not adopt a minimum section size of 200m² and instead aligns the General Residential Zone with the density requirements as set out in the RMA Amendment Act.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166. 2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of Medium Density Residential Zone that would enable up to five story residential developments within a 400m walkable catchment of Hamilton's suburban centres.	Adopt Medium Residential Zone as notified.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166. 3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter broadly support the proposed High Density Residential Zone, but is concerned that the proposed height limit for residential development, of 21m, is poorly aligned with HCC’s ambition of supporting developments of six or more storeys. It is noted that, it is often difficult to achieve a six storey development even with a height limit of 21m, especially without making avoidable design trade-offs.	Enable greater height and more flexible design rules, where appropriate (e.g., close to centres and along transport routes).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.4	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter broadly support the proposed High Density Residential Zone, but is concerned that the proposed height limit for residential development, of 21m, is poorly aligned with HCC’s ambition of supporting developments of six or more storeys. It is noted that, it is often difficult to achieve a six storey development even with a height limit of 21m, especially without making avoidable design trade-offs.	Amend the proposed six storey maximum to enable greater intensification and a varied skyline near the central city.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter states that PC12 is introducing pedestrian access requirements, that would see residential developments of 4 or more units be required to have separated pedestrian access to the front of units that, depending on location, is between 1.5m and 1.8m wide and it is noted that current requirements for internal residential corridors are 1.2m and residential doorways tend to be 950mm.	Align pedestrian walkways with the same width standard (1.2m) as used for internal corridors.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter states that PC12 is introducing pedestrian access requirements, that would see residential developments of 4 or more units be required to have separated pedestrian access to the front of units that, depending on location, is between 1.5m and 1.8m wide and it is noted that current requirements for internal residential corridors are 1.2m and residential doorways tend to be 950mm.	Address urban design concerns through mechanisms such as design guidelines, better use of the Urban Design Panel, and development incentives to resolve any concerns over pedestrian access.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about policies 4.2.2.2(b) and 4.3.2.2(b) because these policies are premised on an assumption of adverse effects from new development on neighbours and are unreasonably vague and could pose a regulatory roadblock to beneficial new developments across Hamilton.	Revise approach of policies 4.2.2.2b and 4.3.2.2b, to better support urban intensification by better reflecting the positive impact of development.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.8	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about policies 4.2.2.2(b) and 4.3.2.2(b) because these policies are premised on an assumption of adverse effects from new development on neighbours and are unreasonably vague and could pose a regulatory roadblock to beneficial new developments across Hamilton.	Revise approach of policies 4.2.2.2b and 4.3.2.2b, to better support urban intensification by better reflecting the positive impact of development.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.9	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed changes within the Business Zones (e.g. height of 21m within an 800m walkable catchment of the Central City; enabling upper floor apartments as a permitted activities in some Business Zone areas; and amended building controls, to better align with the proposed residential zones).	One area that HCC could look to develop further would be enabling greater height and density, especially of a mixed-use nature, within Sub-Regional, Suburban and Neighbourhood Centres.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.10	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the removal of height controls and amend the minimum density requirements because the removal of general height controls will enable greater investment and development in Hamilton’s Central City.</p> <p>It is believed that these policy changes will serve as a catalyst for the revitalisation of Hamilton’s City Centre as a desirable place for people to live, work and play.</p>	No specific relief sought.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.11	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General		The submitter is concerned that the proposed walkable catchment around the central city is insufficient for a city of Hamilton’s size because it is believed that an 800m walkable catchment is inadequate for Hamilton and would not give due effect to the intent of the NPS-UD in enabling new housing development, nor HCC’s own ambitions of being a 20 minute walkable city. It is believed that areas adjacent to Hamilton’s central city are prime areas for intensification, being the most suitable land for higher density living. Enabling greater density in these areas would better allow more people to live closer to the central city, and get the benefits from, public amenities and transport links.	Align the proposed walkable catchment with comparable Tier One cities and seek to implement a walkable catchment of at least 1200m around the Central City Zone. This would better align with the intent of the NPS-UD and provide more people with an opportunity to live closer to the central city, and get the benefits from, public amenities and transport links.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the expansion of ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ from 5 to 37, alongside expanded use of archaeological overlays because the proposed ‘Historic Heritage Areas’ will have significant intensification and development restrictions placed upon them. Areas with an archaeological overlays will place similar restrictions, even if they have already been developed on. The proposal could see a wide range of unintended consequences from financial and insurance obstacles to restricting housing supply.	Re-evaluate their heritage, character and archaeological sites to ensure that they strike a better balance of preserving true heritage as opposed to their current approach which is extremely liberal on the definition.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.13	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to an infrastructure capacity overlay being applied to all properties within the overlay area because (i) if implemented poorly, this could likely result in significant delays for residential developments across Hamilton, adding time and cost pressure, (ii) there is the risk that this overlay becomes a large barrier to residential development, and given the proposed scale, could have notable impacts on housing supply and affordability across Hamilton; (iii) there are concerns about the extent to which a prospective developer would have readily available access to information about availability and state of three waters infrastructure.	Provide greater information and engage further with the development community on the proposal to introduce an infrastructure capacity overlay.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.14	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the implementation cost of proposed new stormwater, site permeability and landscaping related provisions for residential development because of the implementation cost of these measures and the flow on effect to homebuyers.	Planning rules that avoid being prescriptive and instead enable the sort of site specific attributes that ultimately result in good quality design outcomes.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.15	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the use of financial contributions for the provision of residential amenity (streetscapes etc) and for the provision of restoration and protection of the Waikato River given the clear rationale for funds collection. However, the submitter has reservations around the proposed use of financial contributions to fund upgrades and improvements to three waters and transport infrastructure because of the cumulative impact of new cost pressures on development in Hamilton.</p> <p>Instead the submitter supports the use of transparent, beneficiary pays funding models for the provision of core infrastructure.</p>	Does not adopt the use of financial contributions for funding three waters and transport infrastructure. Instead, we recommend the use of transparent, beneficiary pays alternative funding models, such as targeted rates, asset recycling or Special Purpose Vehicles.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.16	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the requirements of at least 10% of residential units (and a fractional rule for small number of units) on a site that shall be designed to provide wheelchair access alongside accessible bathrooms and because the draft provisions are overly prescriptive and do not account for the wide range of potential accessibility needs nor account for real world demand for these products.	Pursue an approach to encouraging greater construction of accessible units through development incentives in the district plan. In our view, this would result in more flexibility for both developers and purchasers. This would better enable negotiations between homebuyers and developers regarding which accessible features are required for each individual’s circumstances.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.17	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter is concerned the proposed new cycle parking requirements could have an adverse effect on Hamilton’s built environment because mandatory cycle parking in developments without strong market demand for it, may result in a loss of amenity and site yield. There are concerns regarding the practicality and equity of communal bike charging facilities; questions surround who would pay for the electricity and whether E bikes of an expensive nature would in fact use communal facilities at all. The submitter supports adopting less proscriptive requirements, that enable greater site specificity.	Do not adopt the proposed cycle parking requirements and instead retains the ability for the market to allocate cycle parking as required and adopt less proscriptive requirements, that enable greater site specificity.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.18	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that mandating the installation of EV charging equipment, over and above current demand for EVs, could result in the installation of what might in the future be obsolete technology. We are further concerned that given the current level of grid capacity; this policy could require the installation of costly sub-stations that could be disproportionate to current demand for electricity in a residential development.	Do not adopt the proposed EV charging requirements and instead retains the ability for the market to allocate EV charging capacity as required.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.19	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with the loss of amenity and increased concrete required to achieve new width requirements of 7m for rear lanes in developments, as well as requirements that heavy vehicles/rubbish trucks are able to drive forward at all times, with associated turning bays provided for onsite.	The submitter recommends a site-by-site discussion taking in other site specific factors into account.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.20	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter is concerned that if provisions requiring Integrated Transport Assessments considering the proposed developments impact on embodied and operational greenhouse gas emissions because if these provisions are misapplied, HCC may take a climate lens to consenting that will stifle urban growth and effectively veto projects they do not agree with from a climate perspective.	No specific relief sought.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.21	General	General		The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions notified appear to be overly prescriptive. Overly prescriptive planning rules can result in lower quality urban design outcomes, as developments follow the letter of the law and are unable introduce site-specific variances.	Review the proposed notification provisions, with a view to introducing greater flexibility.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.22	25.15 Urban Design	General	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of incentives to encourage comprehensive and integrated developments on larger, amalgamated sites because these developments tend to result in higher quality urban design outcomes.	Introduce incentives into the district plan to encourage comprehensive and integrated developments on larger, amalgamated sites.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.23	General	General		The submitter has reviewed the Ministry for the Environment’s publication of ‘The Value of Urban Design’ and would raise that they see further opportunities to embrace housing intensification, as intended by the NPS-UD and the RMA Amendment Act, whilst enhancing Hamilton’s built environment through thoughtful design implementation.	No specific relief sought.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey	166.24	25.15 Urban Design	General		As it stands, HCC has an existing Urban Design Panel ("UDP"), consisting of industry experts (such as Urban Designers, Architects, Transport and Civil Engineers etc). The design guide VISTA is already in place, and we recommend the place and profile of the UDP be raised in order to interact in more cohesive ways within the District Plan context.	Raise the place and profile of the UDP in order to interact in more cohesive ways within the District Plan context.
William Courtney McMaster	167.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 and the blanket application of the three-stories, three dwellings as of right. The submitter supports the current planning provisions that allow for development. The submitter is concerned that higher density across all suburbs will result in inappropriate, un-coordinated and unattractive land use.	No relief stated.
William Courtney McMaster	167.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports Historic Heritage Areas as a 'qualifying matter'.	Retain Historic Heritage Areas in the Plan.
William Courtney McMaster	167.3	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed financial contributions.	No specific relief sought.
William Courtney McMaster	167.4	General	General	Support in part	The submitter believes developers should provide adequate infrastructure. Assessments of infrastructure capacity should apply to developments of three or more dwellings on a site. The cumulative effects of development on infrastructure must be taken into account when assessing individual applications.	Require developments with three or more units to assess infrastructure capacity and consider cumulative effects.
William Courtney McMaster	167.5	25.15 Urban Design	General		The submitter seeks detailed urban design guidelines for developments in higher density areas and in HHAs.	Create detailed urban design guidelines for higher density areas and HHAs.
William Courtney McMaster	167.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes residential intensification in the HHAs without resource consent.	That any ‘three plus three’ development in HHAs must have a resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity; and resource consent must not be granted unless conditions are imposed to mitigate adverse effects against historic heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
William Courtney McMaster	167. 7	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.3 Maximum Height Control	Support	The submitter supports no height limit in the Central City Zone.	Focus high density development in the Central City Zone.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 8	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes allowing six stories within 800m of the central city, including parts of Whitiara, Te Rapa and Hamilton East. This is expanding higher density into areas not currently suited to that purpose.	No specific relief stated.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 9	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 which allows up to three dwellings up to three stories on most sections in residential zones without needing to obtain a resource consent.	Seeks Council decline Plan Change 12 in its entirety; and Retain current provisions and rules relating to dwelling development in suburban residential zones.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 10	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change in its entirety. This ‘blanket’ proposal goes against sound current town planning practices which have served Hamilton City well and protected the city from inappropriate land use development.	Seek that Council decline all provisions relating to Plan Change 12 and retain current District Plan provisions and rules relating to dwelling development in suburban residential zones.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 11	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes provisions that allow three dwellings up to three stories within residential zones without consent. The submitter is concerned about urban design and infrastructure outcomes from new developments.	Seek the removal of the provisions relating to increased density in residential zones, medium density residential zones and high intensity residential zones.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes the allowance of 11m as a permitted height with concern for shading and inappropriate development.	Seek that buildings of up to 11m are not allowed if they shade neighbouring properties.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 13	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed 1.5m setback from transport corridors with concerns for canyoning and shading.	Seeks a 4m transport corridor setback.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 1.5m transport corridor setback with canyoning and shading concerns.	Seeks a 4m transport corridor setback.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter a 1m side and rear yard with concerns for loss of privacy, visual and noise issues.	Seeks that side and rear yard setbacks should be at least 4 metres.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes a 1m side and rear setback with concerns for loss of privacy, visual and noise issues.	Seeks side and rear yard setbacks of least 4 metres.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 17	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support	The submitter supports consenting requirements in the high density zone to ensure development provides for high quality urban design and visually attractive buildings.	Retain resource consent requirements in the high density residential zones.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 18	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes a 1m transport corridor, side and rear boundary setback with concerns for canyoning, shading, privacy, visual and noise effects.	That transport corridor, side and rear yard setbacks outside the Central City Zone should be at least 4 metres.
William Courtney McMaster	167. 19	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.4 Rules - Notification	Oppose	The submitter notes the notification standards in rule 4.4.4 and what infringements are exempt.	That neighbouring properties are notified in all cases.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Cherie Trass	168.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter is concerned that intensification of housing in the forest lake area will dramatically increase water catchment which, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into - and adversely affect - the health and wellbeing of the waikato river.	Refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan change 12; and Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented 3 level and above developments within the city precinct.
Cherie Trass	168.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter is concerned about the impact of intensification on sunlight.	Refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan change 12; and Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented 3 level and above developments within the city precinct.
Cherie Trass	168.3	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change.	Refuse to implement Plan Change 12.
Cherie Trass	168.4	25.14 Transportation	General		The submitter wishes new developments to provide car parking.	That new developments provide car parking
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.1	General	General		The submitter supports changes to the District Plan which are aimed at enabling greater housing supply and choice within the city. However, they want to see specific amendments and alterations to the plan to ensure that it takes more fully into account the need for accessibility and inclusion, including for disabled people, both in terms of building design and urban planning requirements.	Specific amendments and alterations to the plan to ensure that it takes more fully into account the need for accessibility and inclusion, including for disabled people, both in terms of building design and urban planning requirements.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter understands that the plan is currently lacking in terms of the need to accommodate the needs of the present and future population of both disabled people and older people, therefore, several objectives and policies in Chapters 2 and 4 need to be extensively reviewed to fully recognise the needs of disabled people, mostly when it comes to accessible housing and making our communities safe, inclusive and accessible for everyone.	Several objectives and policies in Chapters 2 and 4 need to be extensively reviewed to fully recognise the needs of disabled people, mostly when it comes to accessible housing and making our communities safe, inclusive and accessible for everyone.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter understands that the plan is currently lacking in terms of the need to accommodate the needs of the present and future population of both disabled people and older people, therefore, several objectives and policies in Chapters 2 and 4 need to be extensively reviewed to fully recognise the needs of disabled people, mostly when it comes to accessible housing and making our communities safe, inclusive and accessible for everyone.	Several objectives and policies in Chapters 2 and 4 need to be extensively reviewed to fully recognise the needs of disabled people, mostly when it comes to accessible housing and making our communities safe, inclusive and accessible for everyone.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.4	General	General	Support in part	The submitter recognises that the concept of walkable neighbourhoods is useful in assisting the development of urban areas where people can have easier and readier access to services and amenities including, for example, workplaces, healthcare centres, shops and public transport from wherever they live, it is important that a disability lens be cast over the definition of 'walkable'.	The definition of people be broadened and amended to include ‘the needs of all people, including disabled people whose impairments may make it difficult to access community amenities and services more readily, i.e., retailers, health services, education and training establishments, recreational and leisure facilities and public transport.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.5	General	General	Support in part	The submitter recognises that the concept of walkable neighbourhoods is useful in assisting the development of urban areas where people can have easier and readier access to services and amenities including, for example, workplaces, healthcare centres, shops and public transport from wherever they live, it is important that a disability lens be cast over the definition of 'walkable.	That council work in partnership with disabled people and our organisations, to look at encouraging accessible housing developments within 400 metres of essential services such as shops, educational and training establishments (i.e., schools), recreational and leisure facilities (i.e., parks) and public transport.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support in part	The submitter supports the broad principles of Objective 2.2.3, however, there should be an additional policy 2.2.3d created which incorporates the idea of ensuring that urban design is not only functional but that it is accessible for everyone, including, especially, disabled and non-disabled people.	Add new policy 2.2.3d which incorporates the idea of ensuring that urban design is not only functional but that it is accessible for everyone, including, especially, disabled and non-disabled people.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support in part	The submitter supports the policies contained within this section. However, a new policy should be included in the form of 2.2.9c to stipulate that notwithstanding the definition of ‘residential’ it should include people living in residential care and managed care facilities so disability and aged care providers begin thinking about working with disabled people to create greater housing and living choices for their clients and that these factors can be translated into design options.	A new policy should be included in the form of 2.2.9c to stipulate that notwithstanding the definition of ‘residential’ it should include people living in residential care and managed care facilities.
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The submitter supports the insertion of a new policy 2.2.14j to introduce the concept of horizontal accessibility for multi-storey builds which would outline that all duplexes and three storey buildings must contain accessible units built to universal design standards and have level entry because this would increase the number of accessible dwellings within new developments and get around the provisions of the current Building Act which stipulates that lifts can only be installed in developments greater than three storeys in height.	Insert a new policy 2.2.14j introducing the concept of horizontal accessibility for multi-storey builds which would outline that all duplexes and three storey buildings must contain accessible units built to universal design standards and have level entry.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Disabled Persons Assembly - Chris Ford	169.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports the insertion of a new Objective 4.1.2.9 on the ‘need for residential development to incorporate accessibility features and technologies’ because these would include outside of residential developments, the provision of smooth paving, accessible kerbing, mobility parking for both residents and non-residents, and easily accessible areas to store refuse and waste. Inside residential units, provision should be made for electronically operated garage doors, electronic door keys and security systems to be installed along with easily adjustable, variable lighting and provision for showers/bathrooms which can easily become wet floor showers combined with railed toilets if the need arose.	Insert new Objective 4.1.2.9 on the ‘need for residential development to incorporate accessibility features and technologies’.
Cherie Trass	170.1	General	General		The submitter wishes for family homes and duplexes.	Build high rises in new development areas.
Cherie Trass	170.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter considers it important to have historic areas.	No specific relief sought.
Cherie Trass	170.3	25.14 Transportation	General		The submitter seeks car parks in new developments.	That car parks be supplied by developers.
Cherie Trass	170.4	General	General		The submitter wants to live in a green environment, not concrete jungle.	No specific relief sought.
Cherie Trass	170.5	General	General		The submitter wishes for developers to pay for service upgrades.	That developers pay for service upgrades.
Cherie Trass	170.6	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes.	Oppose.
John O'Donoghue	171.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the Hillcrest Shopping area appropriate for an intensification zone given its proximity to the university, public transport, amenities, including schools, medical centre, supermarket, other semi commercial operations.	Reconsider the Hilcrest Shopping area for an intensification zone; and consider how long a sausage shaped areas might be defined to meet the objectives of the overarching policy.
Janice Mary Trass	172.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter is concerned for the potential loss of natural light and privacy from intensification, and its effects on residents wellbeing.	Refuse to implement clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA- specifically to refuse to allow the housing intensification in Plan Change 12 Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented 3 Storey and above developments with the city boundary.
Janice Mary Trass	172.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes.	Keep the history and architecture of the city.
Janice Mary Trass	172.3	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	Oppose.	Adequate parking is a MUST. Not for a developer to CHOOSE
Janice Mary Trass	172.4	General	General	Oppose	Oppose.	Important for families to live in a green space not a concrete jungle.
Janice Mary Trass	172.5	General	General			Developers should pay for service upgrades.
Linda Dowling	173.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		The submitter is concerned about three storey development in 1 and 2 storey neighbourhoods.	Leave the current height restrictions on residential zones; and Only introduce the new plan for new development areas.
Linda Dowling	173.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about 3 to 5 storey housing in 1 and 2 storey housing areas. Parking issues are also raised by the submitter where existing streets may not be able to cope with roadside parking.	Leave the current height restrictions on residential zones as they are; and Only introduce the new plan for new developments.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Xiaoming and Feijiang Guo and Ye	174.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the infrastructure capacity of Claudelands and the impact on the river from intensification.	Refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA - specifically to refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Xiaoming and Feijiang Guo and Ye	174.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage in Claudelands and the loss of sunlight from new developments.	Reject any proposal that would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
The Base Te Awa Limited - Alex Devine	175.1	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the financial contributions provisions in their entirety because the provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disproportionately impact on commercial and in particular retail activities in comparison with other categories of activity. With respect to non-residential activities, are identified as being required primarily to give effect to the Council's strategy for the Waikato River. Use vehicle movements as a proxy for demand, which wrongly assumes that vehicle traffic that visits retail outlets is generated, either wholly or in large part, by those retail outlets rather than by the residential growth that the retail outlets have been developed to serve. <p>The submitter considers that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New retail, food and beverage and entertainment facilities do not themselves generate increased traffic across the city, although they can cause localised traffic effects. The FCC Provisions should not seek to duplicate the matters addressed in the DC Policy and doing so effectively amounts to double charging. No adequate feasibility analysis has been undertaken regarding the impact of the FC Provisions on the development of non-residential activities. <p>New retail, food and beverage and entertainment activities should not be subject to the FC Provisions as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide goods and services that are required to meet demand from incoming residential development; and Do not themselves generate adverse effects that require mitigation through financial contributions. 	<p>The Submitter seeks the following relief with regard to PC 12:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the FC Provisions be deleted in their entirety. That, if the relief in (a) above is not granted, that the FC Provisions be amended by exempting new retail, food and beverage and entertainment activities from the financial contributions. Any other relief or other consequential amendments as are considered appropriate or necessary to address the concerns set out in this submission.
The Base Te Awa Limited - Alex Devine	175.2	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the financial contributions provisions in their entirety because the provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disproportionately impact on commercial and in particular retail activities in comparison with other categories of activity. With respect to non-residential activities, are identified as being required primarily to give effect to the Council's strategy for the Waikato River. Use vehicle movements as a proxy for demand, which wrongly assumes that vehicle traffic that visits retail outlets is generated, either wholly or in large part, by those retail outlets rather than by the residential growth that the retail outlets have been developed to serve. <p>The submitter considers that :</p>	<p>The Submitter seeks the following relief with regard to PC 12:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That the FC Provisions be deleted in their entirety. That, if the relief in (a) above is not granted, that the FC Provisions be amended by exempting new retail, food and beverage and entertainment activities from the financial contributions. Any other relief or other consequential amendments as are considered appropriate or necessary to address the concerns set out in this submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New retail, food and beverage and entertainment facilities do not themselves generate increased traffic across the city, although they can cause localised traffic effects. The FCC Provisions should not seek to duplicate the matters addressed in the DC Policy and doing so effectively amounts to double charging. No adequate feasibility analysis has been undertaken regarding the impact of the FC Provisions on the development of non-residential activities. <p>New retail, food and beverage and entertainment activities should not be subject to the FC Provisions as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide goods and services that are required to meet demand from incoming residential development; and Do not themselves generate adverse effects that require mitigation through financial contributions. 	
Poppy Barran	176.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter considers that objectives and policies within 4.1.2.5 must lead to sustainable and climate-conscious development in line with Council's own strategy, Our Climate Future: Te Pae Tawhiti o Kirikiriroa. Certain points should be updated to better incorporate a climate change response.	<p>Update objective 4.1.2.5 as follows: 'All residential development incorporates sustainable features and technologies that clearly consider climate change through the prioritisation of emissions reduction and adaptation to the changing climate.'</p> <p>update policy 4.1.2.5a as follows: 'Development must enable and encourage the most efficient use of energy and water by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incorporating water-sensitive techniques ii. Off-setting the effects of loss of permeable surfaces iii. Reducing the use of reticulated energy iv. Utilizing solar energy wherever possible v. Providing for electric mobility and its associated charging infrastructure vi. Meeting sustainable building ratings such as Green Star Buildings vii. Providing residents with easily-accessible information on the efficiency features of the development and how to best utilise these features for maximum environmental benefit.' <p>update policy 4.1.2.5b as follows: 'Development must clearly implement methods and technologies to minimise and respond to the effects of climate change at all stages (design, construction and use of buildings), including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Avoiding the creation of emissions as a priority ii. Reducing emissions e.g. through reuse and repurposing of construction materials iii. Replacing existing emissions sources with lower emissions options e.g. through utilisation of renewable energy sources iv. Increasing carbon sequestration e.g. through on-site planting v. Offsetting emissions only as a last resort and only in the local environment (i.e. the Waikato region), once all other emissions reduction opportunities have been exhausted vi. Mitigating 'urban heat island' effect e.g. through planting and providing adequate shade vii. Ensuring building design considers and accounts for the weather extremes predicted for Hamilton Kirikiriroa, i.e. more rain and more extreme rain, increases in temperature (both during day and night), and more hot days.' <p>update the explanation for Objective 4.2.1.5 and associated policies to: 'This objective will ensure that new residential dwellings are responding to and preparing for the impacts of climate change throughout all stages of development, including through the use of water and energy-efficient technologies. For example, in response to these policies, residential units may wish to install solar panels, install a rainwater tank, and provide infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles.'</p>
Poppy Barran	176.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of objective 4.2.2.2 and policy 4.2.2.2c. However we must not lose sight of the fact that, in order to reduce emissions and respond to climate change as set out in Council's own strategy Our Climate Future: Te Pae Tawhiti o Kirikiriroa, higher-density residential development must be supported by good quality transport networks that enable people to travel without a vehicle.	To update policy 4.2.2.2c as follows: 'Higher-density residential development is located close to neighbourhood centres, parks, open spaces, and other areas of high social amenity. Higher-density residential development must also be located close to and/or enable residents to easily access good quality existing or planned public transport networks (such as outlined in Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan) and walking and cycling amenities. Residents of these developments must be provided with information about these amenities and how to use them (e.g. information on nearby bus services, walking tracks, etc at the time of moving into the residential dwelling).'
Poppy Barran	176.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability	Support in part	The submitter considers that more guidance is required for the type of tree(s) planted noting that native trees will assist the Council's goal of 10% native vegetation cover by 2050.	To update 4.2.5.3 (d) as follows: 'Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site. The trees will be New Zealand native species wherever practical, that are able to survive the expected impacts of climate change for Hamilton Kirikiriroa (e.g. increased temperatures). The trees must be planted clear of any required

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			and Landscaping			<p>vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, and at the rate set out below:</p> <p>i. Detached residential unit - Two per residential unit. ii. Duplex residential unit - Two per residential unit. iii. Terrace housing unit - Two per residential unit. iv. Apartment buildings - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. v. All other activities - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area.'</p> <p>And make the same changes to the large lot residential zone.</p>
Poppy Barran	176.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter considers that more guidance is required for the type of tree(s) planted noting that native trees will assist the Council's goal of 10% native vegetation cover by 2050.	<p>Update wording for 'd. Urban trees' under Section 4.2.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>'Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site. The trees will be New Zealand native species wherever practical, that are able to survive the expected impacts of climate change for Hamilton Kirikiriroa (e.g. increased temperatures). The trees must be planted clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, and at the rate set out below:</p> <p>i. Detached residential unit - Two per residential unit. ii. Duplex residential unit - Two per residential unit. iii. Terrace housing unit - Two per residential unit. iv. Apartment buildings - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. v. All other activities - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area.'</p>
Poppy Barran	176.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter considers that more guidance is required for the type of tree(s) planted noting that native trees will assist the Council's goal of 10% native vegetation cover by 2050.	<p>Update wording for 'd. Urban trees' under Section 4.2.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>'Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site. The trees will be New Zealand native species wherever practical, that are able to survive the expected impacts of climate change for Hamilton Kirikiriroa (e.g. increased temperatures). The trees must be planted clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, and at the rate set out below:</p> <p>i. Detached residential unit - Two per residential unit. ii. Duplex residential unit - Two per residential unit. iii. Terrace housing unit - Two per residential unit. iv. Apartment buildings - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area. v. All other activities - Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m² of site area.'</p>
Poppy Barran	176.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area		The submitter sees opportunity in the outdoor living areas standards to provide for our natural environment.	<p>Add an additional point under 4.2.5.10a, as follows:</p> <p>viii. In all instances, supports the regeneration of and residents' connection, to the natural environment. This must occur through the provision of greenery in the form of plants, trees, and/or shrubs, for example through plantings in in the ground or by utilising 'living walls' and/or other planting infrastructure as suited to the space in question.</p> <p>And make the same changes to the large lot residential zone.</p>
Poppy Barran	176.8	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter sees opportunity in the outdoor living areas standards to provide for our natural environment.	<p>Add an additional point under 4.2.5.10a, as follows:</p> <p>viii. In all instances, supports the regeneration of and residents' connection, to the natural environment. This must occur through the provision of greenery in the form of plants, trees, and/or shrubs, for example through plantings in in the ground or by utilising 'living walls' and/or other planting infrastructure as suited to the space in question.</p>
Poppy Barran	176.9	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter sees opportunity in the outdoor living areas standards to provide for our natural environment.	<p>Add an additional point under 4.2.5.10a, as follows:</p> <p>viii. In all instances, supports the regeneration of and residents' connection, to the natural environment. This must occur through the provision of greenery in the form of plants, trees, and/or shrubs, for example through plantings in in the ground or by utilising 'living walls' and/or other planting infrastructure as suited to the space in question.</p>
Poppy Barran	176.10	25.14 Transportation	General	Support in part	The submitter considers there to be missed opportunity to enable better climate change mitigation and resilience, and to enhance biodiversity, have been missed.	Update Chapter 25.14 to ensure that public transport, biking and micromobility, and any other relevant transport infrastructure must have sustainability features. For example, add policies so that any new covered biking and micro-mobility parking must either have a green roof to encourage more planting and biodiversity in our city, or be

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						powered by solar PV for the e-bikes and e-scooters to charge. Another example is for any new bus stops must have a green roof or rain garden/rain collection system installed.
Poppy Barran	176.11	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter considers that all new developments must have a rain water tank, citing climate change impacts on the city's water sources.	Update relevant sections to ensure that all new developments in residential zones must have a rainwater harvesting tank and any other forms of water conservation.
Poppy Barran	176.12	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter considers that all new development must provide a rain water tank citing climate changes impacts on the City's water sources.	Update Chapter 25.14 to ensure that all possible transport infrastructure enables rainwater harvesting and any other forms of water conservation.
Poppy Barran	176.13	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of objective 4.1.2.6 and policies 4.1.2.6c, 4.1.2.6f, and 4.1.2.6h, however certain points should be updated to better incorporate a climate change response.	<p>To update policy 4.1.2.6c iv as follows: 'Private, useable outdoor living areas that are located to the rear of the site where it is practicable to do so, and that provide adequate shade for respite from extreme heat and urban heat island effect'</p> <p>To update policy 4.1.2.6c v as follows: 'Access to sunlight and daylight throughout the year, whilst still accounting for the climate extremes, including extreme temperatures that Hamilton Kirikiriroa is likely to experience due to climate change'</p> <p>To update policy 4.1.2.6c viii as follows: 'Energy efficient and sustainable design technologies wherever possible'</p> <p>To update policy 4.1.2.6c xiii as follows: 'High quality landscaping to add to visual amenity and mitigate the impacts of climate change, including 'urban heat island' effect and impacts on the natural environment and biodiversity.'</p> <p>To update policy 4.1.2.6f: 'Vegetation and trees must be retained wherever possible. Where not possible, the equivalent amount of vegetation or tree cover must be enabled elsewhere within the city boundary, for example via 'green roofs' or 'living walls' on the residential building/unit in development (if practical), or in another location within the city boundary.'</p> <p>To update policy 4.1.2.6h: 'Requite the provision of landscaping to mitigate potential adverse effects of activities and to contribute to the overall amenity and climate resilience of residential areas.'</p> <p>To update the second paragraph in the explanation for Objective 4.2.1.6 and associated policies to: 'Important design features include access to sunlight, outdoor living space, consideration of climate change and its impacts on living spaces, storage space, space for waste and recycling, visual connectivity to public spaces such as the street, and privacy. Incorporation of these features will ensure functional and high-quality living environments for the occupants. Considering and incorporating the impacts of climate change into housing design will ensure that the living environment continues to be functional, high-quality, and provide for the wellbeing of Hamiltonians, as our climate continues to change and said impacts are realised.'</p>
Holly Dark	177.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about intensification in the Claudelands area and its impacts on water catchments and the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA – specifically to refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Holly Dark	177.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectiv es and Policies: General Resident ial Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage in the Claudelands area, and the impact of new developments on sunlight, privacy and noise.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Willetta Staheli	178.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 with concerns for mental health and city infrastructure capacity. The submitter is concerned about street car parking as result of more intensive developments. The submitter seeks promotion of multi-level high-rise apartments with lifts, close to a bus stop, and shopping, with generous green areas, and the release of more land for development.	<p>Promote multi-level high-rise apartments apartments with lifts close to bus stops and shopping, with generous green areas; and</p> <p>Release more land for development.</p>
Chris Banks	179.1	General	General	Support	The submitter is in favour of the proposed changes to allow housing densification and supports the Plan Change.	Proceed with the Plan Change.
Chris Banks	179.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter supports protection of historical sites and the natural environment, but not protecting heritage houses like Auckland Council are doing.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chris Banks	179.3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Support	The submitter supports improvements to walking, cycling and public transport accessibility.	Please get people that actually cycle to help with the design of cycleways.
Chris Banks	179.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter supports provisions to provide and retain trees and enhance landscaping.	No specific relief sought.
Malcolm Williams	180.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes three units at three stories within established areas. The submitter opposes units of up to 5 stories citing sunlight, traffic and noise issues. The submitter supports high and Medium density in Central city and also new subdivisions.	Oppose the general residential and medium density plan.
Malcolm Williams	180.2	General	General		The submitter supports saving older older buildings and houses and this does not mean leaving the front facade of building (Hamilton Hotel). We are losing our history and identity. The submitter also supports three waters and protecting trees.	No specific relief sought.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.1	3.7 Ruakura	General		Proposed amendments to Chapter 3.7 of the District Plan are limited to largely minor changes in terminology which results in: a. 'Land Development Consent' being referred to as 'resource consent'; and b. 'Land Development Plan Areas' being referred to 'Development Areas'.	The submitter's position is neutral and no specific relief has been requested.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General		The General Residential Zone provisions proposed essentially reflect the general prescribed requirements of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) which HCC are required, as a Tier 1 territorial authority, to incorporate into the District Plan.	The submitter's position is neutral and no specific relief has been requested.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The retention of the 'Development activities' (formerly Land Development Consents) consenting approach under Rule 4.3.3.1, which applies specifically to the Ruakura (and Te Awa Lakes) Precinct, is supported.	No specific relief requested.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.8 Ruakura Residential Precinct - One Integrated Retail Development	Support	The Medium Density Residential Zone provisions for the 'Ruakura Residential Precinct', as it is now known, also retain an objective, policies and rules which specifically provide for one Integrated Retail Development in accordance with the Ruakura Structure Plan. The submitter supports these Integrated Retail Development provisions, including the proposed amendments to the associated standards in 4.3.5.8, being the revised height control plane and increased height limit of 14m.	No specific relief requested.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.8 Ruakura Residential Precinct - One Integrated Retail Development	Support	The Medium Density Residential Zone provisions for the 'Ruakura Residential Precinct', as it is now known, also retain an objective, policies and rules which specifically provide for one Integrated Retail Development in accordance with the Ruakura Structure Plan. The submitter supports these Integrated Retail Development provisions, including the proposed amendments to the associated standards in 4.3.5.8, being the revised height control plane and increased height limit of 14m.	No specific relief requested.
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.6	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The financial contributions being proposed under PC12 are more suited to "infill", or "brownfield" subdivision where a developer focuses solely on works within one property (or sometime multiple), and the funds are needed to retrofit/upgrade existing infrastructure to meet demand. With a greenfield subdivision the infrastructure and streetscape is being provided by the developer, along with the streetscape amenity as the streets are being created as part of the development.	It is sought that Council remove the requirement for financial contributions for any greenfield Development. It is sought that Council undertakes a full review of the efficiency and effectiveness of spending existing revenue before seeking new revenue streams, as there is room for improvement here. It is sought that financial contributions are not applied to CPL given the existing PDA with Council around the provision of infrastructure and contributions payable.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>Greenfield developers will be required or will design into their subdivision stormwater mitigation and treatment measures that already avoid any effects on the downstream network.</p> <p>As another example of the developer already providing for those matters for which financial contributions are being sought, for the planned Commercial Area, CPL has engaged Edwards White Architects to design the buildings and streetscape to ensure this is high quality, attractive, and provides for a high level of amenity. Beyond any Council requirements, it is in the developers’ best interests to ensure these services are provided and the streetscape amenity features are installed as this adds to the overall amenity of the subdivision.</p> <p>The aspects listed in 24.2.1 a. (i-v) that the proposal financial contributions relate to are therefore already paid for by the developer of a greenfield development. As such any further charges relating to those matters would be Council ‘double dipping’. Any double up of requirements for money from developers by Council is considered highly inappropriate.</p> <p>Additionally, Council is already receiving money from Development Contributions and through rates. However, we have seen examples of this money potentially not being well spent. Council therefore needs to look at how it is spending money and ensure this is the most efficient and effective use of the funds it is already receiving before looking at increasing revenue streams.</p> <p>Council also needs to be mindful that the return on investment will be impacted by additional charges, and this may reduce the viability of some projects.</p> <p>CPL oppose the financial contributions provisions in Chapter 24 as proposed, and specifically consider that it is not appropriate to apply Financial Contributions as proposed by PC12 to greenfield subdivisions.</p>	
Chedworth Properties Ltd - Brendon Hewett	181.7	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	<p>The new Infrastructure Capacity Overlay includes requirements for Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments under Rule 25.13.4.6; albeit it is noted that forms of these assessments apply whether a site is subject to the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay or not.</p> <p>The proposed information requirements for Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments are described in Volume 2, Appendix 1.2.2.5a, which includes ‘ii. Council confirmation of available Three Waters infrastructure capacity to appropriately service the proposal’. In relation to this particular information requirement, it is unclear how Council can provide such confirmation on infrastructure capacity in a timely and effective manner based on existing systems and resources available.</p> <p>Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments under Rule 25.13.4.6 are also proposed to be required by Council for activities as limited in scale as creating four or more additional residential units or allotments; which is not a significant development in its own right.</p> <p>Given the potential complexities around the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments, and the uncertainty created with respect to the time and cost implications for new developments, CPL’s oppose the proposed changes to Chapter 25.13 (and the associated provisions for Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments).</p>	No specific relief requested.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendment to the zoning of the mentioned property (proposed Medium Density Residential) and suggests the site meets criteria of a suburban centre. Current (Residential intensification) and proposed PC12 (MDR) zoning are not consistent with on-site activities.</p>	Rezone 245 and 247 Killarney Road from Medium Density Residential Zone to Business Zone 5.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.2	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.3	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: 1.2.2.5b, item ii, the term ‘appropriately service’ needs to be clearly defined for better interpretation to all audiences. Programme, cost and timing questions arise if there is lack of clarity regarding Three Waters infrastructure capacity.	Clarification to understand how Council will administrate this requirement. Define ‘appropriately service’.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.4	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: <i>1.2.2.5b</i> , item iii, these requirements will result in delays and inefficiencies. No outline of how an applicant can source this information.	Clarification to understand how Council proposes for an applicant to source the required information details. If Council is required to support the provision of this information, we seek confirmation that this will be provided efficiently and in a timely manner. Delete iii(c) as an assessment of possible mitigation measures is required under Section 95E and 104 of the RMA. Clarification of iii(d) as the capacity of infrastructure catchments vary significantly in size and it is unclear if this requirement will be relevant to minor proposals.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.5	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose the inclusion of consultation but suggests an amendment to include a threshold to trigger its requirement (e.g., concurrent land use and subdivision resource consent for less than 40 lots would not require consultation with Council).	Clarification to understand how Council proposes to administrate this consultation and confirmation that it will occur in an efficient and timely manner. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council. Define ‘outcomes’. - Clarification as to whether a response or resolution from Council is required before an application process.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)	182.6	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	RE: Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item vi, the submitter suggests that this is an over-complex requirement for small scale development and a threshold trigger put in place e.g., the requirements for details on the associated demands on downstream infrastructure for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds, this information could be better provided via a cumulative effects assessment.	Amend Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item vi to remove the requirements for details on ‘associated demands on downstream infrastructure’. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council.
Barker and Associates -	182.7	1.2 Information	1.2.2 Addition	Oppose	Re: Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item x, Targets and performance indicators allowing for monitoring of the proposal’s compliance should be considered on a site-by-site basis and can be managed through	Oppose Table 1.1.2.5b, item x.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (245 Killarney Road)		Requirements	al Information Requirements		conditions of consent and not be a requirement for minor development. This requirement could be replaced with a threshold trigger.	
Carla Shailer	183.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes intensification in existing suburbs. The submitter notes issues including crime, transport and infrastructure.	That Council rejects infill of 2-5 storey units in existing suburbs; and Give neighbours a voice; and Take care of green spaces and waterways.
Carla Shailer	183.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions with concern for storage, privacy, sunlight and external living space.	Make sure developers follow the plan; Do not allow 3-5 storey units on small sections; Allow for homes to have privacy, adequate storage, sunlight and an external space
Carla Shailer	183.3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions with concern for storage, privacy, sunlight and external living space.	Make sure developers follow the plan; Do not allow 3-5 storey units on small sections; Allow for homes to have privacy, adequate storage, sunlight and an external space
Carla Shailer	183.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions with concern for storage, privacy, sunlight and external living space.	Make sure developers follow the plan; Do not allow 3-5 storey units on small sections; Allow for homes to have privacy, adequate storage, sunlight and an external space
Carla Shailer	183.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter seeks external living and green spaces.	Allow homes to have a yard.
Carla Shailer	183.6	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area		The submitter seeks external living and green spaces.	Allow homes to have a yard.
Carla Shailer	183.7	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area		The submitter seeks external living and green spaces.	Allow homes to have a yard.
Carla Shailer	183.8	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All		The submitter is concerned about impacts on infrastructure from intensification in the Five Cross Roads area.	Think how infrastructure is impacted and safety of the community

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Residential Zones			
Carla Shailer	183.9	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about impacts on infrastructure from intensification in the Five Cross Roads area.	Think how infrastructure is impacted and safety of the community
Carla Shailer	183.10	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about impacts on infrastructure from intensification in the Five Cross Roads area.	Think how infrastructure is impacted and safety of the community
Graeme and Ann Sutton	184.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	With respect to the planned housing intensification, it is imperative, adequate off-street parking be a prerequisite to consents being given, for sites to be developed in this way. There are already safety issues around Eton Drive and Berkley Avenue associated with parked vehicles due to insufficient off-road parking, particularly for young children.	No specific relief stated.
Graham Shirley	185.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the desire to increase the intensity of housing in the central city, but strongly opposes the proposal to allow 3 storey building across the General Residential Zone as stated in Policies 4.2.2.2. The submitter believes the development of three storey residential dwellings in General Residential Zone will destroy the privacy and character of existing residents in the area and result in negative impacts on the property values of single dwellings in the neighbourhood. Additionally, he also highlights the issues related to noise and infrastructure, such as wastewater, which could become a real problem for the Council to resolve.</p> <p>The submitter also highlights the traffic issues resulted from 3-storey building. From his observation, the 3-storey residential building on the southern side of Five Crossroads on Peachgrove Road has resulted in traffic hazard due to residents and visitors' cars clogged the street.</p>	The submitter does not specifically offer any relief to be sought, but suggests the Council does not go ahead with the proposal to allow 3 storey buildings across the General Residential Zone.
Lynne McKeown	186.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 to enable development around the city under the view of a home-owner.</p> <p>The submitter believes that the development of multi-storey houses will result in the following adverse effects or issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Privacy - the development of 3 storey buildings next to an existing single storey home will adversely affect the privacy of residents in the area. Sunlight - the development of 3 storey buildings will block sunlight of the existing houses on either side. Car parking issues - due to the lack of car parking spaces in existing neighbourhood, many cars are parked on both sides of the street, which are broken into and also blocked the vision of cyclists. Permits for new development - houses will be built inadequately if the development of high-density houses (3x3 houses) are permitted without resource consent requirements 	The submitter seeks that their opinion will be taken into consideration, especially around issues regarding privacy, sunlight, car parking and permits for new development.
Campbell Edward Turner	187.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter makes comments against several proposed provisions within Chapter 4.2, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (4.4.1.1) The submitter notes that this area currently has no ‘high concentration and bulk of buildings’ (4.4.1.2) The submitter notes that most people do not walk ‘to the edge of the CBD’ but instead towards a more central area. 	The submitter seeks that the area bounded by River Road, Riverview Tce, Tamihana Avenue and Whitiara Bridge is rezoned as General Residential. The submitter further notes that they do not consent to their address and phone number being shared with the public as previous experience has shown there can be a backlash.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (4.4.1.3) The submitter notes that the section regarding the ‘Visitor Facilities Precinct’ bears no relationship or similarity to the area on the East side of the river which is currently totally residential. (4.4.1.4) The submitter is happy that consent will be required, but is concerned with how adequate on-site amenity (e.g. access to sun, HIRTB) and privacy will be provided for and consistent with the zone's expected built character. (4.4.1.5) The submitter comments that this provision is vague and unspecific, and questions how positive contributions are achieved in regards to quality and safety. <p>The submitter also provides several comments specifically on protecting our heritage and natural environment, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That it seems pointless to zone Gully Hazard areas and flood hazard areas beside the Waikato River as HDRZ given the significant geotechnical information requirements as well as stability issues which would compromise any large development. The existing wastewater mains beneath properties in this area would cause major infrastructure disruptions during development. That developments in the area could require major earthworks due to the area's existing topography, which may destabilize surrounding properties and lead to slips. 	
Jim Downey	188.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 and does not provide any further details to his objection.	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Dr Ann Hardy	189.1	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed due to the lack of parking requirements and the following resulting effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetscapes and the ability to move around the area by foot Cars parked on berms, yellow lines and footpaths Rutting of berms Safety issues due to cars parked on the footpath Delinquent rubbish and recycling bins impending foot traffic and creating odour issues. <p>It's an ugly, unpleasant and often smelly (the rubbish) environment that the submitter does not wish to see replicated in our intensification-permitted area under the conditions of Plan Change 12.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that Council planning staff and councillors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the appropriate amount of parking required and push-back on the Government’s requirements accordingly. Undertake research on occupier's opinions and perceptions of personal car use and other transport alternatives to determine what needs to change to push behavior towards "giving up cars and moving towards public transport". Consider both incentives for behavioral change as well as penalties/enforcement. 	<p>The submitter does not seek any specific relief to be sought, however in their submission they do note that they would like the Council’s Planning staff and the Councilors to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the appropriate amount of parking required and push-back on the Government’s requirements accordingly. Undertake research on occupier's opinions and perceptions of personal car use and other transport alternatives to determine what needs to change to push behavior towards "giving up cars and moving towards public Transport". Consider both incentives for behavioral change as well as penalties/enforcement.
Katerina Dowd	190.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not agree with the development of high-density houses in existing residential areas, including Dinsdale, Glenview, Chartwell and Hamilton East. The development of new high-rise buildings in the existing neighbourhood will result in adverse effects on privacy of residents who are living in the area (i.e., having high rise buildings looking into their backyards). High-rise buildings are also associated with parking issues. There is a need for people to have a car as they can't always rely on public transport, therefore, it is essential to consider having more car parks when building new houses.</p> <p>The submitter also highlights the issues with zoning in Hamilton, as they always change to follow government's direction. She believes that this is very unsettling for people as they don't know what to expect in each zone when purchasing a property.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If multi-storey buildings are to be developed, they should be either in the city centre or in the new subdivision areas instead of developing them in the existing residential areas. New multi-storey houses should provide car parks for residents (i.e., underground parking or having a special car park building). The zones should be set in concrete and there should be guidelines for everyone to understand what to expect in each zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Miriam Teresa Monk	191.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed plan change due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased shading from taller buildings which will impact the enjoyment of resident's backyards, their ability to maintain gardens, access to fresh air and Vitamin D, humidity (resulting in moss and mold), mental/physical/social/emotional health including long term effects such as Seasonal Affective Disorder, Depression and Stress. Lack of privacy, overlooking of neighboring properties will restrict outdoor activities and cause detrimental harmful effects. A lack of fencing will reduce safety and security within the community. Social issues will be greatly affected (noise, rubbish, parking and storage issues). Insufficient green spaces. An overall poor quality of life. 	The submitter does not seek specific relief in regard to the All Residential Zones chapter (Chapter 4.1). However, Submission Point 191.4 states a request for re-zoning in some areas.
Miriam Teresa Monk	191.2	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 for higher density housing as they believe that existing transportation issues will increase along with increased residential housing density, adversely impacting all aspects of the local area.</p> <p>These issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic including car accidents and driving across berms and footpaths to avoid queues. Parking, which is dangerous for road users and blocks traffic flow. Road noise, which is loud enough to disturb sleep affecting quality of life. 	The submitter does not seek specific relief in regard to the Transportation chapter (Chapter 25.14).
Miriam Teresa Monk	191.3	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	Chapter 24: Financial contribution to offset extra cash and harm as a result of development.	The submitter seeks that financial contributions be required for the extra demand on amenities, infrastructure, open spaces and streetscape.
Miriam Teresa Monk	191.4	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	This area not to be included in the Medium/High Density Residential Zone Maps.	The submitter seeks to keep the residential area between Hukanui Primary School and the Ambulance Station (including residences at 252 up to 260 Hukanui Road) excluded from the Medium and High Density Housing Zones. The submitter also suggests that in the long-term this strip could possibly be rezoned to a green belt to link the Hukanui Oaks and the Gully to the north and north east.
Miriam Teresa Monk	191.5	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed plan change, noting that the capacity of the existing stormwater network in their neighboring area is already struggling to cope with the current levels of runoff and rainfall, leading to regular overflow and flooding into neighboring low-lying properties (i.e. 252, 254 and 256 Hukanui Rd). The submitter also expresses concerns with land permeability and instability which they believe contribute to the subsidence of the north-east bank of the Hukanui School Gully and Stream Network.</p> <p>The submitter notes that these effects will continue alongside extreme weather events due to climate change, and will increase enormously with increased density of residential housing in the area.</p>	The submitter seeks that HCC considers locations in which to increase high density residential housing for their specific capacity to accommodate hazards such as overflow, flooding, and land stability.
Lou Anne Lowry	192.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the area bounded by River Road, Casey Avenue, Riverview Terrace, and the Boundary Road Bridge to be zoned as high density residential zone (HDRZ), due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant development constraints in the area, including flood hazard areas, Gully Hazard areas and Waikato River stability, will compromise any large development. Therefore, the submitter believes it seems pointless to designate this area as a HDRZ; There is a wastewater main under some of these properties, meaning major disruptions and expenses to the infrastructures if any development go ahead. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Lou Anne Lowry	192.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Section 4.4.1. for the purpose of the HDRZ in relation to the wider area on the east side of the river for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area currently has no 'high concentration and bulk of buildings'; Most people do not walk 'to the edge of the CBD' because they generally go to a more central area; The 'Visitor Facilities Precinct' bears no relationship or similarity to this area, which is currently residential area; No requirements have been specified in order to ensure 'adequate on-site amenity and privacy (e.g., sun and current height to boundary ratios) and consistent with the expected urban built character of the zone; and The last paragraph of the purpose section in relation to 'the importance of development integrating with and positively contributing to the quality, safety, and convenience of publicly accessible spaces' does not advance the purpose. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Jose Daniel Roman	193.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the area bounded by River Road, Casey Avenue, Riverview Terrace, and the Boundary Road Bridge to be zoned as high density residential zone (HDRZ), due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant development constraints in the area, including food hazard areas, Gully Hazard areas and Waikato River stability, will compromise any large development. Therefore, the submitter believes it seems pointless to designate this area as a HDRZ; There is a wastewater main under some of these properties, meaning major disruptions and expenses to the infrastructures if any development go ahead. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Jose Daniel Roman	193.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Section 4.4.1. for the purpose of the HDRZ in relation to the wider area on the east side of the river for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area currently has no 'high concentration and bulk of buildings'; Most people do not walk 'to the edge of the CBD' because they generally go to a more central area; The 'Visitor Facilities Precinct' bears no relationship or similarity to this area, which is currently residential area; No requirements have been specified in order to ensure 'adequate on-site amenity and privacy (e.g., sun and current height to boundary ratios) and consistent with the expected urban built character of the zone; and The last paragraph of the purpose section in relation to 'the importance of development integrating with and positively contributing to the quality, safety, and convenience of publicly accessible spaces' does not advance the purpose. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Beatriz Elvira Roman Samuel Peter Lowry	194.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the area bounded by River Road, Casey Avenue, Riverview Terrace, and the Boundary Road Bridge to be zoned as high density residential zone (HDRZ), due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant development constraints in the area, including food hazard areas, Gully Hazard areas and Waikato River stability, will compromise any large development. Therefore, the submitter believes it seems pointless to designate this area as a HDRZ; There is a wastewater main under some of these properties, meaning major disruptions and expenses to the infrastructures if any development go ahead. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Beatriz Elvira Roman Samuel Peter Lowry	194.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the area bounded by River Road, Casey Avenue, Riverview Terrace, and the Boundary Road Bridge to be zoned as high density residential zone (HDRZ), due to the following reasons:</p>	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant development constraints in the area, including food hazard areas, Gully Hazard areas and Waikato River stability, will compromise any large development. Therefore, the submitter believes it seems pointless to designate this area as a HDRZ; There is a wastewater main under some of these properties, meaning major disruptions and expenses to the infrastructures if any development go ahead. 	
Beatriz Elvira Roman Samuel Peter Lowry	194.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Section 4.4.1. for the purpose of the HDRZ in relation to the wider area on the east side of the river for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area currently has no 'high concentration and bulk of buildings'; Most people do not walk 'to the edge of the CBD' because they generally go to a more central area; The 'Visitor Facilities Precinct' bears no relationship or similarity to this area, which is currently residential area; No requirements have been specified in order to ensure 'adequate on-site amenity and privacy (e.g., sun and current height to boundary ratios) and consistent with the expected urban built character of the zone; and The last paragraph of the purpose section in relation to 'the importance of development integrating with and positively contributing to the quality, safety, and convenience of publicly accessible spaces' does not advance the purpose. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Beatriz Elvira Roman Samuel Peter Lowry	194.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Section 4.4.1. for the purpose of the HDRZ in relation to the wider area on the east side of the river for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area currently has no 'high concentration and bulk of buildings'; Most people do not walk 'to the edge of the CBD' because they generally go to a more central area; The 'Visitor Facilities Precinct' bears no relationship or similarity to this area, which is currently residential area; No requirements have been specified in order to ensure 'adequate on-site amenity and privacy (e.g., sun and current height to boundary ratios) and consistent with the expected urban built character of the zone; and The last paragraph of the purpose section in relation to 'the importance of development integrating with and positively contributing to the quality, safety, and convenience of publicly accessible spaces' does not advance the purpose. 	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Robert Poirier	195.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Chapter 2 (Strategic Framework) of PC12 as they believe that it encourages the degradation of established neighbourhoods and infrastructure.</p> <p>The submitter believes high density development allowed by PC12 will increasingly result in several issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crowded and congested conditions in neighbourhoods; Disperse urban, inner city, other crime and social problems into the suburbs, given the high number of individuals and families presently packed into inner city hotel and emergency housing where some cause daily disturbances and damage; and Degrading impacts to neighbourhoods as evidenced from the current saturation of interspersed, burgeoning Kainga Ora and private renters <p>The submitter believes PC12 will result in further densification and erosion of social and environmental standards, which will drain from the limited resources such as the Police, social service, noise control, and animal control agencies.</p> <p>The submitter also pointed out that the PC12 information sessions have not targeted all groups of community as property owners are attended as they are actively concerned with protecting their</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having well-established and enforceable bylaws and regulations to prepare for urban and suburban densification and negative social issues; A thorough review of existing and potential municipal bylaws is crucial to assess for their sufficiency, effectiveness and sustainability to afford balance against the PC12 proposal. The Council is obligated to proactively reach out to different groups of people and provide information concerning its laws, regulations and their strict enforceability to all households, including potential PC12 tenants and landlords; The Council should work in conjunction with the Police and Kainga Ora to find a mutual understanding of societal expectations, reasonable community standards and enforcement easures to counteract the results of the proposed changes, while fostering intrinsic and extrinsic common courtesy and respect the general public; Decisions should be made concerning the consequences of rubbish littering and legal dumping, parking blocks footpath due to narrow street, property boundary breaches and break-ins, graffiti, unreasonable noise and animal control measures; The Council and Police to provide reliable enforcement to laws and regulations to effectively maintain peace and order in neighbourhoods

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					investment; Conversely, potential and present tenants, investors and landlords do not likely to shown much interest as they are not overly impacted.	
Robert Poirier	195.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 4 of PC12 which allows a maximum of 3x3 housing development to be exempt from having resource consents. The submitter believe that given the current scarcity of resources and diminishing infrastructure in Hamilton (e.g., fresh and waste water, street capacities for parking, rapid growth of mandatory rubbish and recycling bins for residents), resource consents must be required for all new built in areas that cover by PC12.	The submitter seeks the relief that the Council must provide no exemptions to resource consents for all new built development resulting from PC12.
Robert Poirier	195.3	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	The submitter supports Chapter 24 of PC12 if it holds the building owners investors financially responsible for breaching city standards, laws and bylaws.	The Council must hold building owners and investors financially liable through fines and/or contingency funds, should they or their tenants breach enforceable city standards, laws and bylaws.
Robert Poirier	195.4	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes development under PC12 that are proposed without adequate resident and motor vehicle parking. The submitter believes inadequate parking will result in negative impacts, such as obstruct streets, footpaths, limited road sight and also turn adjacent neighbourhood streets, footpaths and front lawns into vehicle parking at night.</p> <p>The submitter believes that developers will take PC12 as an opportunity to develop more houses and rent them for profits, which would minimise affordability and contrary to the Central Government's purpose of imposing PC12 to promote affordable housing throughout New Zealand. They believe the increased number of rentals and tenants in the area will result in more combustion motor vehicle congestions and parking issues.</p> <p>The submitter highlights the negative impacts resulting from an increased, human and internal combustion motor vehicle congestion are not consistent with Central Government's vision and implementation of sustainable development policies outlined in the United Nations Agenda 2030 document.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council must limit escalating residential, street congestion and excessive, unsightly, obstructive parking.
Alison Jane Hamilton	196.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objectives and Policies 4.1.2.1 in the Plan Change 12 (PC12) which relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The submitter considers that the provisions for the Claudelands area were based on 15 homes per hectare instead of 55. They believe that housing intensification in Claudelands area will dramatically increase water catchment, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	The submitter seeks that the Council refuses to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA, specifically to allow the housing intensification proposed in PC12.
Alison Jane Hamilton	196.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Objectives and Policies 4.2.2.2 in the PC12 as they consider that it will enable more loss of heritage homes and adversely affect the health of residents by potentially blocking sunlight if multi-storey dwellings are to built beside a single storey house. The submitter believes high density development will result in the loss of natural light and privacy of current residents who chose to buy and live in the existing heritage, inner city suburb.</p> <p>The submitter opposes three or more storey development in Claudelands as they consider that this change will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton and adversely affect the environment into the future.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council rejects any proposal which would allow the unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Colin Stokes	197.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports the application of Te Ture Whaimana in existing and new developments.	Give consideration to any runoff from intensification areas with more building coverage.
Colin Stokes	197.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies:	Support in part	The submitter supports the intent of 4.1.2.6 but seeks stronger wording concerning woeful development outcomes.	Strengthen requirements for all two and three storey building designs must be approved by urban design panel with landscaping.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			All Residential Zones			
Colin Stokes	197.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposed recession place with concern for increased shading, light and people's wellbeing.	Maintain current plan rules relating to recession planes; or Should the proposal be implemented, seek that the 4m should be defined as being measured from the lowest side of the property boundary.
Colin Stokes	197.4	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support	The submitter supports the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato. In particular, preventing increased storm water contamination. The submitter seeks consideration of overland flow paths and the improvement of the awa.	Maintain the current proposed provisions; and Require that overland flow paths be clearly identified for three or more houses subdivision of an existing lot.
Colin Stokes	197.5	Chapter 18 Transport Corridor Zone	General	Support	The submitter supports Chapter 18 and 25.4.	No specific relief sought.
Christopher Sherratt White	198.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objectives and Policies 4.1.2.1 in the Plan Change 12 (PC12) which relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The submitter considers that the provisions for the Claudelands area were based on 15 homes per hectare instead of 55. They believe that housing intensification in Claudelands area will dramatically increase water catchment, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	The submitter seeks that the Council refuses to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA, specifically to allow the housing intensification proposed in PC12.
Christopher Sherratt White	198.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Objectives and Policies 4.2.2.2 in the PC12 as they consider that it will enable more loss of heritage homes and adversely affect the health of residents by potentially blocking sunlight if multi-storey dwellings are to built beside a single storey house. The submitter believes high density development will result in the loss of natural light and privacy of current residents who chose to buy and live in the existing heritage, inner city suburb. The submitter opposes three or more storey development in Claudelands as they consider that this change will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton and adversely affect the environment into the future.	The submitter seeks that the Council rejects any proposal which would allow the unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Rohan Fernando	199.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes making Hamilton East a High Density Zone. The submitter has concern for sunlight, noise, traffic and car parking.	Amend the High Density zoning of Hamilton East to Medium Density.
Stride Investment Management Limited - Bianca Tree and Amy Dresser	200.1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed zoning of Chartwell Shopping Centre as Business 3 - Sub-regional Centre. The submitter also supports the rezoning of the walkable catchment of Chartwell Shopping Centre to medium density.	Retain the proposed zoning of the Chartwell Shopping Centre as Business 3. Retain the proposed zoning of the walkable catchment of Chartwell Shopping Centre as Medium Density Residential.
Stride Investment Management Limited - Bianca Tree and Amy Dresser	200.2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support in part	The submitter supports amendments proposed to the Business 3 zone to give effect to the NPS-UD, including the amendments to enable residential activities above ground floor in sub-regional centres and in this zone. PC 12 does not propose to amend the height limit applying to the Business 3 zone, and proposes to retain the existing height limit of 20m. This does not give effect to the NPS-UD, and Stride considers it is necessary and appropriate to apply an increased height limit to the Chartwell Shopping Centre because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 3(b) NPS-UD requires district plans in metropolitan centre zones to enable building heights and density of urban form to reflect demand for housing and business use in these locations, and in all cases building height of at least 6 storeys. 	The submitter seeks that Rule 6.4.1 is amended to apply a 30m height limit to the Chartwell Shopping Centre, to give effect to the NPS-UD. The submitter also seeks that Rule 6.4.4 is amended to delete the maximum floor area ratio from the Business 3 zone. In addition to the specific relief sought above, the submitter seeks such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council has further undertaken its own assessment of the suitability of the centres in Hamilton City for intensification, and has identified that Chartwell is suitable for intensification. The Council has rezoned the majority of the land within a walkable catchment of Chartwell Shopping Centre to medium density. The Council does not appear to have considered whether it should enable greater building heights within Chartwell Shopping Centre as required by Policy 3(b) (or even under its assessment as a town centre status under Policy 3(d)). A greater height limit and level of density would be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services within Chartwell Shopping Centre. The receiving environment is unlikely to be affected by adverse shading or other adverse effects arising from this additional height, because the surrounding residential zone is also proposed to have an increased height limit. 	
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter oppose policy 19.2.3f to the extent that it now requires development to maintain “The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the setting of a historic heritage building or structure...shall be consistent with identified heritage”.	The submitter seeks that the policy be amended as they consider this too restrictive for new development and seeks that the term consistent be removed and replaced with compatible to allow more flexibility with design (or similar wording to the same effect): “The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the setting of a historic heritage building or structure...shall be consistent <u>compatible</u> with identified heritage”.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for any alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HAAs to require consent.	The activity status table should be amended so that such buildings do not require consent be constructed, altered, or demolished.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.4	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for development and subdivision in HHAs to be consistent with the scale, form, bulk, character and height as the identified heritage values.	The submitter seeks the following change to E1 - E Heritage Values and Special Character General (or similar wording to the same effect): b. Is consistent and compatible with the identified heritage values, including scale, design, form, character, style, bulk, height, materials and colour, and retains, protects or enhances the heritage resources and values and historic setting.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.5	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Oxford Street West HHA and seek that it is removed from this schedule. Notwithstanding this, we would also be supportive of the HHA being uplifted from 3 and 5 Oxford Street. Both 3 and 5 Oxford Street contain buildings that are of poor quality and are worthy of demolition (not protection).	The submitter opposes the Oxford Street West HHA and seek that it is removed from this schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.6	General	General	Oppose	We oppose the identification of 3 Oxford Street as a heritage building	The submitter seeks that 3 Oxford Street (H253) is removed from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (Structures, buildings and associated sites)
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	201.7	Planning Maps	General		The submitter opposes the identification of 3 Oxford Street as a heritage building and the introduction of the HHA on Oxford Street (west).	Seek that the HHA on Oxford Street (west) and Heritage Building - 3 Oxford Street (H253) be removed from the planning maps.
Dorothy Anne Dixon	202.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies:	Oppose	The plan change pays lip service to the damage being done to residential streets and the voice of the residents. The law was passed without public consultation. People should be consulted and have input into how their neighbourhood is developed. Any proposal by a developer should be submitted to residents within a 200m radius to comment on before permission is granted.	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenge the current government parties as to their rights to pass laws without public consultation; To outline in the Strategic Plan the consultation process the Council will undertake with residents; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			All Residential Zones			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To outline the obligations of developers to ensure the erection of new dwellings will fit the existing height environment of the street with the least disturbance to geography (including hillside degradation, lifestyle and value of residents, health and safety including dust and parking).
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The Rototuna North East area has been rezoned from the Rototuna North East Special Character Zone to General Residential Zone and Rototuna North East Residential Precinct.	Rezone the area from Rototuna North East Character Zone to Rototuna North East Residential Precinct.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.2	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the infrastructure capacity overlay and flags the S32 report - Appendix 2.5 Infrastructure Capacity Provisions as inadequate. The site (247-253 and 263-269 Horsham Downs Road, Rototuna North) should not be included in the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay as it should be regarded as a greenfield area as the above appendix regards 'Greenfield areas are excluded from the overlay, as the current subdivision and development process enables capacity issues to be addressed through consent processes'. There is inconsistency between the technical assessments provided in relation to demand and capacity in the Infrastructure Capacity Provisions, Capacity Modelling, and Three Waters Performance Assessment Report.	<p>Delete the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.</p> <p>Remove the Rototuna North East area from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.</p>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports the overall purpose of Chapter 4 – Residential Zones to create a compact City and deliver higher density development.	No specific relief requested.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Support	The submitter supports the addition of this notification assessment.	Retain Rule 4.2.4
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Support	The submitter supports the addition of this notification assessment.	Retain Rule 4.3.3.2.
Barker and Associates -	203.6	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.6.12 Subdivisi	Support in part	Rule 23.6.12(a), which references the maximum development yield for Rototuna North East, has been deleted which aligns with the NPS-UD.	Delete Rule 23.6.12(a).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)			on in the Rototuna North East Residential Precinct			
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.7	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications e.g., greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications e.g., greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.8	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: <i>1.2.2.5b</i> , item ii, the term ‘appropriately service’ needs to be clearly defined for better interpretation to all audiences. Programme, cost and timing questions arise if there is lack of clarity regarding Three Waters infrastructure capacity.	Clarification to understand how Council will administrate this requirement. Define ‘appropriately service’.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.9	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The requirements of table <i>1.2.2.5b</i> , item (iii) will likely cause delays and inefficiencies as there is no outline on how applicants can source this information.	Clarification to understand how Council proposes for an applicant to source the required information details. If Council is required to support the provision of this information, we seek confirmation that this will be provided efficiently and in a timely manner. Delete iii(c) as an assessment of possible mitigation measures is required under Section 95E and 104 of the RMA. Clarification of iii(d) as the capacity of infrastructure catchments vary significantly in size and it is unclear if this requirement will be relevant to minor proposals.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.10	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose item iv in Table 1.2.2.5b, the inclusion of consultation but suggests an amendment to include a threshold to trigger its requirement (e.g., concurrent land use and subdivision resource consent for less than 40 lots would not require consultation with Council).	Clarification to understand how Council proposes to administrate this consultation and confirmation that it will occur in an efficient and timely manner. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council. Define ‘outcomes’. Clarification as to whether a response or resolution from Council is required before an application process.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited	203.11	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	RE: Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item vi, the submitter suggests that this is an over-complex requirement for small scale development and a threshold trigger put in place e.g., the requirements for details on the associated demands on downstream infrastructure for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds, this information could be better provided via a cumulative effects assessment.	Define ‘ <i>down stream infrastructure</i> ’. Amend Table 1.1.2.5b, item vi to remove the requirements for details on ‘ <i>associated demands on downstream infrastructure</i> ’. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
(Rototuna North East)						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.12	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item x, Targets and performance indicators allowing for monitoring of the proposal's compliance should be considered on a site-by-site basis and can be managed through conditions of consent and not be a requirement for minor development. This requirement could be replaced with a threshold trigger.	Oppose Table <i>1.1.2.5b</i> , item x.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.13	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	Rule <i>25.14.4.2.v(ii)</i> and <i>25.14.4.2.w</i> both refer to Figure <i>15.1aa</i> in Volume 2, Appendix 15-1, however, this cannot be found.	Clarification as to which figure in the District Plan is Figure <i>15.1aa</i> .
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Pragma Holdings Limited (Rototuna North East)	203.14	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter requires clarity regarding Rule 25.14.4.2b to understand the level of charging facility required to be provided and the administration for in shared parking scenarios. Clarity is needed regarding electricity costs, usage accountability, and possible electric vehicle ownership. The submitter does not believe the current wording is implementable or practical.	Amend Rule 25.14.4.2b to provide options for different typologies. For example, an apartment building with shared access and/or parking facilities could alternatively provide 1 electric charging point for every 2 parking spaces. Further clarification with regard to this rule is sought.
Anna Whitmore	204.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.2 Home-based Businesses	Oppose	The submitter does not consider the limit on heavy motor vehicles on home-businesses appropriate.	No specific relief sought.
Anna Whitmore	204.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter notes the restriction of play equipment visible from a public place.	Amend rule to allow for freedom for non-offensive play equipment on properties; Require neighbours consent for such businesses.
Anna Whitmore	204.3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	The submitter notes the requirement for front glazing and considers that not everyone likes this level of glazing and sometimes large windows are not the best for light/room layout.	Common sense and good design can prevail.
Anna Whitmore	204.4	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and	Oppose	The submitter does not think having trees in parking spaces is practical and that the rule lacks common sense.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Vehicle Parking			
Anna Whitmore	204.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.9 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of a SNA in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)	Oppose	The submitter notes the pruning standards in 4.3.5.9 as short-sighted with concern for fruit trees and diseased trees.	Clarification of tree trimming.
Anna Whitmore	204.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The submitter the lack of requirement for on-site garaging short-sighted.	Require on-site garaging.
Anna Whitmore	204.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter notes a heritage area in Forest Lake.	Clarification on what is a heritage area, so that only heritage homes are included.
Anna Whitmore	204.10	General	General		The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions will result in section sizes that are too small; that 6 storey buildings are too high and will result in loss of sunlight and privacy; that children will not learn how to have a vegetable garden or play outside; and that fence heights at 1.2m is unsafe for children and pets.	No specific relief sought.
Simon and Michelle Lawrence and Challies	205.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter seeks amendments to policy 4.3.2.1 (f) that avoid repetitive designs, and provide attractive plantings.	Amend policy 4.3.2.1(f) so that dwellings must be varied in style within a section and neighboring sections such that they don't look repetitive and slum-like. And amend so that dwellings must maintain the character of the neighborhood. And amend so that developments require plenty of attractive plantings to alleviate the stark building to land ratio.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Simon and Michelle Lawrence and Challies	205.2	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development		The submitter supports in part rule 24.4.2b.ii and considers the proposed financial contributions insufficient, seeking contributions to police, schools, gully restoration and green space.	Seek greater financial contributions per PUD to develop increased community amenities.
Simon and Michelle Lawrence and Challies	205.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General		The submitter seeks a rezoning of Carlyle Ave from Medium Density. The submitter notes that the street is greater than 400m from Chartwell with a gully running behind that requires private care.	Policy 2.2.14c to exclude the whole of Carlyle Ave from the medium density residential zone.
David -	206.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	We oppose the zoning of our neighborhood, the East side of Taniwha Street, and also all of Avon Street, Wye Street and Torrington Avenue as a High Density Residential Zone under the Hamilton City Council's proposed Plan Change 12 as it will totally destroy the character, history and existing community of that area and seriously impact both the natural environment and the well-being of people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That Existing Use Rights are established in the District Plan for residents in all proposed residential zones to ensure greater clarity to retain use and activities. That their neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the East side of Taniwha Street) is removed from the High Density Residential Zone, and not zoned as Medium Density Residential either. That their neighborhood is zoned Historic Heritage or General Residential. That Council consider the merit of the suggestions above regarding the zoning of King Street, Devon Street, Somerset Street and Commerce Street.
David -	206.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density	Oppose	<p>Oppose 4.4.5.1 density and 4.4.5.2 (a) building coverage 60%</p> <p>Oppose removal of houses, mature trees and vegetation and the de-greening of our neighbourhood as sections disappear under greater areas of housing, concrete and decks would not only impact on the natural environment but also on the well-being of those living in the area.</p>	<p>We request Existing Use Rights as a rule in the District Plan for residents in all proposed residential zones dating from 01 December 2021 to ensure greater clarify to retain use and activities.</p> <p>We request that our neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the East side of Taniwha Street) BE REMOVED from the High Density Residential Zone in Plan Change 12.</p> <p>That the same neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the east side of Taniwha Street) would NOT be zoned Medium Density either as 5 storeys are almost as tall as 6.</p> <p>That this neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the East side of Taniwha Street) be zoned Historic Heritage or General Residential.</p> <p>That Council consider our suggestions at the end of Section 2 and see if they have any merit, both in relation to High Density Residential Housing and Frankton History</p>
David -	206.3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	We oppose the reduction of permeable surfaces to as little as 20% due to increased stormwater flow, erosion of streams and polluting of water bodies.	None specifically relating to permeable surfaces.
David -	206.4	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping		We oppose that there could be as little as 10% of the total site landscaped with grass or plants and can include the canopy of a tree regardless of the ground treatment below them. Oppose that only one tree per site, with an additional tree for every 150m2, is all that is required for terraces/apartments. The landscaping that would result would be pitiful in comparison to trees, gardens and lawns that it would be replacing thus having a negative effect on the environment and well-being of people.	No specific relief sought in relation to landscaping.
David -	206.5	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	Opposed to split building heights on the opposite sides of Taniwha Street, opposed to 6 storeys/21 metre building heights due to lack of sunlight, loss of privacy, construction noise, loss of home value, infrastructure capacity, street parking loss, noise and light pollution from apartments.	<p>We request Existing Use Rights as a rule in the District Plan for residents in all proposed residential zones dating from 01 December 2021 to ensure greater clarify to retain use and activities.</p> <p>We request that our neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the East side of Taniwha Street) BE REMOVED from the High Density Residential Zone in Plan Change 12.</p> <p>That the same neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the east side of Taniwha Street) would NOT be zoned Medium Density either as 5 storeys are almost as tall as 6.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p>That this neighborhood (Avon Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue and the East side of Taniwha Street) be zoned Historic Heritage or General Residential.</p> <p>That Council consider our suggestions at the end of Section 2 and see if they have any merit, both in relation to High Density Residential Housing and Frankton History</p>
David -	206.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	Oppose building of 6 storey/21 metre buildings so close to the gully and the proposed Significant Natural Area. Will have a serious impact on the wildlife and natural environment, disrupting habitat, nesting places and flight paths.	The submitter does not seek any specific relief on this concern beyond what is already captured in Point 206.1 above.
David -	206.7	General	General		There has been a lack of communication and consultation from HCC with residents and home owners. Most of our neighbours were not aware of the extent or impact of the planned changes.	No specific relief sought on consultation.
David -	206.8	General	General		Suggest areas such as King St, Devon St, Somerset Street be zoned for high density housing above businesses (except for the First Presbyterian Church and Good George). Commerce Street from Kent St to High St should be preserved.	Suggest areas such as King St, Devon St, Somerset Street be zoned for high density housing above businesses (except for the First Presbyterian Church and Good George). Commerce Street from Kent St to High St should be preserved.
Laura Liane Kellaway	207.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change 12 (PC12) regarding the proposed housing intensification. The submitter highlights the importance of respecting the past and present of neighbourhoods in new proposals for intensification in residential areas. She believes that the potential impacts of the PC12 will likely include ongoing demolition and removal of existing houses in some Hamilton's residential suburbs (i.e., eastern and northern suburbs) to enable construction of new dwellings.</p> <p>The submitter highlights the concerns that have not been addressed in the PC12 in relation to the character values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term 'character' used in PC12 is not backed up with details of what the specific characters of existing neighbourhoods are or associated controls to retain these characters The removal of character zones and rules is not adequately explained in PC12. If the proposed historic heritage areas do not proceed, there is no protection for the existing extents of character areas and proposed historic areas. 	<p>The submitter seeks an integrated master plan to be proposed to look cohesively at Hamilton across all zones. The submitter suggests that new development should base on its existing neighbourhood and in new areas that can be developed without the need for demolition of existing buildings or poor infill.</p> <p>The submitter also seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neighbourhood urban character areas are planned before any significant intensification take place; and Retention of provisions for character areas, but amend it as an overlay.
Laura Liane Kellaway	207.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change 12 as there is a lack of provisions that support good quality environment for development to maintain strong neighbourhoods. The submitter believes that the Plan Change has been poorly consulted on and not provided for all levels of the community, which will result in long-term consequences. They highlighted that the potential impacts on neighbourhoods are insufficiently addressed, in which provisions for the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) are a blunt standardised tool that have not carefully considered good quality design standards. In particular, the submitter stated the following issues that are not adequately addressed in chapters of the Plan Change 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Universal application of the MDRZ within the city is inappropriate and will likely have significant impacts on existing communities; The purpose of the MDRZ to enable 'backyard infill' development will limit the development of higher quality intensification; New provisions for multi-storey buildings adjacent to a single storey houses in MDRZ or High Density Residential Area will result in issues regarding privacy, shading, lack of sunlight and wind, and low quality living environment; <p>From the submitter's perspective, the issues are much more complex and require carefully consideration with local communities. They believe that it is difficult to work through what the actual housing shortage is and whether new development will improve housing supply in the long term considering the unaffordable housing issues. The submitter also pointed out that 'urban renewal and intensification' has not necessarily been the solution in the past, but displaced the existing communities. They believe that redevelopment has resulted in the loss of existing</p>	No specific relief for the MDRZ has been sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					neighbourhoods and structures that support people, however, the significant neighbourhood impact on people has not been addressed in the Plan Change 12.	
Laura Liane Kellaway	207.3	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed High Density Residential Zone over Frankton East block which includes Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Taniwha Street, Norton Road to Wha Street, which is situated between an Industrial area (marked in yellow) and the Central City one to the east (shown in pink) in the Planning Maps. The submitter believes the proposal will destroy almost old residential areas in Frankton East, apart from those that may be made historic heritage areas.</p> <p>In their opinion, this proposal will adversely affect parts of Frankton, take away sense of place as well as the past and present and will not provide for the future. The submitter believes this proposal will result in issues related to construction, noise, dust, overshadowing and environmental issues in the long-term.</p> <p>The submitter states that while the centre city is nearby, Frankton is not walkable to many of the key facilities and had decades of underinvestment. They noticed several changes in the neighbourhood in the last 50 years, including the clearance for the industrial estate of Hamilton, overbridge bypass and then for the Mill Street main East to West bypass. However, there were no gains or benefits for the neighbourhood resulting from these changes, just rearrangements of park facilities and four lanes going through the centre of our suburb.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more appropriate review of the existing neighbourhood and how new housing is incorporated while retaining its existing characters A lower density for Frankton East neighbourhood which recognises the existing community and character including historic heritage and a height limit in this zone. Mixed use zoning throughout the city including residential in industrial and areas that are being left as industries move to the far north and east
Laura Liane Kellaway	207.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the 3x3 housing development in the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) under the PC12. The submitter believes this proposal is not a good solution for Hamilton nor inclusive of neighbourhoods and the land that is not vacant. They pointed out that this proposal can result in the loss of parking and removal of good design criteria, which can further result in generational impacts.</p> <p>In the submitter's perspective, the current plan change will remove controls that allow neighbourhoods to be thrived, have quality spaces and community consultation. They believe there are spaces within the city centre that can accommodate these changes and take good quality developments, instead of Frankton.</p> <p>The submitter highlights several concerns in relation to general housing intensification that have not been addressed in the PC12 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no area developed based on the concept of neighbourhood urban character, which identified in the objectives of the new residential zones; Existing non-statutory community plans for Frankton and Hamilton East have been ignored; There are no new design guidelines provided in PC12; The selection of existing established neighbourhoods for clearance to accommodate high-density development has been poorly communicated to the community. 	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stronger design rules that include good design outcomes and include privacy, sun, warm living Provisions of more accessible units across all residential types including the 3x3 development, as 24% of the population in 2020 is in this category; outdoor spaces, control of over shadowing, and provide uality, within the Urban Design and Residential Chapters. Including objectives and policies on how existing neighbourhoods are to be protected from ongoing cumulative effects; Providing a rule for cumulative assessment of impacts on streets and neighbourhoods when more than 10% of the properties are in 3x3 development;
Laura Liane Kellaway	207.5	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes PC12 because the existing amenity values required under section 7 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) are not protected in PC12 for residential area. They also highlight that PC12 does not address or control adverse effects (i.e, noise, dust, construction and life quality) of proposed development on existing neighbourhood.</p> <p>The submitter also highlights that the sustainable management in Part 2 of the RMA has not been addressed. The submitter believes the removal and demolition of existing houses that are in good condition to accommodate high density development is not a sustainable practice.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of amenity values under s7 of the RMA, and address adverse effects of the proposed clearance of the suburb. Sustainable management (Part 2 of the RMA) of existing residential areas. Intensification occurs in central city and vacant areas first. Neighbourhood plans are in place prior to intensification. Correction of details within the section 32 report - North of City Area plan. The plan should be amended to 'East of Norton Road' as Frankton East, and as part of Frankton suburban area. Integration of geology factors (eg gullies, earthquake faults) and how this effect future urban design Rules which allow council to pre-plan appropriate neighborhood streets (e.g. with trees and parking bays) - preferably before 10% intensification.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rules to protect dripline of existing trees from concrete cover.
Laura Liane Kellaway	207. 6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the intensification in principle of apartments in the inner central city (commercial area),but seeks further changes to PC12.	<p>The submitter seeks the following relief:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rules for providing quality living environment; Retaining existing trees including both exotic and native trees, but limit their height to 6 m; Mixed-use zones in non-residential areas that are close to transport and facilities; and A community-based approach to planning changes within the city. An integrated masterplan across all areas.
Laura Liane Kellaway	207. 7	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned with provisions of the HDZ and in particular notes that shading, lack of sunlight and wind will be issues. The submitted notes that there is no height limit in the HDZ. The submitter considers that the selection of areas for HDZ has been poorly communicated and that there is no evidence that the proposal is acceptable and will be well controlled.	<p>The submitter seeks that rules are included in the HDZ as they relate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wind Privacy, access to sun and good ventilation Height <p>The submitter seeks existing use rights for residents in the HDZ to allow activities which are permitted under the Operative District Plan at 01 July 2022 to continue.</p>
Laura Liane Kellaway	207. 8	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that there are no rules within the Urban Design chapter that support good urban design practice.	The submitter seeks stronger urban design rules and urban design rules and standards that require review by the Urban Design Panel for all residential units (not only those with 4 or more units).
Summerset Group Holdings Limited - Oliver Boyd	208. 1	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the submission made by Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand. In particular, the submitter supports the inclusion of changes that are provided by the MDRS.	The submitter requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's housing intensification plan change.
Renee and Tim Beere	209. 1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter notes the protection of the Claudelands Special Character area, while allowing some new developments. Infill in character areas should be of suitable cladding, design and off street parking.	<p>Retain Claudelands as a Special Character Area; and</p> <p>Allow for development within the current rules.</p>
Renee and Tim Beere	209. 2	General	General		The submitter seeks higher density living in the inner parts of the city, that protect heritage facades, provide reasonable living space or mid to high range that have water retention methods.	Give developers encouragement to refurbish buildings already available in the city, retaining the historical characters; and Encourage developers and builders by discounted development fees when they meet water conservation requirements.
Renee and Tim Beere	209. 3	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter seeks changes to the traffic patters on the central city , consideration for car parking, promotion of city living and alternative transport modes.	The submitter seeks changes to the traffic patters on the central city , consideration for car parking, promotion of city living and alternative transport modes.
Hendrik Van Blerk	210. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the creation of a Medium Density Residential Zone, however, seeks clarification on how the extent was determined. Several properties on Horsham Downs Road are considered to exhibit the conditions for Medium Density zoning including walking distance to local business centres and public transport.	<p>That the extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone be extended to include 112, 114 and 118 Horsham Downs Road. Refer to the map attached to their submission; and</p> <p>Any other relief to give effect to this submission.</p>
Peter Boyle	211. 1	General	General		The submitter is concerned that the Plan Change does not recognise and provide for the character and amenity of the area currently zoned Hamilton East Residential Intensification Area. The submitter considers 6 storey buildings inappropriate for this area.	Reject Plan Change 12.
Zicong (Michael) Chen	212. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the creation Medium Density Residential Zone, however, challenges the spatial extent of its application along Horsham Downs Road and the methodology applied.	The submitter seeks the extension of the Medium Density Residential Zone to include 112, 114 and 118 Horsham Downs Road.
Scott Bicknell	213. 1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 24 Te Aroha Street within the General Residential Zone and Historic Heritage Area. The submitter provides an assessment of the Historic Heritage Area that seeks removal of the HHA.	<p>Remove 24 Te Aroha Street from the General Residential Zone and rezone the site to include it in the High Density Residential Zone; and</p> <p>Removed the Myrtle Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Scott Bicknell	213. 2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks to have 24 Te Aroha Street included in the High Density Residential Zone, removed the Myrtle Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area and removed from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	Remove the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay from the Myrtle Street area.
Steve Atkins	214. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers their a lack of mandate to peruse residential intensification, and an increase in the population of Hamilton to have negative effects.	Hamilton City Council should seek a mandate from it's people to increase/decrease or stabilise the city's population.
Steve Atkins	214. 2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the adverse effects from intensification unacceptable and leads to narcissistic treatment of property owners.	No specific relief sought.
Steve Atkins	214. 3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping		The submitter has concern for trees that impact on neighbouring properties including shade and property damage.	Amend the rule to avoid negative impacts on neighbours as stated. Rules need to be included stating; 1. Trees are to be kept at the owners expense and that if they overhang boundaries or negatively impact on other properties such as shading solar panels, they must remedy the situation at the neighbours request. 2. A tree owner must be liable for any damage caused to a neighbouring property, including such things as root damage to driveways and underground infrastructure, and above ground damage.
Matthew Iremonger	215. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter has concern for the loss of heritage in the Claudelands area. In addition, they have concern for the loss of sunlight, impacts on wellbeing and infrastructure from intensification.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments.
Matthew Iremonger	215. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter has concern for the infrastructure capacity of the Claudelands area and the impact intensification will have on water catchments and the Waikato River.	Refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitters recognises and generally support the policies and rules of Chapter 19 - Historic Heritage as the changes in PC12 strengthen provisions introduced in PC9 for example lot sizes, building setbacks and other specific rules and activities classes are now more appropriate to protect historic heritage. Protection from the General Residential intensification aspects of the plan is certainly warranted and supported.	Supports the amendments to Chapter 19 - Historic Heritage.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter notes that there is provision for medium and high-intensive development near the central city and near Claudelands, while this will impact the Claudelands HHA to some degree due to parking and infrastructure they do not oppose intensification next to the HHA.	Supports the intensification next to the Claudelands HHA but notes potential parking and infrastructure issues.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter notes that Claudelands West has a 'village' character from its intact historic elements include bungalows and transitional villas built in the 1910s-early 1940s, most on single-titled separate 'sections. Previous work of local residents to retain the special character that these buildings provide, and to protect such buildings and the neighbourhood, through the introduction of the Claudelands West Special Character Zone. Although the area's pre-1940 housing stock includes examples of stucco (Spanish Mission) construction and several historic houses made of brick, the vast majority are constructed from native timbers. Claudelands West's pre-1940s wooden houses include villas, transitional villas and bungalows of both the English and Californian types as well as local variants.	Seeks amendments to introduce protections for pre-1939 buildings in the HHA with rules such as limitations on removal, demolition, and re-positioning of pre 1939 buildings.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter notes that as recognised in HCC's description Claudelands West includes blocks of flats built in the 1970s. While some of these blocks are on separate sections, others have been in-filled behind a character bungalow. The building of flats brought about considerable intensification of land use. Further in-filling or construction of apartments would be detrimental to the heritage	Supports the activity rules such as making apartments NC, and the limits on lot sizes. These are consistent with earlier protections in the area (under Special Character provisions of the DP before PC9). Hence, the provisions of PC12 will be consistent with has previously been accepted in the area (that is, established precedents).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					nature of the area, so that further in-filling and construction degradation must be guarded against with strong planning provisions.	
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density	Support	The submitter notes that as recognised in HCC's description Claudelands West includes blocks of flats built in the 1970s. While some of these blocks are on separate sections, others have been in-filled behind a character bungalow. The building of flats brought about considerable intensification of land use. Further in-filling or construction of apartments would be detrimental to the heritage nature of the area, so that further in-filling and construction degradation must be guarded against with strong planning provisions.	Supports the activity rules such as making apartments NC, and the limits on lot sizes. These are consistent with earlier protections in the area (under Special Character provisions of the DP before PC9). Hence, the provisions of PC12 will be consistent with has previously been accepted in the area (that is, established precedents).
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks	Support	<p>The submitter agrees with Council's assessment in Chapter 5.1.1.1 b. and c. that:</p> <p>“The Historic Heritage of Claudelands West can be maintained in several ways. The low-density housing pattern is an important element, as is ensuring that any new buildings are compatible with houses constructed before 1939. This means height, scale and bulk similar to the existing built form. The front yard and the streetscape are important and can be maintained by buildings set back from the road and low front fences. This ensures that the building line is preserved and there are opportunities for front-yard gardens and tree planting.”</p> <p>“The front yard and the streetscape are important and can be maintained by buildings set back from the road and low front fences. This ensures that the building line is preserved and there are opportunities for front-yard gardens and tree planting.”</p>	Supports the setback and fencing provisions for Historic Heritage Areas.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott Adam Archer 286 River Road	216. 7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that building separation between new and existing buildings (especially pre-1939 buildings) in the HHA so development is consistent with the historical context.	Seeks consideration is given to separation between new and existing buildings (especially pre-1939 buildings) within the HHA.
David -	217. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	Oppose houses up to three stories and 11 metres high next to existing single storey homes in the General Residential Zone. Opposed to no resource consent or neighbour consultation requirements.	That at the very least developers must consult with neighbours when wanting to build 3 storey buildings and get the neighbours written permission before commencing work.
Niall Baker	218. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the introduction of MDRS within residential zones for reasons relating to amenity, lack of nuance, non-notification of compliant developments and the risk of creating slum developments.	Advocate in opposition to the government direction.
Niall Baker	218. 2	General	General		The submitters seeks clarification as to which provisions have immediate legal effect and the applicability of qualifying matters.	Annotate the plan to identify immediate legal effect status and applicability of any ‘qualifying matters’.
Niall Baker	218. 3	General	General		The submitter seeks improvement to the plan structure and layout for readability and ease of reference. For example matters of discretion could be placed within each chapter.	Plan structure and layout to be revised for improved readability.
Niall Baker	218. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter seeks modelling to be undertaken and to provide illustrations of what is proposed and the impact in each Residential zone type to assist with public understanding of the Plan Change.	Provide illustrations of proposed building typologies and graphics
Niall Baker	218. 5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Policy 4.1.2.3d should not provide for developments not meeting permitted activity Status, and instead promote and encourage activities to meet permitted activity standards.	Delete Policy 4.1.2.3d
Niall Baker	218. 6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	Objective 4.1.2.6 refers to providing a level of amenity consistent with the planned urban environment. This also needs to refer to the existing and planned urban environment, to recognise that urban environments consistent of existing dwellings that were constructed prior to Plan Change 12 and that do not always reflect the densities now provided for or desired. It is also consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, to sustainability manage resources (including physical resources, being existing buildings).	Amend the policy to refer to existing and planned urban environment.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Niall Baker	218.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Oppose	The submitter considers ancillary structures to have potential effects on adjoining properties and should be subject to a consent process and assessment criteria.	Provide for Ancillary residential structures as Restricted Discretionary activity.
Niall Baker	218.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	Seeks clarification on whether building heights include aerials, satellite dishes and similar structures.	No specific relief requested
Niall Baker	218.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Oppose	Notification to affected neighbours is important and consistent with the intent of the RMA to provide for public input into resource management decision making. Infringements to the relevant standards (even at 10%) can have significant amenity impacts for adjoining properties. For large scale developments that trigger public notification tests under the RMA due to the level of potential effects or any relevant matters, these should be subject of public notification.	Apply Schedule 3A of the Amendment Act and confine rule 4.2.4 to only what is required by legislation Remove provision for non-notification or allowance for limited or public notification to be precluded, unless required by the Amendment Act, where the adjoining neighbour has provided written approval Remove the provision for proceeding without public or limited notification.
Niall Baker	218.10	General	General		The submitter seeks explicit protection of existing use rights in the plan.	Existing use rights should be explicitly provided in the plan.
Niall Baker	218.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Oppose	The submitter seeks the requirements for design solutions that maintain and enhance amenity values. There is importance of window design and sill heights to mitigate overlooking onto neighbouring properties.	The Plan should require design solutions, for example if a habitable room window overlooks habitable windows of neighbours adjoining property or another unit within a townhouse/multi occupancy development. This includes: 1. Designing for: a 1700 high sill height 2. requiring any portion of the glazing below 1700 sill height as obscure/frosted glass with 25% transparency 3. requiring provision of a screen to 1700 height from floor level with 25% permeability 4. requiring provision of awning windows with obscure glazing and openable to maximum 125 mm Similar rules should also be applied to balconies where they overlook neighbour properties, to prevent downward views
Niall Baker	218.12	General	General		The submitter seeks additional standards to maintain privacy and amenity.	Introduce additional standards for new residential units, including the following: a) Introduce Urban design standards, rules and require review by the Urban Design Panel for all residential developments (not only those with 4 or more units) b) Incorporate Urban design rules (not just design guidelines) into the Urban Design Chapter 25, to ensure good urban design outcomes. c) Require balconies to face the street, or internal spaces rather than towards neighbouring properties. If this cannot be achieved, require balconies and roof terraces to include privacy screening to limit views onto adjacent sites. d) Avoid locating the main living room windows directly across the side boundary where they will provide views into the indoor or outdoor living areas of the adjacent house or site. e) Require locating courtyards next to blank walls or service areas like garages of the adjacent house, in order to maintain privacy, to the extent possible. f) The location of upstairs windows and decks should look down into the private outdoor space to the front or rear of their own property, not over the side boundary. Views over the neighbours’ private outdoor space should be screened as far as practicable. g) Require planting as screening between neighbouring houses. h) The plan should require the selection and location of trees to be planned and integrated part of the development, considering summer shade and winter sun, as well as the shadow they will cast when fully grown. Try to avoid shading over the boundary.
Niall Baker	218.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	Provide planning controls that apply to HHAs for scheduled sites of historic significance (Schedule 8A) and Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Schedule 8B). Consistent with the qualifying matters under the RMAA and Part 2 RMA. Currently Chapter 19 provisions for building heights, height in relation to boundary, setbacks etc only apply to Historic Heritage Areas. This needs to be extended to the other schedules, as above.	Apply all rules 19.4.2, 19.4.3, 19.4.4, 19.4.5, 19.4.6 and 19.4.7 to historic heritage areas, Schedule 8A and Schedule 8B.
Niall Baker	218.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	Rules 19.3.3m, n, o, and p are opposed because an artificial distinction between front, corner and through site and rear site is not supported.	Rules should be made the same for duplex dwellings - Rule should be Non complying activity status for all duplexes.
Niall Baker	218.20	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports general residential zoning of Fairview Downs. Residential Zoning type being the most consistent with current and historical built patterns and level of development.	No specific relief sought.
Barker and Associates -	219.1	Planning Maps	General		The submitter seeks that the current Open Space zoning as it relates to 51A Rifle Range Road be re-zoned to General Residential Zoning. The site is consented to accommodate a 24-unit managed	Re-zone the site/Open Space/51A Rifle Range Road to General Residential Zone to enable residential development (as already partially consented) through PC12.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sanjil Mistry Pragma Property Group -51A Rifle Range Rd					care facility with a café and is already partially developed. Enabling residential use on the site is a more efficient use of land and would give effect to the NPS-UD. The existing dwelling is in the process of being demolished and is surrounded by residential development within walkable catchments to City and suburban centres. The site is well located for residential use and is in close proximity to key community facilities and a change of zoning will not be a loss to the City.	
Kristine Hayward	220. 1	General	General	Oppose	Opposes the intensification of low cost Kainga Ora housing as they believe they will develop into slum-like conditions with an increased gang presence, compromising safety and increasing stress for existing residents. The submitter expresses concern that the Bader St / Melville suburb is one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in Kirikiriroa which has reached a saturation point of low social economic housing construction.	The submitter seeks that consideration is given to progressive home ownership in the Melville area. The submitter also suggests the establishment of a purpose-built community which provides an abundance of parks/open space for the every day needs of residents within walking distance from their homes.
Diane Quinn	221. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter has concern regarding 3 to 5 storey residential units in residential areas. Hamilton needs to be both visually attractive, and support the well being of its residents. The submitter seeks preservation of the city's history.	Reconsider the infill approach to buildings more than 2 storeys high; and Research successful models of high rise communities; and Reject this plan.
Xiaodan Hao	222. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the rationale for Medium Density Zoning and considers the rationale of the Centres Assessment Report and medium density zoning should also apply to 112, 114 and 118 Horsham Downs Road.	Re-zone properties at 112, 114 and 118 Horsham Downs Road from General Residential to Medium Density Residential Zone. Alternatively, any other relief to give effect to the submission.
Wendy Hampton	223. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes intensification of four or more storeys in the suburbs surrounding the central city. The submitter has concerns for social problems, rubbish, quality of life, loss of trees and green space, and the destruction of existing house materials.	Require developers to dismantle or relocate existing buildings. Mitigate the government directives. Require greater financial contribution from developers to improve community green spaces, and streetscapes.
Aaron Paul Beveridge	224. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the impacts of intensification on the neighbourhoods in the Gillies Ave, East Street and Young Street areas, with concern for loss of character, privacy, sunlight and house prices. In addition, the submitter has concern for infrastructure capacity, impacts of increased traffic on congestion and walking, cycling and scootering.	CONsider a heritage zone in the Gillies Ave, East Street, Young Street, Brooklyn Road area to preserve the character, heritage and environment of the area.
Aaron Paul Beveridge	224. 2	General	General		The submitter is concerned about the environmental impact of population increases such as damage to the Waikato River, preservation of the last remaining native bush at Claudelands Park, and the removal of mature trees.	Preserve the environment of the area.
Jean Mary Dorrell	225. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter considers all of Fairfield to be appropriate for Medium Density zoning as it is within walking and cycling distance to the CBD, has local shops and reasonable public transport. The submitter agrees that medium density residential development should be located within and close to suburban centres, tertiary education facilities and hospital, and in areas serviced by passenger transport.	That all of Fairfield (from Five Cross Roads to the east side of the Waikato River) be included within the medium-density residential zone
Jean Mary Dorrell	225. 2	General	General		The submitter considers infrastructure improvements are required in older areas of the City as well at new areas.	That all parts of Hamilton need wide paths, cycleways, stormwater drains.
Jean Mary Dorrell	225. 3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter does not consider the heritage areas to have been assessed competently and considers that qualifying matters need to be legitimate, not an attempt to stop intensification.	Only have valid historic heritage areas. Hire a competent heritage expert and get an independent peer review prior to public notification.
Jean Mary Dorrell	225. 4	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.2 In addition to these general purposes, more specific purposes are identified	Support	The submitter supports developers or homeowners paying for the costs of meeting infrastructure needs created due to development.	24.2 (and subsections) should be added to the operative district plan.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			d in the Financial Contributions Rules section of this Chapter.			
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter is supportive of the approach proposed through PC12. In particular the submitter supports an evidence- and research-based approach which considers the impacts on the environment and the Waikato River; the consideration of the infrastructure that will be required to support intensification and the concept of eco-density. Also supported is the removal of building height limits in the central city which is supported by smaller section sizes in centre zones and residential zones. The submitter fully supports planned higher density in new areas such as Peacocke and Rotokauri where the infrastructure can be developed to support this. Lastly, the submitter considers governments direction to not allow urban design rules for most developments to be short-sighted and would have preferred push back on this. Council should consider introducing strategies that incentivise developers to utilise the Urban Design Panel.	Urban design rules to be introduced for all medium and high density developments.
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter supports protection of heritage and natural environment but does not have sufficient specific knowledge to make a submission on this issue.	No specific relief requested.
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 3	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter has used public transport once in Hamilton and so will not make a submission on this.	No specific relief requested.
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 4	25.13 Three Waters	General		The submitter opposes three waters and considers its introduction a breach of local government democracy.	Oppose three waters. Keep the control in the hands of Local Government.
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 5	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	The submitter supports developers playing both financial and developer contributions.	Charge developers both a financial and a development contribution.
IPC Family Trust - Ian Cassidy	226. 6	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	General	Support	The submitter owns property in Hutt and Auckland cities and has also made submissions to both of these councils. Comparing the three different plan changes they have submitted on: Hamilton City Council came out as the best with regard to adapting the generic requirements forced upon it by central government to meet the needs of the local area.	No relief sought.
Phillip Curnow	227. 1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter supports the existing planning controls for the density of residential development as they impact their property versus the 3 x 3 housing density proposal of government. Concerns regarding height and boundary requirements.	The submitter does not seek any specific relief to be sought but does note that if their concerns regarding height and boundary requirements are unfounded that they would consider withdrawing their opposing submission. These concerns are not expanded upon within the submission.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed High density residential zoning and mentions that the property is within the walkable catchment.	No relief sought.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt	228. 2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports that the site is excluded from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.3	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the assessment criteria item and seeks an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High-Density Zone to not be required to consider the surrounding context including adjacent properties and instead be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High-Density Zone.	We oppose this assessment criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High Density Zone <i><u>to not be required to consider the surrounding context including adjacent properties</u></i> and instead be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.5	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes Assessment criteria B2(c) suggesting it limits the potential maximum height of development within the high density zone. Clarity is needed regarding which boundary should be used when applying this assessment item if the side and rear boundaries vary significantly in different lengths. The submitter seeks an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High Density Zone to not be required to be assessed against this item. Developments within this Zone should be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone.	Re: Assessment Criteria Item B2(c), The submitter opposes this assessment criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High-Density Zone to not be required to be assessed against this item that is based on a ‘Rule of Thumb’. Instead, developments within the High-Density Zone should be assessed on their own merits and the developments’ ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone. We also seek clarification on which boundary should be used when applying this assessment item if the side and rear boundaries vary significantly in different lengths.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.6	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes Assessment Criteria C – Character and Amenity item C1(b), and mentions this item falls out of the scope of Council and the RMA and disagrees with the term 'general rule of thumb'. This term is used in a broad sense and can be misused/misinterpreted that can limit a development's ability to provide good outcomes. Developments within the High-density zone should be assessed on their own merits and the development's ability to be achieve the Purpose, Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone.	The submitter opposes this assessment criteria item and seek an amendment to these provisions to enable new developments within the High Density Zone be assessed on their own merits and the developments ability to be achieve the Purpose of the Zone and the identified Objectives and Policies of the High Density Zone.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.7	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter opposes the information requirement and sees it as a vague statement that has the potential to add time and cost to a Water impact assessment. The submitter mentions that the S32A analysis report has identified the need for rules/ provisions which regulate water-sensitive techniques for developments both residential and non-residential. The requirement to then demonstrate these benefits of ‘complying’ with the proposed rules/provisions is unnecessary and redundant.	The submitter suggests: Removal of Item (iv) within table 1.2.2.5a as the benefits of having specific water-sensitive techniques for residential and non-residential developments has been determined through the 32A analysis.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd	228.8	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the water sensitive techniques under Rule 25.13.4.5 and the proposed definition of mentioned techniques as there is no correlation.	The submitter seeks clarification on the differences of water sensitive techniques within rule 25.13.4.5 and the definition.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
- Sanjil Mistry						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.9	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.	<p>The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.</p> <p>Refer to subsequent submission points seeking relief related to this matter.</p>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.10	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: 1.2.2.5b, item ii, the term ‘appropriately service’ needs to be clearly defined for better interpretation to all audiences. Programme, cost and timing questions arise if there is lack of clarity regarding Three Waters infrastructure capacity.	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification to understand how Council will administrate this requirement. - Define ‘appropriately service’.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.11	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The requirements of table 1.2.2.5b, item (iii) will likely cause delays and inefficiencies as there is no outline on how applicants can source this information	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification to understand how Council proposes for an applicant to source the required information details. If Council is required to support the provision of this information, we seek confirmation that this will be provided efficiently and in a timely manner. - Delete iii(c) as an assessment of possible mitigation measures is required under Section 95E and 104 of the RMA. - Clarification of iii(d) as the capacity of infrastructure catchments vary significantly in size and it is unclear if this requirement will be relevant to minor proposals.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.12	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose the inclusion of consultation but suggests an amendment to include a threshold to trigger its requirement (e.g., concurrent land use and subdivision resource consent for less than 40 lots would not require consultation with Council).	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification to understand how Council proposes to administrate this consultation and confirmation that it will occur in an efficient and timely manner. - Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council. - Define ‘outcomes’. - Clarification as to whether a response or resolution from Council is required before an application process.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.13	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	RE: Table 1.1.2.5b, item vi, the submitter suggests that this is an over-complex requirement for small scale development and a threshold trigger put in place e.g., the requirements for details on the associated demands on downstream infrastructure for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds, this information could be better provided via a cumulative effects assessment.	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend Table 1.1.2.5b, item vi to remove the requirements for details on ‘associated demands on downstream infrastructure’. - Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Pragma Holdings Ltd - Sanjil Mistry	228.14	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Re: Table 1.1.2.5b, item x, Targets and performance indicators allowing for monitoring of the proposal’s compliance should be considered on a site-by-site basis and can be managed through conditions of consent and not be a requirement for minor development. This requirement could be replaced with a threshold trigger.	Oppose Table 1.1.2.5b, item x.
Oyster Manageme	229.1	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Neighborhood Centres	Support in part	The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports the amendment to Policy 6.2.3c to the extent that residential development on upper floors is	The submitter seeks for Policy 6.2.3(c) to be retained as notified, as well as any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
nt Limited - Bianca Tree					provided for, noting that mixed use (commercial and residential development) contributes to a well-functioning urban environment in alignment with the NPS-UD.	
Oyster Management Limited - Bianca Tree	229.2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports the amendment to Rule 6.3(yy) providing for apartments above ground floor as a permitted activity in the Business 1 and Business 6 Zones.	The submitter seeks for Rule 6.3(yy) to be retained as notified, as well as any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.
Oyster Management Limited - Bianca Tree	229.3	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports in part Standard 6.4.1, but seeks for a maximum building height of 15m to be provided for the Business 6 Zone and 21m in the Business 1 Zone (limited areas of the city).</p> <p>The submitter considers that these increased height limits are appropriate as they are in line with the proposed maximum building height limit for other Business Zones, and this would give effect to the NPS-UD by providing for the expected increase in demand for business land within an area which can support additional height greater than that of residential zones.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks for Standard 6.4.1 to be amended to remove provision 6.4.1(d), and revise provisions 6.4.1(b) and 6.4.1(c) as follows:</p> <p>6.4.1 (b) <u>Business 1 Zone</u> or Wwhere located in the height overlay shown in Figure 6.4c below: 21m</p> <p>6.4.1 (c) Business 1, 2, 4, 5, <u>6</u>, 7 (outside of the height overlay): 15m</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter seeks any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.</p>
Oyster Management Limited - Bianca Tree	229.4	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.2 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports the amendment to Standard 6.4.2 which provides a 60° height control plane above a boundary adjoining the General Residential Zone.	The submitter seeks for Standard 6.4.2 to be retained as notified, as well as any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.
Oyster Management Limited - Bianca Tree	229.5	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports the amendment to Policy 7.2.1(g) as it will realize as much development capacity as possible.	The submitter seeks for Policy 7.2.1(g) to be retained as notified, as well as any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.
Oyster Management Limited - Bianca Tree	229.6	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.3 Through-Site Links	Support	The submitter supports PC 12 to the extent that it enables well-functioning urban environments in the Business 1 Zone, Business 6 Zone, and Central City Zone. Specifically, the submitter supports the deletion of Standard 7.4.3 as they consider that removing building height limits in the Central City Zone gives effect to NPS-UD direction for the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet the expected increase in demand for business land.	The submitter seeks for Policy 7.4.3 to be deleted as notified, as well as any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.
Dirk Schuffner	230.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the effects of high density development on existing lower density development, in particular, effects on sunlight, air circulation, privacy, noise and mental wellbeing effects as a result of more intensive developments in existing residential neighbourhoods.	Intensification should be done in a way that does not infringe on the quality of life for existing residents.
Patricia Maria Lundy	231.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes three storey developments in residential suburbs citing sunlight, parking, traffic and roading concerns.	<p>Prevent three storey developments in suburbs; and</p> <p>Control how many units can go on a site; and</p> <p>Provide greenfield development with a variety of homes; and</p> <p>Prevent sale of land for lifestyle blocks.</p>
Christina Mulholland Kelsey Holland	232.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	Submits that that character of buildings play a part in retaining and attracting people to the city due to appealing aesthetics. All areas of Hamilton which commonly have villa and bungalow styles houses should need to keep the character, not just in historic heritage areas. Developers should consider retaining the character of the city such as Hamilton East and Claudelands when building. The submitter opposes the removal of the 'character of the area'.	The submitter seeks for higher density new builds to keep the character of the area where they are located. And that character in all areas is kept, not just in historic heritage areas.
Christina Mulholland Kelsey Holland	232.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	Submits that that character of buildings play a part in retaining and attracting people to the city due to appealing aesthetics. All areas of Hamilton which commonly have villa and bungalow styles houses should need to keep the character, not just in historic heritage areas. Developers should	The submitter seeks for higher density new builds to keep the character of the area where they are located. And that character in all areas is kept, not just in historic heritage areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					consider retaining the character of the city such as Hamilton East and Claudelands when building. The submitter opposes the removal of the 'character of the area'.	
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233. 1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed changes in their current form for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to give effect to the NPS-UD (which is required by S80E of the RMA), HCC is required to make planning decisions which provide at least sufficient development capacity to enable use of the urban environment and meet expected business and housing demands from the short-long term. The submitters consider that PC12 fails to achieve this, and instead the proposed change reduces urban development by applying unnecessary constraints (i.e. wide reaching qualifying matters which are contrary to Section 77I of the RMA) and failing to modify building height and density requirements to an extent which would align them with the NPS-UD. This approach to zoning and provisions is fatally flawed and will result in HCC being unable to meet the demand for housing and business land in the short term. PC12 fails to consider the appropriateness of the option to rezone business or industrial land as residential zones. PC12 applies a centers approach reliant on arbitrary criteria as well as inconsistently applying upzoning and zone descriptions. PC12 does not give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD. PC12 does not comply with 77J and 77K of the RMA. 	<p>- That HCC comprehensively review all business and industrial land with a view to rezone or enable residential activities, to provide sufficient development capacity to meet housing demand and business land capacity.</p> <p>- That HCC delete all cross references to PC9 matters as MDRS and intensification qualifying matters and rely upon the ODP.</p> <p>- That HCC delete the requirement of the NPS-UD to provide sufficient business land as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>- That HCC review and amend the zoning of The Base and surrounding walkable catchment, to give effect to policy 3 of the NPS-UD, comprehensively assessing the appropriateness of the area for intensification including:</p> <p>a. Amending the plan to include a Metropolitan Centre Zone, which recognises the importance of The Base and surrounds as a focal point with a broad range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities; and</p> <p>b. Rezoning the following area as Metropolitan centre zone.</p> <p>c. Rezone all Residential Zoned land within a 800m walking catchment of The Base (or proposed Metropolitan Centre Zone) Medium Density Residential Zone; and</p> <p>d. Undertake any consequential amendments to any district wide chapters, necessary to incorporate the Metropolitan Centre Zone.</p>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233. 2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes 2.1.e because it is unnecessary repetition of the RMA, qualifying matters should be addressed within section 32 evaluation.	Delete paragraph e.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233. 3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports Figure 2.1a Hamilton’s Plan at a Glance as it appropriately identifies The Base as a sub-regional centre.	Retain.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233. 4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Oppose	The submitter opposes <i>Policy 2.2.2a.ii, v - vii</i> , mentions SNA's should be managed via specific policy direction linked appropriately to mapping of said areas. Clause ii does not clearly link to and implement objective 2.2.2. Clauses v-vii are specific methods which are best addressed in the infrastructure chapter and duplicates proposed objective 25.13.2.2 and policy 25.13.2.2.a. Clause vii is inappropriate and in-effective, HCC own section 32 evaluation has concluded that there is insufficient infrastructure capacity.	The submitter seeks: Delete clause ii and v - vii.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233. 5	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objective 2.2.4 and suggests: The proposed wording results in the objective being limited in its application, resulting in uncertainty and risk for “brownfield urban development”.	Retain ODP – delete “greenfield”.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt	233. 6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Support	Retain Objective 2.2.5 and policy 2.2.5d, consistent with policy 6 of the NPS-UD.	Retain.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Station Corner Limited						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Support	Re: Objective 2.2.6 and policy 2.2.6a, Policy recognises the hierarchy of business centres, including The Base.	Retain.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Oppose	Re: Objective 2.2.14 and Policy 2.2.14c, The Base and surrounding land should be recognised as a Metropolitan Centre Zone and surrounding land be appropriately zoned as MDRZ. Maintains consistency with policy 2.2.6a.	Amend policy 2.2.14c as follows: Provide for medium-density residential developments within a nominal 400m walking distance of the Sub-regional Centre at Chartwell and the Suburban Centres at Thomas Road, Lynden Court, Five Cross Roads, Clyde Street East, Hamilton East, Glenview, Frankton, and Dinsdale; <u>and Provide for medium-density residential development within a 800m walking distance of the Metropolitan Centre Zone at The Base.</u>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233.9	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objective 2.2.14 and Policy 2.2.14h and mentions business land development capacity should be established in accordance with the NPSUD, it is considered that this policy is unenforceable, ineffective and inefficient as drafted.	Delete
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Station Corner Limited	233.10	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	The submitter opposes: 23.7.1.t - Allotment Size and Shape and mentions the insufficient section 32 justification to support any amendments to industrial zone provisions and that the proposed shape factor is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete
N J and M A Ormond	234.2	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the proposed intensification in the City. Concerned by the loss of sunlight and privacy in existing established suburbs from three or more three storey units. Bird life will be affected from loss of trees, no play areas for children, no opportunity to have a vegetable garden to grow food and parking congestion. The submitter considers that developers have no interest in maintaining good tenants, and that three storey units are not suitable for people of advancing years.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the environment has not been taken into account and the adverse impact on the Waikato River will be immense with infrastructure such as storm water pipes, roading, transport and other requirements falling on the rate payer.</p>	The submitter offers ones way of providing more housing by doubling the rate on residential houses that are used as business premises and free these properties for people to purchase and live in.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.1	General	General	Support in part	Waka Kotahi has a role giving effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). The four strategic priorities of the GPS 2021 are safety, better travel options, climate change and improving freight connections. A key theme of the GPS is integrating land use, transport planning and delivery. Land use planning can affect the demand for travel, creating pressures and opportunities for investment in transport infrastructure and services, or for demand management.	Full utilisation of the tools available to Council to enable development in the most accessible urban areas.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.2	General	General	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi supports the NPS-UD, the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, and Proposed Plan Change 12.</p> <p>The NPS-UD has a strong focus on ensuring that increased densities are provided in the parts of the city most accessible for active and public transport modes.</p>	Full implementation of the requirements of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, including the Medium Density Residential Standards and related provisions in eligible zones, modified only to the extent necessary to accommodate qualifying matters.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi supports the High Density Residential Zone (the Zone) and its provisions, because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> They give effect to Policy 3 (a) (c) of the NPS-UD; 	Consider extending the High Density Residential Zone further south towards Waikato Hospital (a major facility and employment centre) and to the west of Lake Rotoroa, north of Innes Common (approximate areas marked on the plan in their submission Sub Point #1). In the event that the extent of the HHA areas to the East of the Central City Zone are reduced through the PC9

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The nominal 800m walkable catchment is consistent with Ministry for the Environment guidance; and The extension of the Zone well beyond the 800 metres along the Ulster Street/Te Rapa Road spine aligns with the approximate location of the future rapid transit spine identified in the Hamilton-Waikato Metropolitan Spatial Plan (2021, p.23). 	process, the Council should reconsider whether the High Density Residential Zone (which currently adjoin these HHA areas) can be extended further into some of these areas.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Support	The proposed walkable catchment of 400 metres (more or less) from sub-regional or suburban centres and the application of a new Medium Residential Density Zone gives effect to NPS-UD Policy 3(d) and is consistent with the MfE guidance.	No relief sought.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Support	The General Residential Zone provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements.	No relief sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.6	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support	In accordance with Policy 3 (a) of the NPS UD, some of the business zones within the walkable catchment of the Central City Zone have been amended to allow for at least 6 storeys building height with a corresponding relaxation in the consenting status for apartments located above ground level. This approach is supported.	No relief sought.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.7	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 6.3 yy.	No relief sought.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.8	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	In accordance with Policy 3 (d) of the NPS UD, some of the business zones (sub regional and suburban centres) outside of the walkable catchment of the Central City Zone have a more permissive consenting approach to apartments located above ground level. This approach is also supported.	No relief sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.9	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support	<p>The submitter supports these provisions because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> They will enable a range of high density (minimum 6 storey high developments) residential typologies in locations which are accessible to employment and facilities in the Central City; and This will support the uptake of active and public transport and give effect to NPS-UD Policy 3(a), Policy 1 (a), (d) and (e) and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”) 	Retain Objective 4.4.2.1 and Policies 4.4.2.1a and 4.4.2.1b.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.10	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.3.1 (e) because it discourages low density developments to ensure residential density is maximised.	Retain Rule 4.4.3.1 e.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.11	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports retention of Rule 4.4.3.1 (f) because it discourages low density developments to ensure residential density is maximised.	Retain Rule 4.4.3.1 (f)
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.12	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports retention of Rule 4.4.3.1 (f) because it discourages low density developments to ensure residential density is maximised.	Retain Rule 4.4.3.1 (g).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood						
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Objective 4.3.2.1.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Objective 4.3.2.2.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 15	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”)	Retain Policy 4.3.2.2(a).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”)	Retain Policy 4.3.2.1 (d).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 17	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 4.3.2.2 (c).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 18	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”)	Retain Rule 4.3.3.1 (e).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Support	These provisions are supported because they provide for a reasonably high intensity zone which enables a greater intensity of density (through more permissible building heights and dwelling units per site) including in locations not previously provided for. The MDRZ is also within a walkable or cyclable distance to services, jobs and daily needs. This approach gives effect to Policy 3 (d), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Rule 4.3.4.4.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 20	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	These provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and are therefore supported.	Retain Objective 4.1.2.3.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 21	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	These provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and are therefore supported.	Retain Objective 4.2.2.1.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 22	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	These provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and are therefore supported.	Retain Objective 4.2.2.2.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 23	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table		These provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and are therefore supported	Retain Rule 4.2.3.1 (e).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 24	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	These provisions essentially implement the MDRS requirements under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and are therefore supported.	Retain Policy 4.2.2.1(a).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 25	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Objective 6.2.1.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 26	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”)	Retain Objective 6.2.2
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 27	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 6.2.1 (f).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 28	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 6.2.2 (h).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 29	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Neighbourhood Centres	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 6.2.3 (c).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 30	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 6.2.8b.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 31	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Rule 6.3 yy (ii).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 32	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Rule 6.4.1 (b).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 33	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support	These provisions provide a framework to encourage more apartments above ground level in sub regional and suburban centres. In addition, the maximum building height has been increased in those Business Zones identified in Figure 6.4(c) to facilitate apartment living. This approach gives effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Figure 6.4c.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 34	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support	<p>These provisions are supported. Overall, they provide a framework that enables a range of high density (minimum 6 storey high developments) residential typologies in locations which are accessible to the employment/facilities located within the Central City.</p> <p>The High Density Residential Zoning approach supports the uptake of alternative transportation modes, including active and public transport which gives effect to Policy 3(a), Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).</p>	Retain rule 4.4.5.4 (Building height).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 35	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The amendments identified place a greater emphasis on promoting residential development in the Central City Zone by removing the maximum height control and increasing the minimum densities for residential units. These provisions are supported because they give effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 7.2.1g.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 36	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	The amendments place a greater emphasis on promoting residential development in the Central City Zone by removing the maximum height control and increasing the minimum densities for residential units. These provisions are supported because they give effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 7.2.6h.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 37	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Ferrybank Precinct	Support	The amendments identified place a greater emphasis on promoting residential development in the Central City Zone by removing the maximum height control and increasing the minimum densities for residential units. These provisions are supported because they give effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 7.2.8e.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.38	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.3 Maximum Height Control	Support	The amendments identified place a greater emphasis on promoting residential development in the Central City Zone by removing the maximum height control and increasing the minimum densities for residential units. These provisions are supported because they give effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Delete 7.4.3 Maximum Height Control.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.39	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Support	The amendments identified place a greater emphasis on promoting residential development in the Central City Zone by removing the maximum height control and increasing the minimum densities for residential units. These provisions are supported because they give effect to Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) and Policy3 (a), (d) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain 7.5.3 (b).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.40	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The three waters infrastructure capacity overlay rule and information requirement is generally supported – the rationale for its inclusion being to manage the effects of development on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River (a statutory requirement of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato)	Given the extent of the three waters infrastructure capacity overlay, it is recommended that a programme (*) (including process/timeline) is established in parallel to PC12, which sets out when Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades ³ . The establishment of a formal programme (if not already underway) would greatly assist with ensuring that these overlays are actively managed to ensure they don’t end up overly constraining development. ³ <i>To the extent that this is possible; it is acknowledged that this programme will be in part driven by demand/funding driven by applicants.</i>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.41	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The three waters infrastructure capacity overlay rule and information requirement is generally supported – the rationale for its inclusion being to manage the effects of development on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River (a statutory requirement of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato).	Given the extent of the three waters infrastructure capacity overlay, it is recommended that a programme (*) (including process/timeline) is established in parallel to PC12, which sets out when Council expects to uplift parts of the overlay due to infrastructure upgrades ³ . The establishment of a formal programme (if not already underway) would greatly assist with ensuring that these overlays are actively managed to ensure they don’t end up overly constraining development. ³ <i>To the extent that this is possible; it is acknowledged that this programme will be in part driven by demand/funding driven by applicants.</i>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.42	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.2.5.6 k.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.43	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.2.5.6 (l).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.44	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.2.5.6 (m).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.45	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.3.4.6 (h).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.46	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.3.4.6 (l).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 47	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support	These rules, which are carried over from the Operative District Plan, are supported because they ensure the efficient use and operation of the Waikato Expressway (identified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure, NPS UD).	Retain Rule 4.5.4.6 (h).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 48	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Objective 2.2.13.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 49	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 2.2.13e.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 50	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”).	Retain Policy 2.2.13f.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 51	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Objective 2.2.14.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 52	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14a.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 53	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day	Retain Policy 2.2.14b.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 54	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14c.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 55	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14d.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 56	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14e.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 57	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14f.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235. 58	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these objectives and policies because they place an emphasis on achieving a greater transport mode shift and reducing the reliance on cars for travel (thereby minimising greenhouse gas emissions). This approach supports Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD and the outcomes of the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). Objective 2.2.14.ii is supported. This is consistent with a move to more active modes of transport and a reduction of vehicle kilometres travelled. However, it is noted that the current distribution of centres/services may not allow for comprehensive accessibility for all parts of the city to these day to day services and facilities. It will be important to monitor accessibility, particularly as densities increase, in order to ensure that this objective can be realised.	Retain Policy 2.2.14g.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235. 59	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from	Support	Funding for the necessary transport network improvements and transport capacity upgrades arising from the additional growth that PC12 facilitates will require the Council to rely on a range of funding sources. To that end, the policy and rule framework outlined in Chapter 24 Financial contributions is supported.	Retain 24.2.1.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood			develop ers a contribu tion in the form of money, or land, or a combina tion of both money and land, which:			
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.60	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.3 Objectives and Policies	Support	Funding for the necessary transport network improvements and transport capacity upgrades arising from the additional growth that PC12 facilitates will require the Council to rely on a range of funding sources. To that end, the policy and rule framework outlined in Chapter 24 Financial contributions is supported.	Retain Objective 24.3.1 (i).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.61	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.3 Objectives and Policies	Support	Funding for the necessary transport network improvements and transport capacity upgrades arising from the additional growth that PC12 facilitates will require the Council to rely on a range of funding sources. To that end, the policy and rule framework outlined in Chapter 24 Financial contributions is supported.	Retain Policy 24.3.1a (i).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.62	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Support	Funding for the necessary transport network improvements and transport capacity upgrades arising from the additional growth that PC12 facilitates will require the Council to rely on a range of funding sources. To that end, the policy and rule framework outlined in Chapter 24 Financial contributions is supported.	Retain Rule 24.4.2 (a) (i).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.63	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Objective 25.14.2.1.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.64	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies:	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. 	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1a.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood			Transportation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.65	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1d.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.66	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1e.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.67	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1g.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood			Policies: Transport		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.68	25.14 Transport	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transport	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.69	25.14 Transport	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transport	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1i.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.70	25.14 Transport	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transport	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - InChapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to: - Integrate the transport network and land use. 	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1k.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.71	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Policy 25.14.2.1m.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.72	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain 25.14.4.2 (q).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.73	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. 	Retain 25.14.4.2 (r).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.74	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain 25.14.4.2(s).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.75	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain 25.14.4.2 (t).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.76	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. 	Retain 25.14.4.2 (u).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.77	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Rule 25.14.4.2 (v).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.78	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Rule 25.14.4.2a.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.79	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p>	Retain Rule 25.14.4.3a.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood			Standards		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	In relation to Rule 25.14.4.3a Travel Plan requirements; Waka Kotahi expect that this rule will generate a large number of travel plans so it will be important that the Council is properly resourced to work with applicants to implement these effectively. This may require more than the current Workplace Travel Coordinator we understand is employed by the Council.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.80	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2a (d) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.81	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2a (e) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	235.82	Appendix 15	15-2 Integrated	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p>	Retain Table 15-2a (g) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Agency - Mike Wood		Transportation	Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.83	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2a (h) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.84	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport <p>Network on land use and vice versa.</p> <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (b) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.85	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (c) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.86	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (d) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.87	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (f) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.88	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (g) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.89	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (i) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.90	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (j) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.91	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (k) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.92	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 2Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2b (l) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.93	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2e (a) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.94	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15-2e (b) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.95	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (c) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.96	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (d) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.97	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (e) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.98	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (f) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.99	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Integrate the transport network and land use.- Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.- Accommodate growth and urban intensification.- Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users- Encouraging growth in public transport patronage.- Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (g) in Appendix 15.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.100	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (h) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.101	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Chapter 25 proposes a more directive policy and rule framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the transport network and land use. - Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. - Accommodate growth and urban intensification. - Achieving well-functioning urban environments and good accessibility for all users - Encouraging growth in public transport patronage. - Managing the adverse effects of and on the transport Network on land use and vice versa. <p>This approach is supported because it aligns with Policy 1 (a) (d) and (e) of the NPS UD; the GPS (“accelerating mode shift across New Zealand in high-growth areas – includes Hamilton”). The additions are also consistent with Policies 3.12, 6.6.6 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the Transport Agencies broader obligations under s96(1)(a) of the Land Transport Act (2003).</p>	Retain Table 15.2e (i) in Appendix 15.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Mike Wood	235.102	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the need to manage the impacts on and from the State Highway network.	No relief sought with respect to Policy 25.14.2.1l.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Waikato-Tainui support the inclusion of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato in the purpose of the strategic framework of the District Plan	Retain s2.1 (a).
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato	236.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support	Waikato-Tainui support the inclusion of Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato in the purpose of the strategic framework of the District Plan	Retain s2.1 (b).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Incorporated) - Alana Mako						
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Mana Whenua		Waikato-Tainui consider that developments and decisions associated with developments for any discretionary or non-complying resource consent should be required to consider Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and any other iwi management plans at all times. This will assist developers/applicants with determining cultural impacts and who to engage with at the forefront of the project rather than post lodgement or mid-development.	Amend Policy 2.2.1(d) as follows: Where required, development and the decisions associated with developments are to consider any relevant Iwi Management Plan. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Waikato-Tainui support requiring new subdivisions and development to incorporate water-sensitive techniques to reduce demand for water supply and wastewater disposal and to manage stormwater. However, it needs to include what techniques should be incorporated to ensure that the most effective technique is incorporated.	Amend Policy 2.2.2a(v) to specify or list water-sensitive techniques. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.5	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato		Retain Policy 2.2.2a(vi).	Retain Policy 2.2.2a(vi).
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato		The Waikato River corridor has been included in Hamilton City Councils Plan Change 9 as a significant Natural Area, and only activities identified through Plan Change 9 may apply for consent within a SNA. This clause has been included for the purposes of housing intensification, which should be prohibited within an SNA under Plan Change 9. We understand the intention of the clause however, it implies that perhaps activities may occur.	Amend Policy 2.2.2a(viii) to ensure that activities under Plan Change 12 must prohibit river and stream bank erosion, river and stream bed scouring and deposition. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Retain policy 2.2.2b.	Retain policy 2.2.2b. Amend the plan to ensure that policy 2.2.2b applies to all activity status Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.8	General	General		Waikato-Tainui seek for the plan to be amended to ensure Policy 2.2.2b applies to all activities and all activity statuses.	Amend the plan to ensure that policy 2.2.2b applies to all activity status.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato	236.9	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato		As this objective is only to be considered by discretionary and non-complying activities, this policy implies that not all activities require implementation of the Joint Management Agreement with Waikato-Tainui. The JMA applies across the whole city regardless of activity status.	Retain Policy 2.2.2b(ii). Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Incorporated) - Alana Mako					Retain Policy 2.2.2b(ii).	
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 10	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato		As this objective is only to be considered by discretionary and non-complying activities, this policy implies that not all activities require implementation of the Joint Management Agreement with Waikato-Tainui. The JMA applies across the whole city regardless of activity status. Amend the plan to ensure Policy 2.2.2b(ii) applies to all activity status.	Amend the plan to ensure Policy 2.2.2b(ii) applies to all activity status.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 11	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Waikato-Tainui support this policy [Policy 2.2.2b (iii)] however as mana whenua involvement is becoming more prevalent through this plan change and other plan changes, Hamilton City Council need to outline the mechanism as to how they will provide for all this engagement.	Amend Policy 2.2.2b(iii) to include an appendix to outline how Hamilton City Council will provide for mana whenua engagement. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 12	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Waikato-Tainui support Policy 2.2.2b(iv), however as noted in the feedback provided under Schedile 1 Clause 4a consultation, Chapter 3 makes no mention of mana whenua freshwater values and other values and aspirations. There has been no change since providing that feedback and the notification of this plan change. There has also been no indication of when ICMP’s will be reviewed.	No relief sought with respect to Policy 2.2.2b(iv) itself. Relief is sought with respect to Chapter 3 and this is dealt with as a separate submission point. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 13	General	General		Chapter 3 makes no mention of mana whenua freshwater values and other values and aspirations. There has been no indication of when ICMP’s will be reviewed.	Amend Chapter 3 to include mana whenua freshwater values and other values and aspirations as noted in Policy 2.2.2b(iv).
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 14	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato		As the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori have been decoupled from Plan Change 9, it is difficult to see how this policy can be given effect to and complied with. In essence archaeological sites, taonga and sites of significance to Maaori were identified but have since been removed from the plan change, therefore developers/applicants may not be required to provide for the recognition of those sites.	Amend Policy 2.2.2b(ix) to ensure policies in PC12 are consistent with provisions in PC9. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 15	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		Waikato-Tainui seek that Policy 2.2.2.b (i-viii) or wording to similar effect is included in the Objectives and Policies relevant to all residential development to ensure mana whenua are involved in decisions relating to the awa.	Amend 4.1.2 to include wording of similar effect as in Policy 2.2.2b(i-viii); Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato	236. 16	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All		Amend Policy 4.1.2.1b to better reflect and implement Te Ture Whaimana.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.1b as follows: <i>Developments and activities in the Residential Zones must give effect to the outcomes objectives in the The Vision and Strategy - Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato through developments and activities being designed and</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Incorporated) - Alana Mako			Residential Zones			<p><i>operated to protect and restore the health and wellbeing of the River.</i></p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.17	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The objectives and policies within Chapter 4 do not provide for or recognise the relationship mana whenua have with the whenua and awa.	<p>Add a new objective to Chapter 4 as follows:</p> <p><i>The relationship Mana Whenua have with both the whenua and awa, and the spiritual, cultural and/or historical significance of the whenua and awa to Mana Whenua shall be recognised and provided for.</i></p> <p>And any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.18	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		Amend the notification requirements for all residential zones to ensure there are appropriate prompts to engaging with mana whenua for all activities in all residential zones, within and outside of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay. Including the consultation and engagement process outlined in Chapter 6 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Management Plan provides a clear process for applicants and an agreed process by Waikato-Tainui.	<p>Amend all notification requirements in all residential zones to add appropriate prompts for proposals for 1, 2 or 3 dwellings on a site that infringe no more than two of the rules to include recommendations from mana whenua through engagement similar to requirements in Proposed Plan Change 9; and</p> <p>Amend to include the consultation and engagement flow chart outlined in Section 6.4 of Tai Tumu, Tai pari, Tai Ao – Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan to promote engagement with Waikato-Tainui and mana whenua; and</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.19	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which:	Support	<p>Waikato-Tainui support the inclusion of 24.2.1 to recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana. However, it is unclear who will administer and have oversight of the fund for these contributions, and it is considered appropriate for Waikato-Tainui to have oversight of that fund or the projects the contributions are applied to.</p> <p>Further clarity is required on who will make the decision on the purpose for which the financial contribution will be applied to. As a JMA partner, it is appropriate for Waikato-Tainui to be included in the decision-making for this purpose.</p>	<p>Amend Section 24.2.1 to make it clear who will administer and have oversight of the fund for these contributions including that Waikato-Tainui will have oversight; and</p> <p>Amend Section 24.2.1 to make it clear who will make the decision on the purpose for which the financial contribution will be applied to, including that as a JMA partner, Waikato-Tainui will participate in the decision-making for those purposes;</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakite nga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236.20	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and	Support	For financial contributions in the form of land, Policy 24.3.1.a(iv) state “Financial contributions in the form of land must vest in Council prior to completion of the activity or development”, however in terms of that land being a financial contribution for the purposes of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana, it is expected that the land would be exempt from further development.	<p>Amend Section 24.2.1 to ensure that land provided as a financial contribution for the purposes of achieving Te Ture Whaimana will be exempt from further development;</p> <p>OR amend Section 22.2.1 to ensure Waikato-Tainui has oversight and participate in decision-making as to the purpose that land is used for.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			land, which:			
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 21	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which:		There needs to be consistency between territorial authorities in terms of the approach to determining financial contributions for the purposes of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana. This means there will be a consistency in approach to giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana and the purposes the contributions are applied to will not vary between districts.	<p>Amend Section 24.2.1 to ensure there is consistency in requiring financial contributions for the purposes of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana between Hamilton City Council and other territorial authorities within the Waikato and Waipaa River Catchments</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 22	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both money and land, which:	Support	The financial contribution purposes applied to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana should not be limited to the costs listed in Residential Development 24.4.2 (a)(i)(B) as there may be other purposes that mana whenua deem more appropriate for a specific development or area.	<p>Amend Section 24.2.1 to ensure the financial contribution purposes applied to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana are not limited to the costs listed in Residential Development 24.4.2 (a)(i)(B).</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 23	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.2.1 To recover from developers a contribution in the form of money, or land, or a combination of both	Support	The proposed contribution for this charge is ~\$1700 per additional dwelling or ~\$555 per additional bedroom. Waikato-Tainui are concerned that the financial contributions will not be commensurate to the development and the adverse effects it may potentially have on the awa or demonstrate improvement in water quality. Waikato-Tainui do not think the financial contributions will be enough to offset the effects as well as providing for betterment.	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			money and land, which:			
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 24	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		To ensure that consented activities for the whole Hamilton City Council area implement and give effect to the Joint Management Agreement, Te Ture Whaimana and engaging mana whenua, it is important that any proposals include in the AEE any recommendations by mana whenua. Mana whenua need to be engaged in developments, especially considering the adverse effects these intensive developments could have on the awa. Also, the scale of development across the district will likely have an impact on mana whenua values. Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao outlines a clear consultation and engagement process that is under-utilised by applicants/developers within the Hamilton City boundary.	Add a new standard to 25.13.4 as follows: " <u>Applications for activities that are required by 25.13.3 must provide in the assessment of environmental effects for the proposal, identification of any measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects recommended by representatives of Mana Whenua in any engagement carried out for the proposal by the applicant in accordance with consultation and engagement processes identified by mana whenua, Chapter 6 of Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao – Waikato-Tainui Environmental Management Plan or any other iwi management plan.</u> " Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 25	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure that consented activities for the whole Hamilton City Council area implement and give effect to the Joint Management Agreement, Te Ture Whaimana and engaging mana whenua, it is important that any proposals include in the AEE any recommendations by mana whenua. Mana whenua need to be engaged in developments, especially considering the adverse effects these intensive developments could have on the awa. Also, the scale of development across the district will likely have an impact on mana whenua values. Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao outlines a clear consultation and engagement process that is under-utilised by applicants/developers within the Hamilton City boundary. 	Add a new standard to 25.13.4 as follows: <u>Applications must provide in the assessment of environmental effects for the proposal an assessment of any Iwi Management Plans.</u> Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 26	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		Waikato-Tainui suggest this should be deleted as several Integrated Catchment Management Plan’s have not been through a formal review therefore may be outdated not relevant.	Amend Rule 25.13.4.6 as follows: ... This Rule does not apply in areas where an ICMP approved by the Council exists and satisfies the information requirements for Water Impact Assessments or Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments in accordance with Table 1.2.2.5a of Volume 2, Appendix 1.2.2.5, or where all the information that a Water Impact Assessment or Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment would otherwise include, or the matters it would otherwise address, are incorporated in a Water Supply Agreement with Council or other documents, assessed and approved under any other provision of this District Plan or the Waikato Regional Plan Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 27	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waikato-Tainui consider clarity is required in regard to the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment. It is unclear what criteria Hamilton City Council will use to assess these. Information required in the assessment seem redundant and some of the information would need to be included in the AEE regardless of the infrastructure assessment. Further clarity is required on what the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment is trying to achieve and how it will assist in determining whether development should occur. As these will be included as part of the AEE, it is assumed these assessments will be assessed by the processing planner. It is considered that this could result in inconsistency of approach and assessment due to a range of factors such as, experience, qualifications, time etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Section 1.2.2.5a or Chapter 25 to make it clear what the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment is trying to achieve that is different to information included in the AEE; and Amend to ensure the three waters infrastructure capacity assessments are developed or assessed by a defined suitably qualified person. Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 28	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waikato-Tainui consider clarity is required in regard to the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment. It is unclear what criteria Hamilton City Council will use to assess these. Information required in the assessment seem redundant and some of the information would need to be included in the AEE regardless of the infrastructure assessment. Further clarity is required on what the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment is trying to achieve and how it will assist in determining whether development should occur. As these will be included as part of the AEE, it is assumed these assessments will be assessed by the processing planner. It is considered that this could result in inconsistency of approach and assessment due to a range of factors such as, experience, qualifications, time etc. 	<p>1. Amend Section 1.2.2.5a or Chapter 25 to make it clear what the three waters infrastructure capacity assessment is trying to achieve that is different to information included in the AEE; and</p> <p>2. Amend to ensure the three waters infrastructure capacity assessments are developed or assessed by a defined suitably qualified person.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 29	Planning Maps	General	Support	Waikato-Tainui support the approach taken to identify the areas constrained and to develop a three waters infrastructure capacity overlay. However, a large strip of industrial zoned land through the middle of the district and the area above the central city zone along the river are outside the overlay.	Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay provisions to ensure that if any area is rezoned from a non-residential zone to a residential zone that it must comply with the provisions of the areas that are within the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 30	Planning Maps	General	Support	Waikato-Tainui consider that greenfield areas ... need to be included within the three waters infrastructure capacity overlay to ensure there is proper protection of those areas.	Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay map to include greenfield areas within the overlay area.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 31	Planning Maps	General	Support	<p>Waikato-Tainui support the approach taken to identify areas where three waters infrastructure is constrained and to develop a three waters infrastructure capacity overlay.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui consider that Significant Natural Areas need to be included within the overlay to ensure there is proper protection of those areas.</p>	Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay map to include Significant Natural Areas within the overlay.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakiten ga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	236. 32	Planning Maps	General	Support	<p>Waikato-Tainui support the approach taken to identify areas where three waters infrastructure is constrained and to develop a three waters infrastructure capacity overlay.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui consider that archaeological and cultural sites need to be included within the three waters infrastructure capacity overlay to ensure there is proper protection of those areas.</p>	Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay map to include archaeological sites within the Overlay.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited - Matt Norwell and Grace Forno	237. 1	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support	The provision of the height overlay promotes uniformity and ensures that non-residential zones align with the new MDRS standards across Hamilton. In addition, it maximises and enables future business development capacity.	Support the provision of the height overlay (Figure 6.4c).
Foodstuffs North Island Limited - Matt Norwell and Grace Forno	237. 2	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.1 Maximum Building Height	Support in part	<p>The height overlay does not give effect to the NPS-UD, specifically Objectives 3 and 4. Objective 3 requires district plans to enable more business, and Objective 4 focuses on urban environments developing and changing to meet their communities needs.</p> <p>PC12 has not enabled more businesses to be located in areas outside of the central city and Te Rapa, which discourages the provision of supermarkets, such as New World Glenview and Four Square Heaphy Terrace. Both New World Glenview and Four Square Heaphy Terrace provide services to their communities and employment opportunities, are well-serviced by existing public transport and there is a demand for additional services in these areas.</p> <p>The NPS-UD is not solely focused on increasing residential development, but also in creating well-functioning urban environments which PC12 does not give effect to. Residential zones have been enabled to develop but business zones have not been enabled to support this.</p>	Amend the height overlay (Figure 6.4c) to include other business zones/suburban centres as shown in Figure 3 in their submission, including New World Glenview (Ohaupo Road, Glenview) and Four Square Heaphy Terrace (1030 Heaphy Terrace, Fairfield).
Gerard Rennie	238. 1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter contends the extent of the Chartwell suburban centre.	Reduce the size of the Chartwell centre.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Gerard Rennie	238. 2	General	General		The submitter considers it necessary to investigate title restrictions disallowing development.	Investigate title restrictions disallowing development.
Pauline Lockett	239. 1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter is concerned about the effects 3-5 storey developments might have in the Dinsdale suburban centre. The submitter has concern about sunlight effects and does not think a one size fits all approach is in the best interests of the residence in the Dinsdale area.	That the Hamilton City Council rejects the plan changes that allow medium density within 400m walking distance of the suburban centre of Dinsdale.
Foodstuffs North Island Limited (FC Provisions) - Alex Devine	240. 1	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the financial contribution provisions in its entirety, stating that unless the relief sought submission is granted, PC12 will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not comply with the Council’s obligations under the RMA as amended by the Enabling Act. Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Be otherwise inconsistent with the purpose and principles in Part 2 RMA. Be inappropriate in terms of section 32 RMA. <p>The submitter highlights that PC 12 introduces new FC’s pursuant to sections 77E and 77T of the Enabling Act, noting that these FC provisions will disproportionately impact on commercial and retail activities in comparison with other categories of activity. Retail activities do not generate adverse effects on the Waikato River. Using vehicle movements to establish demand is inappropriate given the blurred relationship between use for retail outlets vs residential growth. The Enabling Act and NPS-UD are concerned primarily with intensification of residential activity. Retail activities will not compromise achievement of the Council’s strategy for the river. Retail facilities do not themselves generate increased traffic across the city.</p> <p>The FC Provisions also incorporate a local network infrastructure component. The Submitter understands that those costs may already be recovered through the Council’s Development Contributions Policy. The FCC Provisions should not seek to duplicate the matters addressed in the DC Policy and doing so effectively amounts to double charging. New retail activities should not be subject to the FC provisions as they provide goods and services that are required to meet demand from incoming residential development and do not generate adverse effects that require mitigation through financial contributions.</p>	<p>(a) That the FC Provisions be deleted in their entirety.</p> <p>(b) That, if the relief in (a) above is not granted, that the FC Provisions be amended by exempting new retail activities from the financial contributions.</p> <p>(c) Any other relief or other consequential amendments as are considered appropriate or necessary to address the concerns set out in this submission.</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241. 1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the Medium Density Zoning, and that the only mapped Qualifying Matter relates to the already identified Significant Natural Area.	Retain the zoning.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>The submitter generally supports the explanatory text to the revised chapter 4 however, has significant concerns regarding the explanatory text including a definition of “residential amenity”, and further explanation including ambiguous references to “good access” and “functional living spaces both internally and externally”. The submitter is also concerned at the linkage made between a safe environment and internal and external living spaces, as these are unrelated matters.</p> <p>The explanatory text should not provide additional definitions, references to matters which are outside of the RMA (e.g internal living areas) and should provide a clear explanation of intent.</p> <p>In addition references to appropriate non-residential activities refer to “residential character” – this is not reflected in the policy framework.</p>	Delete the explanatory text or otherwise the explanatory text should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.1 (and policies 4.1.2.1a-e)</p> <p>The submitter supports the HCDP alignment with the Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato’ – The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.</p> <p>However, the submitter does not support the inclusion of additional objectives and policies which in effect duplicate the objectives and policies in other chapters (e.g Chapters 2 and 25 of the</p>	Any amendment to Objective 4.1.2.1 (and policies 4.1.2.1a-e) should also address relief sought elsewhere in this submission relating to stormwater management, earthworks etc.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					District Plan). Many of the matters identified in the policies directly relate to the adverse effects addressed by the other chapters and are not matters pertinent to Chapter 4.	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.2 (and policies 4.1.2.2a – f) and associated explanatory text.</p> <p>The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of Objective 4.1.2.2 and Policies 4.1.2.2-f. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While alignment of development with infrastructure is generally supported the policies should not foreclose on the ability to provide for interim solutions to infrastructure to enable housing supply. • The references to a preference of public of private infrastructure is inappropriate and inconsistent with the other requirements under the PC12 which require onsite infrastructure. In addition, high density developments often have communal private infrastructure. • References to consistent with Structure Plans, including any staging identified in structure plans, should be “in general accordance”. • It is also considered inappropriate for the policies to determine that compliance with the structure plan would achieve the use of land and infrastructure “efficiently”. Structures plans are the detail within them is indicative only. Such a policy is limiting to the delivery of growth which options not identified by structure plans could be achieved. • Reference to the achievement of densities should be replaced with “aim to achieve”, as specific compliance will not always be achievable in every circumstance. 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.3, Policies 4.1.2.3a-d)</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the text as notified subject to consistency with relief sought elsewhere in this submission.</p> <p>Policy 4.2.1.[3]c is not considered appropriate – it is outside of the RMA to require dwelling to provide “the day to day needs” of people. This policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.</p> <p>Delete Policy 4.2.1 c</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.4, Policies 4.1.2.4a-e and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the text as notified – however opposes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4.1.2.4a should be clearer as to what effects of non- residential activities need to be managed (e. noise etc) • Policy 4.1.2.4 c and d, should have the limitation on serving only the “local” community deleted – this phrase “local “ is undefined and will be problematic in implementation. In addition this may be appropriate only for local cafes/diaries etc, but is too limiting for activities such as churches, community counselling etc. • Policy 4.1.2.4e should be deleted as visitor accommodation is needed throughout the city – not just in identified precincts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4.1.2.4a should be clearer as to what effects of non- residential activities need to be managed (e. noise etc) • Policy 4.1.2.4 c and d, should have the limitation on serving only the “local” community deleted – this phrase “local “ is undefined and will be problematic in implementation. • Policy 4.1.2.4e should be deleted as visitor accommodation is needed throughout the city – not just in identified precincts.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.1.2.5, Policies 4.1.2.5a-b and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter supports the encouragement of sustainable features, including provision for electric charging etc, however does not support this being a requirement of development.</p>	<p>The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.</p> <p>Submitter does not support encouragement of sustainable features, including provision for electric charging being a requirement of development.</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings	241.8	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and	Oppose	Objective 4.1.2.6, Policies 4.1.2.6a-j and explanatory text	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Limited - Gary Noland			Policies: All Residential Zones		<p>The submitter generally supports the text as notified subject to consistency with relief sought elsewhere in this submission, and in particular encouragement of public fronts and private backs for dwellings as these align with the design philosophy set by PC7 for Rotokauri North.</p> <p>However the submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of the Policies. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to access private areas by “invitation” only – this is not relevant and could be utilised to dictate “gated” rear lanes. • references to matters which are outside of the RMA (e.g internal living areas) • as well as habitable rooms fronting the streetscape inclusion of specific reference to “kitchen”. • References to sunlight and daylight are too broad and could be misinterpreted to be applicable to the whole dwelling <p>Objective 4.1.2.6, Policies 4.1.2.6a-j and explanatory text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring onsite manoeuvring does not align with the other policies regarding minimising effects of parking/garaging and has not related method • Reference to limiting the number of vehicle crossings should be deleted – this is managed by Chapter 25. • Service and storage areas should be deleted • Deletion of references to retention of existing vegetation – Chapter 25 enables general vegetation to be removed as a permitted activity. • While overlooking between properties should be managed – this is done via the outlook rule and should not be further managed by policies seeking to avoid overlooking. 	<p>Specific relief sought;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to limiting the number of vehicle crossings should be deleted – this is managed by Chapter 25. • Service and storage areas requirement should be deleted • Deletion of references to retention of existing vegetation – Chapter 25 enables general vegetation to be removed as a permitted activity.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Objective 4.1.2.7, Policies 4.1.2.7a and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter opposes any further control at the interface of the significant natural areas. SNAs and their protection have been addressed by PC9 and further buffers and restrictions on adjoining land is not needed or supported.</p>	<p>Objective 4.1.2.7, Policies 4.1.2.7a and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter opposes any further control at the interface of the significant natural areas.</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.10	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>4.3.1 MDZ Purpose</p> <p>The explanation and purpose of the MDZ currently excludes any reference to Rotokauri North. This should be added (with reference back to 3.6.A) for consistency.</p>	<p>4.3.1 MDZ Purpose</p> <p>The explanation and purpose of the MDZ currently excludes any reference to Rotokauri North. This should be added (with reference back to 3.6.A) for consistency.</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.3.2.1, Policies 4.3.2.1a-f and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the principles of public frontages, as these align with the PC7 outcomes.</p> <p>The submitter opposes any reference to development in Rotokauri North adhering to a “masterplanning approach”. This is a hang over from the operative version requiring Comprehensive Development Plans, and through the decision of PC7 not required in Rotokauri</p>	<p>Objective 4.3.2.1, Policies 4.3.2.1a-f and explanatory text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter opposes any reference to development in Rotokauri North adhering to a “masterplanning approach” • Adherence to structure plans and staging should be “in general accordance” • Encouragement of pairing of vehicle crossings – this works for terraces and duplex dwellings only • Infrastructure staging etc should allow for and foreclose on interim solutions • Effects of car parking on streetscape undermines the permitted activity criteria

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>North. Its introduction effectively re-litigates matters also agreed and settled between the submitter and HCC via PC7.</p> <p>The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of the Policies. These include matters raised previously:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adherence to structure plans and staging should be “in general accordance” • Infrastructure staging etc should allow for and foreclose on interim solutions • Provision for universal access. This is not an RMA matter to be addressed via a district plan. • Encouragement of pairing of vehicle crossings – this works for terraces and duplex dwellings only and is problematic for vacant lot designs. • Effects of car parking on streetscape undermines the permitted activity criteria which allow for this (whereas the policy requires this to be avoided” 	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>Objective 4.3.2.2, Policies 4.3.2.2a-c and explanatory text</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the identification of medium density having effects on existing neighbours etc, and planned character including terraces and apartments.</p> <p>The submitter opposes policy 4.3.2.2.c as it relates to Rotokauri North – encouragement for higher densities have already been taken into account in the PC7 provisions/overlay etc.</p>	Submitter opposes Policy 4.3.2.2.c as it relates to Rotokauri North – encouragement for higher densities have already been taken into account in the PC7 provisions/overlay.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	<p>Objective 4.3.2.6, Policies 4.3.26 and explanatory text.</p> <p>The submitter supports the retention of the PC7 objectives and policies specific to Rotokauri North.</p> <p>The submitter supports the inclusion of “terrace housing” to the policies (as this definition did not exist during the preparation of PC7).</p>	No specific relief sought
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>Activity Tables 4.3.3.1</p> <p>The submitter considers that with the merging of the MDRZ rules there is no reason to require a higher activity status default in Rotokauri North for activities such as childcare centres serving more than 6 children and rest homes than the general MDZ zone. And would support further relaxation of other activities subject to gfa restrictions (e.g cafes).</p> <p>In general the lower activity status would support the strategic objectives and policies enabling and encouraging local activities providing the day to day needs of communities within walkable catchments (without having to use private vehicle movements) and utilising land in the most efficient way.</p> <p>The submitter supports the changes to the activity tables to allow for residential development to align with the MDRS.</p>	<p>Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter specifically;</p> <p>The submitter considers that with the merging of the MDRZ rules there is no reason to require a higher activity status default in Rotokauri North for activities such as childcare centres serving more than 6 children and rest homes than the general MDZ zone. And would support further relaxation of other activities subject to gfa restrictions (e.g cafes).</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.15	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Support in part	<p>4.3.3.2 Notification</p> <p>The submitter considers that the provisions on limited and public notification is confusing and may create an expectation that infringement over 25% are likely to be publicly notified. These should be deleted and replaced with those required by the MDRS.</p>	Delete notification provisions relating to over 25% infringement and replace with those required by MDRS
Rotokauri North	241.16	4.3 Medium Density	4.3.4.1 Density	Oppose	4.3.4.1 Density	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter re removing density limits.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Holdings Limited - Gary Noland		Residential Zone			There is no reason to limit the density for rest homes, retirement villages and manage care facilities.	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.17	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports those provisions which reflect the PC7 decision and/or are more enabling than PC7. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3.4.2 Building Coverage • 4.3.4.3e Permeability • 4.3.4.4 Height • 4.3.4.6 Yards – limited to those parts which are the same as/more enabling than PC7 and not opposed below. • 4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls - limited to those parts which are the same as/more enabling than PC7 and not opposed below. • 4.3.4.8 a and b Public Interface • 4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living 	<p>Retain the following standards which are the same as / more enabling than PC7,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3.4.2 Building Coverage • 4.3.4.3e Permeability • 4.3.4.4 Height • 4.3.4.6 Yards – limited to those parts which are the same as/more enabling than PC7 and not opposed below. • 4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls - limited to those parts which are the same as/more enabling than PC7 and not opposed below. • 4.3.4.8 a and b Public Interface • 4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.18	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>Provisions which are not supported as they are less enabling/more restrictive than PC7, but which are not the MDRS “density standards” are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.3.4.3a and b Permeability. The current PC7 provisions only requires 20% permeable. • 4.3.4.5 HIRB – the PC7 standards should apply to all development not just development of 3 or more units. The PC7 provisions are more enabling than the equivalent MDRS provisions. • 4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks. The submitter opposes and yard setback which is more restrictive than the PC7 provision (e. g 2m opposite side yards for a 0m) • 4.3.4.10(a)(v). The submitter opposes the requirement for the space to be located accessible to a “principle living room”. Outdoor living should be accessible from any living/dining/kitchen area • 4.3.4.11 – the PC7 minimum dimension was 1m (the notified PC12 has 1.5), the submitter opposes any requirement for a waste container management plan, and opposes all additional requirements in clause d) which were not part of PC7. • 4.3.4.12, 4.3.4.14, 4.3.4.15 – PC7 was approved as a MDZ with no requirement for storage, limit on building length or requirement for universal access. The submitter opposes these requirements. 	<p>Delete the standards which are less enabling/more restrictive than PC7, but which are not the MDRS “density standards”; OR Exclude these provisions from applying to the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct:</p> <p>4.3.4.3 a and b Permeability</p> <p>4.3.4.5 HIRB</p> <p>4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks</p> <p>4.3.4.10 (a)(v) Outdoor living</p> <p>4.3.4.11 Waste Management</p> <p>4.3.4.12 Storage Areas</p> <p>4.3.4.14 Built Form</p> <p>4.3.4.15 Universal Access</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	<p>Development Controls 4.3.4.3 Permeability</p> <p>In addition to the above commentary the submitter considers that the combination of clause a) and b) undermines the RMAA MDRS standard for landscaping, and undermines the ability to achieve the notified building coverage/impervious provisions for terraces/apartments access via a rear lane and given the limiting definition of “permeable” and also is less enabling than the operative PC7 which enables up to 80% impervious.</p> <p>A broadened definition of permeable would also be supported (e.g to include narrow paths 1.5m wide etc).</p>	<p>Delete the parts of the standard which are less enabling/more restrictive than PC7 (but which are not the MDRS “density standards);</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Exclude these provisions from applying to the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					The submitter also considered that that provision of trees per unit is too onerous and will reduce useable space within the lots.	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.20	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Oppose	<p>Development Controls 4.3.4.7 Boundary fences and yards</p> <p>The submitter opposes the deletion of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5m setback for garages from the transport corridor boundary for Rotokauri North. • provision for a fence where a north facing open space is located forward of the building line. <p>These standards should form part of PC12.</p>	<p>Amend PC12 to include the identified standards;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend PC12 to include the identified standards for the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.21	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	<p>Development Controls 4.3.4.7 Boundary fences and yards.</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule.</p>	The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.22	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface	Support in part	<p>Development Controls 4.3.4.8 Public Interface.</p> <p>Clauses c-e are opposed insofar as they should only related to development which adjoins a transport corridor boundary and should not only apply to apartment applications the provisions are not appropriate to apply to integrated land use applications for multiple duplex dwellings, or detached dwelling.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.23	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>Development Controls4.3.4.9 Outlook & 4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living</p> <p>Clauses c-e are opposed insofar as they should only related to development which adjoins a transport corridor boundary and should not only apply to apartment applications the provisions are not appropriate to apply to integrated land use applications for multiple duplex dwellings, or detached dwelling.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.24	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	<p>Development Controls 4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking</p> <p>The submitter generally supports those elements that reflect PC7. However, the submitter opposes the provision in part for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the provisions are too complex to be easily interpreted and should be simplified • the reference to a residential units “frontage” is ambiguous, and it not clear whether this relates to the lot, parent lot, future lot, or building line. 	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.25	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.6 Controlled Activities: Matters of Control	Support in part	<p>4.3.6-7 Controlled Activities and Restricted Discretionary Activities: matter of discretion</p> <p>The matters of discretion exclude any reference to the Rotokauri North matters of assessment. These should be included as per the operative plan.</p>	<p>4.3.6-7 Controlled Activities and Restricted Discretionary Activities: matter of discretion</p> <p>The matters of discretion exclude any reference to the Rotokauri North matters of assessment</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited -	241.26	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support in part	<p>Objectives and Policies (additional to enable residential activities)</p> <p>The submitter supports amendment to the business zones to enable and encourage above ground level residential activities. However, the submitter opposes the drafting which implies that they are only encouraged where they contribute to safe streets.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Gary Noland						
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.27	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	Activity Table 6.3. The submitter supports the changes to enable as a permitted activity above ground apartments.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.28	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	Objective 23.2.2, Policy 23.2.2.a. The submitter supports the deletion of reference to maintaining existing amenity values.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.29	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	Objective 23.2.7, Policies 23.2.7 and explanation The submitter supports the retention of the PC7 objectives and policies specific to Rotokauri North. The submitter supports the inclusion of “terrace housing” to the policies (as this definition did not exist during the preparation of PC7).	Retain the provisions as notified.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.30	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	Activity Table 23.3c. The submitter generally supports the proposed changes to Activity Table 23.3C, in particular the new controlled activity status for activities xi-xiii for Rotokauri North, subject to resolution of some double up/conflicting activity statuses (e.g two different status for unit title subdivision) and resolution of any referencing errors to confirm that Table 23.3.C applies to the MDRZ for Rotokauri North.	Retain the provisions as notified, subject to amendments to satisfy the concerns of the submitter
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.31	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape		23.7.1 – Subdivision Suitability The submitter supports retention of the PC7 vacant lot size for residential vacant lots for Rotokauri North, and in general, the provisions in 23.7.2 allowing fee simple and unit title subdivision with no minimum lot size where land use consent is granted first/concurrently, or applications can provide a permitted activity dwelling can be constructed.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.32	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability	Support in part	23.7.2 – Subdivision Suitability The submitter supports retention of the PC7 vacant lot size for residential vacant lots for Rotokauri North, and in general, the provisions in 23.7.2 allowing fee simple and unit title subdivision with no minimum lot size where land use consent is granted first/concurrently, or applications can provide a permitted activity dwelling can be constructed.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.33	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support in part	23.7.4 MDRZ The submitter supports those provisions which reflect the PC7 decision and/or are more enabling than PC7. The submitter opposes the “new” restrictions beyond PC7 incorporated into Rule 23.7.4 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clause o-q relating to pedestrian/cyclist accessways • clause u matters for rear lanes 	Delete the parts of the standard which are less enabling/more restrictive than PC7; OR Exclude these provisions from applying to the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited -	241.34	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.6 Controlled Activities	Support in part	4.3.6 Controlled Activities: matter of discretion The controls activities matters exclude any reference to the Rotokauri North – which should not be included.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter. Specifically matters of discretion xix require updating to delete reference to Rule 4.7.12a which has been deleted

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Gary Noland			s: Matters of Control			
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.35	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: matter of discretion</p> <p>The matters of discretion xix require updating to delete reference to Rule 4.7.12a which has been deleted.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.36	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	<p>Chapter 24 – in its entirety</p> <p>The submitter opposes any financial contributions applying to Rotokauri North as all effect resulting from the development of the greenfield site have been addressed by either Development Contributions and/or the private development agreement. No further contributions are warranted.</p>	<p>Delete identified provisions;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Exclude these provisions from applying to the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.37	25.12 Solid Waste	25.12.2 Objectives and Policies: Solid Waste	Oppose	<p>Policies 25.12.1.d [c]</p> <p>The submitter opposes policy c for the reason reasons as listed under the waste development controls in Chapter 4. Policy d is also considered inappropriate, and conflicts with other objectives regarding optimising existing berms spaces/road corridors and utilisation of rear lanes for collection. Both policies should be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete identified provisions;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Exclude these provisions from applying to the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct</p>
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.38	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	<p>Objective 23.13.2.2 Policies 23.13.2.2a-b, and explanation</p> <p>The submitter generally supports changes to reflect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.</p> <p>The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of the Policies. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specific reference to onsite solutions – for greenfield development the ICMP and SC-ICMP’s generally identify the communal devices which allow for the appropriate detention to manage effects. Not every lot/development is required to have onsite devices. Furthermore, the ICMPs and SC-ICMP identify the appropriate devices for individual lots to manage stormwater effects, as not all solutions are appropriate in the individual catchments. The policies and explanation reference retention and soakage as opposed to detention, there are different expectations and outcomes for all of these stormwater solutions, and it should be clear which of these solutions HCC is seeking. As noted under the Chapter 24 items – the submitter opposes the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield growth areas 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.39	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	<p>Objective 23[25].13.2.4, 23[25].13.2.4[5], Policies 23[25].13.2.4 [a-d], 23[25] .13.2.5a-h and explanation</p> <p>The submitter generally supports changes to reflect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.</p>	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of the Policies. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While alignment of development with infrastructure is generally supported the policies should not foreclose on the ability to provide for interim solutions to infrastructure to enable housing supply. • As noted under the Chapter 24 items – the submitter opposes the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield growth areas 	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.40	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Rules - General Standards 25.13.4 (all)</p> <p>The status of the Rotokauri North SC-ICMP does not correspond to the planning provisions as drafted – the requirements of the Rotokauri North SC-ICMP (as amended by conditions of the approved Fast Track consent) should be clarified to form the same status as a “full ICMP” and thus replace the need for compliance with the relevant standards applicable to other development, including but not limited to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.13.4.1b Integrated Catchment Management Plan • 25.13.4.2 Stormwater – Non-Residential zones • 25.13.4.2A Stormwater – Residential zones • 25.13.4.6 Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments and Water Impact Assessments <p>The submitter supports the requirements for water conservation features, however, requests that these been clarified to include tanks for re-use that fulfil any required retention/detention (including allowing retention/detention tanks which are used for re-use to have the same status for yard etc exclusions as a rainwater tank).</p>	The provisions should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.41	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Objective 25.14.2.1, Policies 23[25].14.2.1a-q and explanation</p> <p>23[25].13.2.5a-h and explanation</p> <p>The submitter generally supports the inclusion for other modes of access and recognition of micro-mobility in enabling more sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of policies which refer to other policies (this is not considered to be appropriate drafting of a policy) • Reference to creation of a continuous tree canopy along corridors – the submitter is concerned that this will create undesirable outcomes for urban environments (and is concerned that the higher planted maintenance will be additional costs borne by the consent holder). • Reference to minimising building new roads. Greenfields areas should be excluded from this policy. • Referencing to “have fun” and “playfulness” in relation to transport corridors. The submitter supports the movement of people via various methods, however, considered that “fun” and “play” is better enabled in open space/green corridors. • Requiring provision of public transport infrastructure – this matter was canvassed at the PC7 hearing and determined more appropriate for development to “enable” and “future proof” for these features. 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing to minimising vehicle crossings – this should be limited to streets with dedicated cycle lane or dedicated 3m (or wider) shared path facilities. Referencing to reverse sensitivity should be clear that it does not relate to all road networks. <p>The submitter specifically opposes policy 25.14.2.1oii which appears to “misunderstand” the use of rear lanes through requiring them to be safe for pedestrians etc – these are service lanes for vehicles not thoroughfare. In addition, not all lanes will require rubbish collection services and emergency vehicles (and lots which lanes have a street frontage for these facilities).</p> <p>The submitter supports the general principle of making the best use of transport corridors provided. However, this needs to be paired with other policies which enable efficiencies to be gained in the road corridor designs (particularly service berm widths) set by Appendix 15 (Table 15-a).</p>	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.42	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 f - Quantity</p> <p>The submitter opposes the retention of the operative maximum number of vehicle crossings per site. This undermines the achievement of medium density development fronting a transport corridor. The provision should be deleted and/or new provisions added to enable a minimum of one crossing per dwelling.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.43	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 h- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The widths for a single residential unit are “missing” from the rule. Until these can be reviewed, the submitter is unable to provide any comment and/or confirm consistency with the outcomes sought by the Chapter 4 changes.</p> <p>The widths for internal vehicle access for 2-6 units appear to be inappropriately wide, thus reducing the potential for developable land, and conflict with the detailed parking provisions in Chapter 4.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.44	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 j- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The submitter opposes the further restriction on rear lanes – the provisions applicable to Rotokauri North should reflect those agreed via PC7.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.45	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 m-p- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The submitter opposes the further restrictions applying to all development. Standard m in particular should not apply to all individual lot vehicle crossings, and standard p should be clear that it does not apply to the transport corridors.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.46	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.2b Electric Vehicle Charging</p> <p>The submitter opposes this forming a requirement for development, and has significant concerns as to the ability of providers to enable this.</p>	The provisions should be deleted to address the concerns of the submitter
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.47	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.3b Waste Management.</p> <p>The submitter opposes this forming a requirement for development and any associated provisions/information requirements for waste management.</p>	The provisions should be deleted

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.48	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	<p>Apartments / terraced housing.</p> <p>The submitter supports the revised definition for apartments and a new definition for terraced housing.</p>	Retain as notified
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.49	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	<p>General</p> <p>The submitter supported amendments to broaden the definition of Rotokauri North features (e.g rear lanes, shared paths) to be applicable citywide.</p>	Retain as notified
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.50	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	<p>Definitions of Urban Design and Urban Heat Island Effect.</p> <p>The drafting of both is too broad and complex to be a definition. The definition of Urban Heat island effect is a explanation of how it occurs, not a definition of what it is.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.51	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Oppose	<p>1.2.1 h Assessment of environmental effects - Requirement for urban design assessments</p> <p>The submitter opposes the requirement for a specific “urban design” assessment and “CPTED” assessments for all applications for 4 or more dwellings.</p> <p>This is unnecessary for application of such a small scale (being 4 dwellings), and will add increased cost, complexities and delays to the delivery of housing.</p>	The provisions should be amended/deleted to address the concerns of the submitter. Specifically the submitter opposes the requirement for a specific “urban design” assessment and “CPTED” assessments for all applications for 4 or more dwellings.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.52	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	<p>B (inclusive) G (inclusive) J (inclusive)</p> <p>The submitter opposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any changes to the assessment criteria which attribute lengths/percentages to being an appropriate outcome “rules of thumb”. These are rules not assessment criteria. any reference to retention of existing vegetation, or viewshafts references to local microclimatic features repetition of outcomes required by development standards (e.g landscaping, position of doors/windows to street etc, fencing) outcomes that undermine permitted activity development controls (e.g parking areas, garage percentages to street frontage) any other matter raised by the detailed submission on the chapters repeated in the assessment criteria. requirements to provide rather enable/future proof for public transport infrastructure reference to roads providing for “play” duplication of matters relevance of JJ where there is an approved ICMP/SC-ICMP 	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to consistency with permitted standards <p>The submitter also considered that the new detail of 1.3.3. in relation to design and layout makes The Design Guides redundant (and they should be deleted).</p>	
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.53	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	<p>1.2.2.23a Subdivision of a duplex in Rotokauri North</p> <p>The submitter has identified that this provision should be deleted, as subdivision in accordance with land use and/or around development is now a controlled activity.</p>	The provision should be deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.54	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	<p>O4 – subdivision of a duplex.</p> <p>The submitter has identified that this provision should be deleted, as the rule references has been deleted.</p>	The provision should be deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.55	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures		<p>Table 15-1a and figure 15.1.a.a.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the cycle parking rates and provision for lockers. Specifically but not limited to those listed for apartments and residential units/duplexes being required per bedroom, and the required parking dimensions.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.56	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Oppose	<p>15-2 ITA</p> <p>The submitter opposes the additional requirements for ITAs, specifically (but not limited to) a design statement addressing matters such as rubbish collection and parking (these are better suited to be addressed at detailed engineering plan approval stage) and the requirement for assessment of greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.57	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-5 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Oppose	<p>Table 15-5a & 15-5aii</p> <p>The submitter is of the opinion that there could be considerable efficiencies in amending the transport design corridors- in particular reducing the expectation for significant service berms – whereas the PC12 amendments have in some cases increased the widths of vested roads. The submitter is also concerned that these changes combined with the policies on tree canopy could further increased the vested road network, which impacts on the available land for the delivery of housing.</p>	The provisions should be deleted or amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Rotokauri North Holdings Limited - Gary Noland	241.58	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	<p>All objectives and Policies</p> <p>As the Chapter 2 strategic framework has been used to guide the changes made in detailed chapters, the submitter generally supports those matters raised in the above table which are supported, where these themes are addressed in the Chapter 2 objectives and policies (and explanatory text).</p> <p>Likewise the submitter opposes those matters raised in the above table which are opposed where these themes are addressed in the Chapter 2 objectives and policies (and explanatory text).</p>	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Colette MacDonald	242.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter has concern for housing intensification in the Beerescourt area with specific concerns relating to the river, heritage, sunlight and privacy.	<p>Refuse housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12; and</p> <p>Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented 3- 6 storey a developments within the city precinct.</p>
Colette MacDonald	242.2	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes high density in the Macdiarmid Road area seeking the character to remain in this area.	Oppose high density zoning in the Macdiarmid Road area.
Colette MacDonald	242.3	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes this change and can see that the ratepayers will end up funding more than the developers.	Oppose this change.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		PC5 contains a comprehensive suite of objectives and policies for the Peacocke Precinct that have been tailored to that area. As notified, these objectives and policies are under the heading “All Residential Zones”, so would apply to residential zones in the Peacocke Precinct. This creates duplicative and potentially conflicting objective and policy guidance. The additional objectives and policies in Chapter 4.1 should be excluded from applying to the Peacocke Precinct.	<p>Add the following text under 4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones:</p> <p><i><u>“The following objectives and policies do not apply in the Medium Density Residential Zone: Peacocke Precinct (refer to 4.3A)”.</u></i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>As notified, the policy is relatively directive, requiring that development must encourage the efficient use of energy and water.</p> <p>However, PC12 does not include rules or assessment criteria requiring the reduced use of reticulated electricity or the use of solar energy.</p> <p>In terms of electric mobility and its charging infrastructure, the provision of such should be at the discretion of property owners / developers. See also submission 25.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.5a as follows:</p> <p><i>“4.1.2.5a</i> <i>Development must encourage the efficient use of energy and water, by:</i> <i>i. Incorporating water-sensitive techniques.</i> <i>ii. Off-setting the effects of loss of permeable surface.</i> <i>iii. Reducing the use of reticulated electricity.</i> <i>iv. Utilizing solar energy.</i> <i>v. Providing for electric mobility and its associated charging infrastructure.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>This policy is very long and reads like a list of assessment criteria.</p> <p>A specific matter which is opposed is clauses (xi) and (xii) which seek to limit vehicle crossings, particularly where narrow dwellings are proposed. While that may be appropriate in the context of shared paths and separated cycleways, it is otherwise an onerous requirement and is inconsistent with the outcomes of PC5.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.6c so that it is more succinct, with detailed matters covered in the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Alternatively, amend clause (xi) and delete clause (xii) of Policy 4.1.2.6c as follows:</p> <p><i>“xi. Limit the number of vehicle crossings to prioritise pedestrian and cyclist safety and amenity on public roads or publicly accessible spaces used to give access to development <u>where shared paths and separated cycleways are located.</u></i> <i>xii. Use of private rear / service lanes, separate to the space forming the public front, associated with narrow-frontage dwellings so as to achieve (9) and (10).”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	For the same reasons as for submission 3 above, the policy should be limited to where shared paths and separated cycleways are located.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.6i as follows:</p> <p><i>“4.1.2.6i</i> <i>Ensure vehicle crossings are minimized on road frontages where narrow dwellings are proposed and where shared paths and separated cycleways are located.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	“Significant Natural Area” is a defined term in the District Plan and refers to areas identified in the planning maps and schedules. Reference to such areas should be capitalised to avoid ambiguity.	<p>Amend Objective 4.1.2.7 as follows:</p> <p><i>“4.1.2.7</i> <i>Buildings and activities at the interface of residential zones with sSignificant nNatural aAreas will be managed to ensure the ecological values of these areas are protected.”</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	“Significant Natural Area” is a defined term in the District Plan and refers to areas identified in the planning maps and schedules. Reference to such areas should be capitalised to avoid ambiguity.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.7a as follows: <i>“4.1.2.7a Adverse effects of adjoining development on identified sSignificant nNatural aAreas shall be managed through limiting earthworks and controlling vegetation maintenance to reduce the impact on their ecological values.”</i>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.7	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support	Development in the Peacocke Precinct is subject to Chapter 4A Peacocke Medium Density Residential Zone, which has been tailored for that area. It is appropriate to be clear about this to avoid duplication or conflict with the “general” Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.8	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.1 Purpose	Support	Subdivision in the Peacocke Precinct is subject to Chapter 23A Subdivision – Peacocke Precinct, which has been tailored for that area. It is appropriate to be clear about this to avoid duplication or conflict with the “general” subdivision provisions.	Retain as notified.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.9	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules	Oppose	<p>24.3 Objectives and policies; Rule 24.4 Financial Contribution Rules, including 24.4.1 General Rules 24.4.2 Residential Development, 24.4.3 Non-residential Development, 24.4.4 Contribution of Land and 24.4.5 Contribution of Land and Money</p> <p>The proposed new financial contribution regime is targeted at managing effects from intensification in urban areas on three waters / transport, parks / reserves / open space, streetscape amenity and giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>In contrast, development in greenfield areas will be designed to accommodate anticipated densities in accordance with best practice requirements (including under ICMs, the RITS, Stormwater Guidelines etc). Parks / reserves / open space and streetscape amenity is also planned and provided for. If such infrastructure is not developer-funded, it is funded by development contributions.</p> <p>The proposed new financial contribution regime fails to recognise this distinction. Instead, it appears to expect a financial contribution from all new development. It is unreasonable to expect financial contributions from greenfield development, which has not contributed to the effects that the regime seeks to manage.</p> <p>The regime should be amended to exclude greenfield areas or at least the Peacocke Precinct.</p>	<p>Amend the objectives, policies and rules to exclude the financial contributions regime from applying to greenfield development.</p> <p>As an alternative to the relief requested above, amend the objectives, policies and rules so that the Peacocke Precinct is excluded.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.10	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	Interpretation	Support in part	<p>Definition for ‘Greenfield development’ under the Interpretation heading in Chapter 24.</p> <p>Including a definition of “Greenfield development” is supported, however, the term is not currently referred to in the provisions of Chapter 24 (see submission 9).</p> <p>Hamilton has clearly defined greenfield precincts. The definition could be improved by clarifying that it includes development in those precincts, as well as any other previously undeveloped rural land.</p>	<p>Retain a definition for ‘Greenfield development’ in Chapter 24 and amend it as follows:</p> <p><i>“Greenfield development means subdivision and/or urban development <u>in the Peacocke Precinct, Te Awa Lakes Precinct, Rotokauri Precinct, Rotokauri North Precinct, Ruakura Precinct and Rototuna Town Centre Precinct and of any other previously undeveloped rural land</u>”.</i></p> <p>As an alternative or in addition to the above, the greenfield development areas could be spatially defined in the Planning Maps</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.11	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	<p>Objective 25.13.2.2 and Objective 25.13.2.5 – health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.</p> <p>These objectives both address similar matters relating to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The two objectives should be consolidated into one objective with associated policies.</p>	Amend Objectives 25.13.2.2 and/or 25.13.2.5 so that they are consolidated into a single objective for the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.12	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies:	Oppose	<p>Policy 25.13.2.2b – financial contributions (three waters).</p> <p>For the reasons given in submission 9, the policy should be amended to exclude greenfield development from the financial contributions regime.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 25.13.2.2b as follows:</p> <p><i>“In accordance with Chapter 24, Except for greenfield development, require a financial contribution <u>in accordance with Chapter 24</u> when off-site stormwater works are needed in a sub-catchment to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of development or to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Three Waters			
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.13	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	<p>Policy 25.13.2.5h – financial contributions (three waters).</p> <p>Policy 25.13.2.5h is identical to Policy 25.13.2.2b. One of these policies should be deleted. This should be addressed as part of the consolidation of Objective 25.13.2.2 and Objective 25.13.2.5 (see submission 11).</p>	<p>Delete Policy 25.13.2.5h. “25.13.2.5h</p> <p>In accordance with Chapter 24, require a financial contribution when off-site stormwater works are needed in a sub-catchment to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of development or to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.”</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.14	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.13.2.6a – design</p> <p>Soakage to ground will not be possible in some areas of Hamilton. This policy should be amended to refer to use of soakage techniques “where practicable”.</p>	<p>Amend clause vi of Policy 25.13.2.6a as follows:</p> <p>“vi. Ensure that surface water runoff is appropriately managed to restore and protect the health and well being of watercourses and the Waikato River, primarily via retention for reuse and soakage techniques <u>where practicable</u>”.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.15	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Rule 25.13.4.2A Stormwater – Residential Zones.</p> <p>The clarity of this rule would be improved by specifying that it relates to “on-lot” stormwater management measures rather than communal stormwater management measures which are typically vested in HCC.</p>	<p>Amend clause (c) in Rule 25.13.4.2A as follows:</p> <p>“c. <u>On-lot</u> stormwater management measures must be maintained and operated in perpetuity in accordance with best practice by the relevant property owner”.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.16	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1b – climate change.</p> <p>There are numerous competing demands on transport corridor space, including creating functional transport corridors, providing for other infrastructure, public transport stops, street furniture and so on. It is impractical and unlikely to be achievable to establish and maintain continuous tree canopy along transport corridors.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 25.14.2.1b.</p> <p>“25.14.2.1b</p> <p>Promote the establishment and maintenance of a continuous tree canopy along transport corridors to improve amenity for corridor users and adjoining land use, minimize the urban heat island effects of urban intensification, enhance biodiversity and ecological function, provide summer shade to make these corridors more comfortable for walking, cycling, and micro-mobility during hotter weather, and store carbon.”</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.17	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1h – parking.</p> <p>It is unclear whether this policy is intended to apply to on-street parking, off-street parking or both. The policy also addresses loading despite the heading of the policy being “Parking”.</p> <p>For clarity, the policy should be amended to relate to off-street parking and loading as on-street parking is unlikely to be able to achieve all of the outcomes sought. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clause (i) should be amended to be clearer; • clause (v) should be amended to enable consideration of the need for charging facilities, rather than mandating them; • clause (vi) and (viii) should be deleted as parking and loading areas are unlikely to meaningfully contribute to these outcomes; • clause (vii) should be amended to refer to loading and drop-off spaces only where they are “required” by the District Plan. 	<p>Amend Policy 25.14.2.1h as follows:</p> <p><u>“Off-Street Parking and Loading 25.14.2.1h</u></p> <p><i>Manage the design, location, quantity, and pricing of any <u>off-street parking and loading</u> infrastructure so that it is provided in a way that:</i></p> <p><i>i. Provides for the special design, personal security, accessibility, and convenience requirements of all users. Is safe, convenient and accessible for all users.</i></p> <p><i>ii. Minimises adverse effects arising from supply of and demand for parking.</i></p> <p><i>iii. Minimises adverse safety and efficiency effects on walking, cycling, micro-mobility, public transport, freight and emergency services.</i></p> <p><i>iv. Maximises opportunities for the efficient use of parking infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>v. Provides <u>Considers the need for</u> charging facilities for electric powered vehicles and micro-mobility devices.</i></p> <p><i>vi. Encourages active modes, micro-mobility and public transport.</i></p> <p><i>vii. Ensures <u>any required</u> loading and drop-off spaces are available for each development and site.</i></p> <p><i>viii. Provides for car share, taxis, and ride share.”</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.18	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1j – public transport.</p> <p>Clause (vi) should be amended to clarify that the requirement for public transport infrastructure applies only to public transport routes.</p>	<p>Amend clause (vi) of Policy 25.14.2.1j as follows:</p> <p><i>“vi. Providing public transport infrastructure <u>on public transport routes</u> as part of developing a new, or upgrading an existing, transport corridor.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.19	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1l – adverse effects on the transport network.</p> <p>For the reasons in submission 16 clause (iii) should be amended to remove reference to continuous tree canopy along transport corridors.</p>	<p>Amend clause (iii) of Policy 25.14.2.1l as follows:</p> <p><i>“iii. Promoting streetscape amenity through transport corridor design, <u>and</u> providing for the Transport Mode Hierarchy, and encouraging a continuous tree canopy along transport corridors.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.20	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1o – access</p> <p>For the reasons given in submission 3, clause</p> <p>(vi) should be amended to clarify that it relates to areas that have physically separated cycleways and shared paths.</p>	<p>Amend clause (vi) of Policy 25.14.2.1o as follows:</p> <p><i>“vi. Minimise the number of vehicle crossings <u>over physically separated cycleways and shared paths</u> to improve safety for walking, cycling, and micro-mobility”.</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.21	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Transpor tation	Support in part	<p>Policy 25.14.2.1q – biodiversity in transport corridors.</p> <p>It is not practical or realistic to expect roads to function as ecological corridors. The policy should be amended to remove the expectation that transport corridors will function as ecological corridors.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 25.14.2.1q as follows:</p> <p><i>“25.14.2.1q Encourage the planting, retention, and maintenance of indigenous trees and vegetation within transport corridors, where appropriate, to recognise and reflect ecological, amenity, cultural, and landscape values and to support the establishment and enhancement of ecological corridors.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.22	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Rule 25.14.4.1(h)(i), (iii) and (iv) – vehicle crossings and internal access.</p> <p>The design and access widths proposed conflict with standards that have been proposed for the Peacocke Precinct under PC5. The rule should be amended to clarify that the standards do not apply in the Peacocke Precinct.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.14.4.1(h) to state that the standards in clauses (i), (iii) and (iv) do not apply in the Peacocke Precinct.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.23	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Rule 25.14.4.1(j) – rear lanes.</p> <p>Different rear lane standards have been proposed for the Peacocke Precinct through PC5. The rule should be amended so that the standards that apply in other parts of the city do not apply in the Peacocke Precinct.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.14.4.1(j) to state that the standards do not apply in the Peacocke Precinct.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.24	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Support in part	<p>Rule 25.14.4.1(m) and (n) (including Figures 25.14.4.1e and 25.14.4.1f) – vehicle access requirements.</p> <p>The standards for the required splays at residential driveways and on-site platforms are unnecessarily onerous. Safe outcomes could be achieved with less restrictive standards.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 25.14.4.1(m) and (n) as follows:</p> <p><i>“m. To ensure that drivers exiting the site have clear visibility to pedestrians, cyclists, and micro-mobility users, splays of 5m <u>2.5m</u> by 2m which are clear of structures higher than 1.2m must be provided at all vehicle crossings. See Figure 25.14.4.1e.</i></p> <p><i>n. Where a vehicle access joins a transport corridor it must have an on-site platform at least 6m <u>4.5m</u> long and with a gradient no steeper than 1 in <u>20 10</u> (5 10 per cent) so that vehicles can stop safely and check for pedestrians, cyclists, micro-mobility users, and other vehicles before entering the transport corridor. See Figure 25.14.4.1f.”</i></p> <p>Amend Figures 25.14.4.1e and 25.14.4.1f to reflect the changes above.</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.25	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	<p>Rule 25.14.4.2b Electric Vehicle Charging.</p> <p>This rule requires an electric vehicle charging point for each vehicle parking space provided for all new residential activities with on-site vehicle parking. The rule is overly prescriptive and adds unnecessary costs. Garages are likely to have power available so that residents can easily install charging facilities if they have an electric vehicle.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 25.14.4.2b and the associated note.</p> <p><i>“25.14.4.2b Electric Vehicle Charging a. All new residential activities with on-site vehicle parking must provide an electric vehicle charging point for each vehicle parking space required.</i></p> <p><i>Note An electric vehicle charging point excludes the charging cable that connects between a residential unit’s electrical outlet and the electric vehicle. The owner or driver of the electric vehicle is expected to provide this.”</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.26	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Rule 25.14.4.3a Travel Plan Requirements.</p> <p>Travel Plans are required for a range of activities, including apartment buildings and many commercial activities (typically large-scale activities).</p> <p>Policy 25.14.2.1n refers to Travel Plans being required for development or activities of a nature, scale or location that has the potential to generate significant movement of people. Requiring Travel Plans for small Apartment buildings which generate insignificant movement of people would be inconsistent with this policy.</p> <p>A threshold of apartments with 20 units would be consistent with the travel plan requirement for places of assembly of 1000m2, which would generate 100 vehicles per day. That is the same as the anticipated generation of 20 apartment units.</p>	Amend Rule 25.14.4.3a so that Travel Plans are only required to be prepared and implemented for Apartment buildings where they involve 20 or more units.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.27	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>Appendix 1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria.</p> <p>1. PC5 contains a comprehensive suite of assessment criteria for subdivision and development in the Peacocke Precinct that have been tailored to that area. As notified, many of the proposed assessment criteria in PC12 would apply to subdivision and development in the Peacocke Precinct. The assessment criteria should be amended so that they do not conflict with PC5.</p> <p>2. The proposed amendments to the assessment criteria use inappropriate and unclear terminology such as “as a rule of thumb”.</p> <p>3. Many of the amended assessment criteria read as though they are standards to be met rather than assessment criteria.</p> <p>4. Changes should be made so that the assessment criteria use more appropriate words such as “the extent to which”.</p> <p>5. Consequential changes should be made to the assessment criteria to address other matters raised in this submission.</p>	Redraft the assessment criteria in Appendix 1.3.3 to ensure they are viable, certain, capable of assessment and implementation and do not conflict with PC5.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.28	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>Appendix 1.3.3, G34 – rear lanes.</p> <p>It is not appropriate for the district plan to require a contractual indemnity for collection of rubbish from rear lanes. The assessment criterion should be amended to be consistent with alternative drafting agreed through PC5.</p>	<p>Amend G34(a) as follows:</p> <p><i>“a. An appropriate legal mechanism will be established for ownership and ongoing management and maintenance of the lane <u>including where applicable, provisions for use of the rear lane by public rubbish collection and recycling trucks</u> and for providing indemnity for collection of rubbish, food scraps, and recycling (where collection vehicles are proposed to enter the rear lane).”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.29	1.4 Design Guides	1.4.2 Residential Design Guide	Support in part	<p>Appendix 1.4.2 Residential Design Guide.</p> <p>The Residential Design Guide is proposed to be amended so that it will apply to all residential zones, rather than just the General Residential Zone. This will make it relevant to the Medium Density Residential Zone in Peacocke. Some changes to the Design Guide are necessary to improve the clarity of the Design Guide and to support good urban design outcomes.</p>	<p>Amend clause (a) and (c) in 1.4.2.6 as follows:</p> <p><i>“a. Where possible, garages and car parking should not dominate the frontage. <u>Garages and car ports</u> and should be located to the side or rear or <u>set back behind the main façade</u> of the building to reduce visual impact (refer Figure 1.4.2e).”</i></p> <p><i>And;</i></p> <p><i>“c. Where possible, driveways <u>of adjoining units should be paired.</u> should not be located side-by-side. <u>Preferably use shared driveways</u></i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p><i>ca. <u>For access to rear lots, driveways should be shared where possible to serve more than one residential unit.</u></i></p> <p><i>Amend clause (e), insert a new clause (f) and amend clause (g) in 1.4.2.13 as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“e. Developments should be designed in a way that provides an appropriate level of on-site amenity and outlook through the use of landscaping and the provision of vegetated green, communal open spaces, careful and building placement that takes into account solar orientation in response and maintenance of privacy.”</i></p> <p><i><u>“f. Developments should be designed to provide an appropriate level of outlook through the way dwellings are arranged and orientated, and the way yards are dimensioned and located.”</u></i></p> <p><i>And;</i></p> <p><i>“g. Development should ensure any integrated common service space that is provided that is readily accessible to the residential units.”</i></p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.30	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures	Support in part	<p>Appendix 15, Table 15-1a.</p> <p>Table 15-1a introduces resident cycle requirements for a range of housing typologies that do not have garages. While the requirement is understandable for apartment buildings (to save residents needing to bring bicycles up stairs or lifts), it is unnecessary for ancillary residential units, single dwellings and duplex dwellings.</p>	Amend Table 15-1a so that the requirement for resident cycle parking for residential activities only applies to Apartment buildings (not ancillary residential units, single dwellings and duplex dwellings).
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg	243.31	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	18-1 Financial Contributions: Calculation methodology and worked examples	Oppose	<p>Appendix 18 Financial Contributions</p> <p>Appendix 18 should be amended to exclude financial contributions from greenfield development for the reasons given in submission 9.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix 18 so that it states that financial contributions are not required in greenfield development areas.</p> <p>Alternatively, amend Appendix 18 so that financial contributions are not required in the Peacocke Precinct.</p>
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244.1	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	General	Support	At the outset, Kirkdale submits that there is broad scope to amend any of the Rototuna Town Centre provisions given that the CDP provisions that are proposed to be removed by PPC12 are a fundamental component of the overall planning framework for the area. The CDP provisions work integrally with the other components of the planning framework (eg Development Areas, Zoning/Purpose of those areas, Development Yields, Indicative Town Centre Layout Plans, etc) such that a change to any one of these components generates consequential amendments to all the others	The CDP provisions work integrally with the other components of the planning framework (eg Development Areas, Zoning/Purpose of those areas, Development Yields, Indicative Town Centre Layout Plans, etc) such that a change to any one of these components generates consequential amendments to all the others
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244.2	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	General	Support	Kirkdale supports the deletion of the CDP requirements for the Rototuna Town Centre. The preparation of the CDP's as required by Operative District Plan provisions has proven to be very costly both financially and in a time sense. In a regulatory sense, the consents necessary to codify the CDP's (particularly for Area A) have proven to be inflexible and inefficient in practice, leading to multiple consent variation applications needing to be made to accommodate the detailed design of buildings within the consented CDP areas.	Retain all amendments in Chapter 13 necessary to delete the CDP requirements.
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale	244.3	Planning Maps	General	Support	Kirkdale supports the extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone in the Rototuna Town Centre (based on the extent of the previous CDP areas allocated for residential development). There is ample open space and community facility provision in the Rototuna Town Centre for Medium	Retain the extent of Medium Density Residential Zone within the Rototuna Town Centre.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Investments Ltd					Density Residential development to be accommodated without detracting from the quality of the environment.	
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 4	Planning Maps	General	Support	Kirkdale supports the exclusion of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay from the land within the Rototuna Town Centre Zone. The infrastructure capacity and requirements for further development of the Rototuna Town Centre are well understood and Kirkdale has in the past and will continue to work with Council to address those requirements.	Retain the exclusion of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay from the land within the Rototuna Town Centre Zone.
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 5	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	General	Support in part	Kirkdale submits that Figures 7-1, 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 in Appendix 7 to the District Plan all need further updating given that the reality of what has been consented and developed in the Rototuna Town Centre, particularly in and around Area A, now bears little resemblance to the structure shown in each of those Figures. Kirkdale notes that the planning maps have been updated to reflect the actual road network now in place which means that without being updated Figures 7-1 to 7-4 will be inconsistent with the planning maps. It is important that Figures 7-1 to 7-4 are accurate as their current inaccuracy has created unnecessary difficulties in consenting processes in the Rototuna Town Centre. As part of updating Figures 7-1 to 7-4 the Primary, Secondary and Retail Frontage notations should be reviewed in terms of their ongoing appropriateness.	Update Figures 7-1, 7-2, 7-3 and 7-4 in Appendix 7 including review of Primary, Secondary and Retail Frontage notations to reflect the actual location of the roading network and consented development in the Rototuna Town Centre.
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 6	Appendix 2 Structure Plans	General		Kirkdale also submits that as part of the update of Figures 7-1 to 7-4 the extent of community facility notation in the Rototuna Town Centre should be reduced. Given that the town centre will soon contain an operating library/community hub, an adjacent aquatic centre has been consented and is currently being funded, and the fact that The Peak recreation centre at Rototuna High School allows for community use, there is ample community facility provision in the Rototuna Town Centre. Further, allowing for Retail 2 development in the area shown below would mean that a viable retail development would be possible in that area, as the adjoining area of Retail 2 on Kirkdale owned land is too small for a viable retail development. The area sought for Retail 1 set out below is a small parcel of land that has been left over following the formation of Korikori Green and access into the Hamilton Christian School. The parcel adjoins land to be zoned Medium Density Residential and has proven to be too small to be viable for development of a community facility, but would lend itself well to a small retail/commercial development that could be established in line with Retail 1 provisions.	Alter the extent of Community Facility notation in the Rototuna Town Centre as shown in their submission.
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 7	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.2 Objectives and Policies: Rototuna Town Centre Zone	Support in part	Kirkdale is concerned that the new wording introduced to the objective is so all encompassing and aspirational that it will be very difficult for any development to be assessed as consistent with the objective. Given the role of objectives in the planning framework, particularly where non-complying activity assessments are required, it is important that objective wording is clear and directive. Kirkdale submits that the objective would be more efficient and effective if the proposed additional wording was deleted	Amend Objective 13.2.6 to read as follows: <i>Development of compact, well designed, and functional residential developments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</i>
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 8	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	Kirkdale is concerned that the wording of Objective 23.2.3 and Policy 23.2.3a is not consistent with the removal of the CDP requirements in the Rototuna Town Centre Zone, and as a result the retention of the proposed wording will create confusion in the consenting process.	Amend Objective 23.2.3 to read as follows: <i>High and Medium Density Residential Zones (excluding Rotokauri North) and Rototuna Town Centre areas are developed comprehensively.</i> Amend Policy 23.2.3a to read as follows: <i>Subdivision that creates additional allotments in the Medium Density Residential Zone (excluding Rotokauri North) or the Rototuna Town Centre Zone does not occur without an approved Comprehensive Development Plan or Land Development Consents for Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes.</i>
Kirkdale Investments Ltd - . Kirkdale Investments Ltd	244. 9	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.6.8 Subdivision in the Medium-Density Resident	Support in part	Kirkdale submits that the retention of clause e. in Rule 23.6.8 is inappropriate and unnecessary given that clause a. that it refers to is to be deleted.	Delete clause e. of Rule 23.6.8

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			ial Zones and Rototuna Town Centre Zone (excluding Rotokauri North Medium Density Residential Zone)			
Robert Hermann	245.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter supports growth of community hubs, particularly if the centre is well established with local shopping, schools and workplaces. The submitter seeks focus on these areas rather than allowing a scattering of developments across the city. The submitter questions Council's role in managing developers consideration of consequential impacts such as school roles.	That Higher density areas should only be allowed within 400m of established suburban centres; and In an existing suburb there should be no more than 2 units per residential street as a permitted activity.
Robert Hermann	245.2	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter believes people still want vehicles and has considers road congestion will become an issue, with on-street parking impacting emergency and service vehicle access.	Conduct traffic modelling including parking congestion based on a minimum of 3 cars per unit is required for a development of this type.
Robert Hermann	245.3	25.13 Three Waters	General		The submitter asks how Council will cover the coast of storm water devices and how realistic rainwater re-use tanks are and if this will make a difference to water use. The submitter considers water meters a better method of conservation.	That Multi story developments are required to install domestic water meters and user charges are applied to these properties; Or The water supply component of the rates is increased for multi story developments to offset ongoing costs.
Robert Hermann	245.4	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General		The submitter believes developers should pay for developments and that operational costs should be factored into any financial contributions.	That financial contributions need to include a calculation for ongoing operational costs.
Robert Hermann	245.5	General	General		The submitter does not feel that the Council has gone far enough in the proposed Plan Change 12 changes. The submitter is concerned about adhoc and unplanned intensification, and the impacts of intensification on existing land owners, noise, traffic and water issues. The submitter considers the policy to enable developers who develop the property to move on and not live there.	No specific relief sought.
Tony Cleland	246.1	General	General		The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 believing it has ties to UN Agenda 2030 and will not improve citizens quality of life. The submitter considers multi storey high density housing leads to future city squalor and reduces sunlight.	That HCC reject this governments Act and not implement Proposed Plan Change 12.
Alison Bell	247.1	General	General		The submitter does not agree with the plan of having multi-storey properties across the city without consultation. The submitter believes that not providing garages or parking spaces for high density housing does not mean those living in the property won't have a car.	Reject the NPS and throw out PC12.
Alison Bell	247.2	General	General	Oppose	Reject all changes.	Reject all changes.
Alison Bell	247.3	25.14 Transportati on	General	Oppose	The submitter considers most Hamiltonians want to travel by private car and seeks the Council give up social engineering for public transport and cycleways.	Cancel PC12.
Gerard Kelly	248.1	3.6 Rotokauri	3.6.1 Objectives and Policies	Support	The submitter supports policy 3.6.1.1a.	That Objective 3.6.1.1 be implemented.
Gerard Kelly	248.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.1.	Implement Objective 4.1.2.1.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Residential Zones			
Gerard Kelly	248.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.2 and its policies.	Implement Objective 4.1.2.2 and its policies.
Gerard Kelly	248.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.3.	Implement Objective 4.1.2.3.
Gerard Kelly	248.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.6.	That Objective 4.1.2.6 be implemented.
Gerard Kelly	248.6	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	The submitter supports 25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation. Integrated Transport Network 25.14.2.1 Policy Climate Change 25.14.2.1b.	Council adopt the objective of Integrated Transport Network 25.14.2.1, specifically Climate Change 25.14.2.1b with the amendment that there is the establishment and maintenance of a continuous tree canopy along transport corridors
Gerard Kelly	248.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter seeks amendment to Objective 9.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting.	The submitter seeks amendment to Objective 9.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas.
Gerard Kelly	248.8	25.15 Urban Design	General		The submitter seeks policies for urban design that emphasise the use of New Zealand native plants and tree species.	The submitter seeks policies for urban design that emphasise the use of New Zealand native plants and tree species.
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter is generally supportive of the overall direction of PC12 and intent to grow development in Hamilton City sustainably. The submitter also sees PC12 as an opportunity to align with their own plans to provide additional Medium Density Residential land through the Te Awa Lakes project.</p> <p>However, the submitter notes that PC12 amends references to Land Development Plans (LDP) and Comprehensive Development Plans (CDP) instead replacing them with reference to ‘land use’ or ‘resource’ consents. As the submitter has an approved LDP in place as part of their project, they have concerns that sporadic removal of this term from the HCC ODP may create conflict for future use. Additionally, the submitter notes they have previously discussed movement of the Major Facilities Zone on their project site with HCC in order to develop this area as Medium Density Residential to enable the full effect of NPS-UD.</p> <p>(Further detail from the attached submission document specific to particular provisions of PC12 is captured in the below submission points).</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that HCC ensures no conflict is created for future use of approved Land Development Plans (LDP) given this term's removal from the ODP under PC12 and replacement with "land use/resource" consents.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that several other specific aspects of provisions within PC12 are amended. These changes are summarized in Attachment A (Page 15) as well as summarized through the following submission points. Additionally, the submitter seeks further or other consequential relief as may be required to give effect to this submission, including consequential amendments to the HCC ODP that address the matters raised.</p>
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa	249.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter notes the zoning shown in Figure 2.1a is out of date.	The submitter seeks that Figure 2.1a: Hamilton at a Glance is updated through PC12 to reflect the current zoning of Te Awa, and the City of Hamilton.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited						
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.3	3.8 Te Awa Lakes	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part the revised provisions of PC12 but requests that additional provisions are added to Chapter 3.8 to provide for appropriately dense mixed-use development in the project area. The submitter considers that these provisions would ensure appropriate above ground residential development along the northern side of Hutchinson Road to realize its vibrant mixed-use center, in alignment with the intent of PC12 to provide densely populated community centres.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that the prohibited activity status set out in Rule 3.8.5.5a is overly prescriptive and onerous, noting that should the need arise to change the staging of development it is prudent to ensure this can be done in an agile manner responding to market conditions (i.e. through a resource consent process) rather than a plan change process.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendment of provisions within Chapter 3.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 3.8.1.4 c. Ensure that residential activities in the Business 6 zone are setback or <u>appropriately acoustically treated</u> from Hutchinson Road. Provision 3.8.2.3. To minimise the potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing industrial activities, residential activities are <u>appropriately acoustically treated</u> when they are setback at least 25m <u>or less</u> from Hutchinson Road. Rule 3.8.5.5a. Any resource consent not in accordance with Rule 3.8.5.2.a is a prohibited <u>non-complying</u> activity
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.4	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter generally support the Medium Density Residential Zone which applies to the majority of their project area. However the submitter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> considers that it should be clearly stated where the Te Awa Lakes specific objectives supersede the general objectives outlined in section 4.3.2.2 to avoid doubt. opposes the current activity statuses for Rules 4.3.3.1iii, jjj, kkk and III as the specific development requirements in areas within their project site should mirror the activity status of the same specific requirements for the Residential Precincts. The submitters note that the difference in activity status is related a previous design feature (Area Q and R waterbody/dam, page 10) which has been refined in the LDP process and no longer presents the perceived risk that the original design was seen to have. oppose the current form of Rules 4.3.3 eee, ffff, ggg, hhh, iii, jjj, kkk and III and question how large-scale, comprehensive development (i.e. their Te Awa Lakes project) can comply with these impractical unlimited provisions and avoid notification (limited and public) being triggered. supports the inclusion of the River Interface Overlay under section 4.3.4.16 as it provides a sensitive response to development that directly interfaces with the Waikato River. However, the submitter opposes the minimum allotment size for the river face allotments as these are already set out in the Te Awa Lakes Structure Plan and LDP. opposes the 8m height limit under Rule 4.3.4.16 b. as they do not believe it supports the direction of PC12 to grow up. supports the inclusion of section 4.3.4.17 as they believe this inclusion directly aligns with the intent of PC12 and the complex housing issues currently faced by Hamilton City and New Zealand. considers that the intent of section 4.3.4.19a. is unclear and opposes its inclusion 	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendment of provisions within Chapter 4.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Objective 4.3.2.2. The Medium Density Residential Zone and development within it <u>excluding development at Te Awa Lakes which is provided for in 4.3.2.4</u> provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Housing needs and demand; and ii. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including 3 to 5 storey buildings. Amend Rules 4.3.3.1iii, jjj, kkk and III. activity status amended from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary. Insert <u>Rule 4.3.3.2v. Development of Te Awa Lakes site that infringes rules 4.3.3eee, fff, ggg, hhh, iii, jjj, kkk, III will not trigger limited or public notification.</u> Deletion of Rule 4.3.4.16 a. The minimum area of land (net site area) required in respect of each residential unit adjoining any existing or proposed esplanade reserve adjacent to the Waikato River shall be 1,000m². Amend Rule 4.3.4.16 b. The maximum height of a building or structure is 8m the same as the General Residential Zone building height (see 4.2.5.4a). Insert <u>Rule 4.3.4.16 e. The Medium Density Zone rules in 4.3.3.1d, 4.3.3.1e and 4.3.3.1f shall apply.</u> Deletion of Rule 4.3.4.19 a. Resource consent applications for activities listed in a) 4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table—Development Activities—Te Awa Lakes Development Areas Q and R shall be obtained for the entire development (which may be staged) of not less than one of the Development Areas in Figure 2-21, together with any adjacent Development Areas or parts of Development Areas, in conjunction with land use, subdivision and development under any rule of the Medium Density Residential Zone.
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint	249.5	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the application of the Business 6 Zone – Neighbourhood Centre being applied to the mixed-use precinct of their project site, alongside the change of activity status to permit apartments above ground floor. However, the submitter expresses some concern with the current permitted activity status of height, general bulk, and location of the MDRZ which adjoins this area and requests several changes (captured below).</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendment of provisions within Chapter 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 6.4.1d. - Increase of the permitted building height for the Business 6 Zone to 15m so to meet or exceed the expected height in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Rule 6.4.4 - Increase of the building intensity building intensity applying to the Business 6 Zone to 2:1 to accommodate dense and affordable development options in neighbourhood centres.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.4.3 e. - That the setback of residential development to Hutchinson Road be amended as outlined to require appropriate acoustic treatment of habitable rooms of residential dwellings if they are located within 25m of Hutchinson Road
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.6	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes Standard 23.6.8d for Subdivision in the Medium-Density Residential Zones, as this is another provision implemented by HCC regarding the lake/dam which was resolved through the project LDP.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes the requirement for a minimum allotment size (1,200m²) for vacant allotments in the MDRZ as they believe this will stifle the intent of enabling growth and is inconsistent with the existing LDP as mentioned.</p> <p>The submitter supports retaining the 15m diameter circle for a minimum shape factor.</p>	<p>Deletion rule 23.6.8d</p> <p>Amend rule 23.7.1b as follows: 'Vacant Lot - Medium Density Residential Zone (Except within the Rotokauri North Residential Precinct the Rule 23.7.1q applies <u>and the Te Awa Lakes Residential Precincts then Rule 23.7.1p applies</u>) = 1200m2'</p> <p>Amend rule 23.7.1p as follows: 'Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct lots that adjoin any existing or proposed esplanade reserve adjacent to the Waikato River (River Interface Overlay). <u>To avoid doubt, a minimum vacant lot size does not apply to all other Residential Precincts in Te Awa Lakes = 1000m2 n/a</u>'</p>
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.7	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the current financial contributions chapter does not clearly outline if/when financial contributions will be required.	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendment of provisions within Chapter 24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amended wording in Chapter 24: But shall exclude any infrastructure works otherwise funded via Council's Development Contribution Policy <u>including sites outside of the Infrastructure Overlay area and/or for comprehensively developed Structure Plan areas where there are negotiated development contributions agreements in place with the Council.</u> Insert <u>Rule 24.3.1 a. vi. Financial contributions will not be required to be paid in respect of amenity or Te Ture Whaimana in respect of the Te Awa Lakes precinct, which is a master planned community which creates positive amenity effects; and gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana, including for betterment.</u> Insert <u>Rule 24.4.2 b. iv. Financial contributions will not be required to be paid in respect of amenity or Te Ture Whaimana for residential development in the Te Awa Lakes precinct, which is a master planned community which creates positive amenity effects; and gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana, including for betterment.</u> Insert <u>Rule 24.4.3 b. iii. Financial contributions will not be required to be paid in respect of Te Ture Whaimana for non-residential development in the Te Awa Lakes precinct, which is a master planned community which creates positive amenity effects; and gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana, including for betterment.</u>
Aurecon New Zealand Ltd - Melissa Needham Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture, Perry Group and Horotiu Farms Limited	249.8	Planning Maps	General		The submitter considers that it is appropriate to rezone a portion of their site from the Major Facilities Zone to Medium Density Residential, and notes that this aligns with provisions of the NPSUD.	Rezone the 'HEN' site (Figure 6 of submission) from Major Facilities Zone to Medium Density Residential, and any consequential amendments including the rezoning of the 'HES' site from Te Rapa North Industrial Zone – Deferred Industrial Zone to Major Facilities Zone and complimentary commercial and light industrial zones.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri	250.1	3.6 Rotokauri	3.6.1 Objectives and Policies	Support	The submitter supports the rewording of Objective 3.6.1.1 to remove topography as a characteristic of Rotokauri which needs to be preserved and support the removal of Policy 3.6.1.1a that requires development to maintain the natural ridgelines.	<p>Delete 'and topography' from Objective 3.6.1.1 of the District Plan.</p> <p>Delete Policy 3.6.1.1a from the District Plan.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Developme nt Limited						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 2	3.6 Rotokauri	3.6.2 Structur e Plan Compon ents	Support	The submitter supports the removal of two of the distinct residential environments under 3.6.2.2 of the Structure Plan components. This includes Lake Waiwhakareke Landscape Character Area and the Ridgeline Character Area.	Delete Structure Plan Components 3.6.2.2a(i) and (ii) from the District Plan.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 3	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the rezoning from Industrial, General Residential, Medium Density Residential and Special Natural under the Operative District Plan (ODP), to Industrial, General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones under PC12.	Remove Special Natural Zone.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 4	Planning Maps	General	Support	The site has been excluded from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	Retain the exclusion of the Rotokauri area from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 5	DELETED 4.6 Rules – General Standards – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.6.2 Develop ment Yield	Support	The submitter supports the deletion of: Rule 4.6.2, referencing the maximum development yield for Rotokauri, has been deleted which aligns with the NPS-UD.	Delete Rule 4.6.2.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports the overall purpose of Chapter 4 – Residential Zones to create a compact City and deliver higher density development.	No specific relief requested
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 7	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports the addition of notification rules (Rule 4.2.4 and Rule 4.3.3.2).	Retain Rule 4.2.4 and 4.3.3.2.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri	250. 8	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion	Oppose	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.	Subsequent submission points 7a-7e outlines the specific relief sought in relation to each item of Table 1.2.2.5b with feedback. Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment overall to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for the assessment. For example, the requirement for information would be required for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Developme nt Limited			Require ments			
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 9	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion Require ments	Oppose	Re: 1.2.2.5b, item ii, the term ‘appropriately service’ needs to be clearly defined for better interpretation to all audiences. Programme, cost and timing questions arise if there is lack of clarity regarding Three Waters infrastructure capacity.	The submitter seeks clarification to understand how Council will administrate this requirement and, to define ‘appropriately service’.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 10	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion Require ments	Oppose	The requirements of table 1.2.2.5b, item (iii) will likely cause delays and inefficiencies as there is no outline on how applicants can source this information	Clarification to understand how Council proposes for an applicant to source the required information details. If Council is required to support the provision of this information, we seek confirmation that this will be provided efficiently and in a timely manner. Delete iii(c) as an assessment of possible mitigation measures is required under Section 95E and 104 of the RMA. Clarification of iii(d) as the capacity of infrastructure catchments vary significantly in size and it is unclear if this requirement will be relevant to minor proposals.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 11	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion Require ments	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose the inclusion of consultation but suggests an amendment to include a threshold to trigger its requirement (e.g., concurrent land use and subdivision resource consent for less than 40 lots would not require consultation with Council).	Clarification to understand how Council proposes to administrate this consultation and confirmation that it will occur in an efficient and timely manner. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council. Define ‘outcomes’. Clarification as to whether a response or resolution from Council is required before an application process.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 12	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion Require ments	Oppose	RE: Table <i>1.1.2.5b, item vi</i> , the submitter suggests that this is an over-complex requirement for small scale development and a threshold trigger put in place e.g., the requirements for details on the associated demands on downstream infrastructure for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds, this information could be better provided via a cumulative effects assessment.	Define ‘down stream infrastructure’. Amend Table <i>1.1.2.5b, item vi</i> to remove the requirements for details on ‘associated demands on downstream infrastructure’. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 13	1.2 Information Requiremen ts	1.2.2 Addition al Informat ion Require ments	Oppose	Re: Table 1.1.2.5b, item x, Targets and performance indicators allowing for monitoring of the proposal’s compliance should be considered on a site-by-site basis and can be managed through conditions of consent and not be a requirement for minor development. This requirement could be replaced with a threshold trigger.	Oppose Table 1.1.2.5b, item x.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Developme nt Limited	250. 14	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeu vring Areas – Tables and Figures	Support in part	Rule 25.14.4.2.v(ii) and 25.14.4.2.w both refer to Figure 15.1aa in Volume 2, Appendix 15-1, however, this cannot be found.	Clarification as to which figure in the District Plan is Figure 15.1aa.
Barker and Associates - Fraser	250. 15	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General	Oppose	The submitter requires clarity regarding Rule 25.14.4.2b to understand the level of charging facility required to be provided and the administration for in shared parking scenarios. Clarity is needed	The submitter seeks amendment to Rule 25.14.4.2b to provide options for different typologies.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
McNutt and Grace Forno Rotokauri Development Limited			Standards		regarding electricity costs, usage accountability, and possible electric vehicle ownership. The submitter does not believe the current wording is implementable or practical.	
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.1	3.6 Rotokauri	3.6.1 Objectives and Policies	Support	The submitter supports: the rewording of Objective 3.6.1.1 to remove topography as a characteristic of Rotokauri which needs to be preserved. The removal of Policy 3.6.1.1a that required development to maintain the natural ridgelines.	The submitter supports the deletion of ‘ <i>and topography</i> ’ from Objective 3.6.1.1 of the District Plan and the deletion of Policy 3.6.1.1a from the District Plan.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the rezoning of Industrial, General Residential, Medium Density Residential and Special Natural under the Operative District Plan (ODP), to Industrial, General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones under PC12.	The submitter supports the removal of Special Natural Zone.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.3	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	The submitter supports the exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.4	DELETED 4.6 Rules – General Standards – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.6.2 Development Yield	Support	The submitter supports the deletion of <i>Rule 4.6.2</i> , referencing the maximum development yield for Rotokauri and mentions the alignment with the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD as it removes additional development restrictions and enables higher density residential development.	The submitter supports the deletion of Rule 4.6.2.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports the overall purpose of Chapter 4 – Residential Zones to create a compact City and deliver higher density development.	No relief sought.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification		The submitter supports the introduction of notification Rule 4.2.4.	Seeks the retention of notified Rule 4.2.4.
Barker and Associates - Fraser	251.7	4.3 Medium Density	4.3.3.2 Rules –	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of notification Rule 4.3.3.2.	Seeks the retention of notified Rule 4.3.3.2.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited		Residential Zone	Notificat ion			
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.8	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter suggests a threshold trigger is appropriate regarding the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for applications e.g., greater than 40 lots in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.	The submitter suggests: Subsequent submission points 7a-7e outlines the specific relief sought in relation to each item of Table 1.2.2.5b with feedback. Amend the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment overall to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for the assessment. For example, the requirement for information would be required for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.9	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	1.2.2.5b, item ii, the term ‘appropriately service’ needs to be clearly defined for better interpretation to all audiences. Programme, cost and timing questions arise if there is lack of clarity regarding Three Waters infrastructure capacity.	The submitter seeks clarity to understand how Council will administrate this requirement and to Define ‘appropriately service’.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.10	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The requirements of table 1.2.2.5b, item (iii) will likely cause delays and inefficiencies as there is no outline on how applicants can source this information	The submitter seeks clarification to understand how Council proposes for an applicant to source the required information details. If Council is required to support the provision of this information, they seek confirmation that this will be provided efficiently and in a timely manner. Delete iii(c) as an assessment of possible mitigation measures is required under Section 95E and 104 of the RMA.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.11	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter does not oppose the inclusion of consultation but suggests an amendment to include a threshold to trigger its requirement (e.g., concurrent land use and subdivision resource consent for less than 40 lots would not require consultation with Council).	The submitter seeks: - Clarification to understand how Council proposes to administrate this consultation and confirmation that it will occur in an efficient and timely manner. - Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council. - Define ‘outcomes’. - Clarification as to whether a response or resolution from Council is required before an application process.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.12	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements		Table 1.1.2.5b, item vi, the submitter suggests that this is an over-complex requirement for small scale development and a threshold trigger put in place e.g., the requirements for details on the associated demands on downstream infrastructure for applications greater than 40 lots, in accordance with the current ICMP thresholds, this information could be better provided via a cumulative effects assessment.	The submitter seeks: Define ‘down stream infrastructure’. Amend Table 1.1.2.5b, item vi to remove the requirements for details on ‘associated demands on downstream infrastructure’. Amendment to include a threshold to trigger the requirement for consultation with Council.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.13	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	Table 1.1.2.5b, item x, Targets and performance indicators allowing for monitoring of the proposal’s compliance should be considered on a site-by-site basis and can be managed through conditions of consent and not be a requirement for minor development. This requirement could be replaced with a threshold trigger.	The submitter opposes Table 1.1.2.5b, item x.
Barker and Associates - Fraser	251.14	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General	Oppose	The submitter cannot identify figure 15.1aa in Volume 2, Appendix 15-1 as it makes reference to both Rule 25.14.4.2.v(ii) and 25.14.4.2.w.	The submitter seeks clarity regarding which figure in the District Plan is Figure 15.1aa.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited			Standards			
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.15	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter requires clarity regarding Rule 25.14.4.2b to understand the level of charging facility required to be provided and the administration for in shared parking scenarios. Clarity is needed regarding electricity costs, usage accountability, and possible electric vehicle ownership. The submitter does not believe the current wording is implementable or practical.	The submitter seeks the amendment of Rule 25.14.4.2b to provide options for different typologies. For example, an apartment building with shared access and/or parking facilities could alternatively provide 1 electric charging point for every 2 parking spaces. Further clarification with regard to this rule is sought.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.16	3.6 Rotokauri	3.6.2 Structure Plan Components	Support	The submitter supports the deletion of two the distinct residential environments in Rule 3.6.2.2 i. and ii.	Retain the deletions in Rule 3.6.2.2 a. i. and ii. as notified.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.17	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part PC12 because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PC12 appropriately amends the Rotokauri Structure Plan to enable urban development, with the removal of restrictions in relation to topography. 2. Retaining the Medium Density Residential zoning of the area to enable delivery of future residential development. 3. PC12 amends the information requirements of the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment to be more appropriate and practical, particularly considering the need for efficient and timely housing supply. 	Seeks the general relief is addressed and necessary changes are incorporated; and any further consequential amendments are made to achieve the general and specific relief sought.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt and Grace Forno Hounsell Holdings Limited	251.18	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not support the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that the overlay is being used as a tool to restrict, reduce and delay residential development. • The section 32 Evaluation Report is inadequate. • As notified the requirements for capacity assessments are broad and ambiguous. • Concerns regarding how this will be administered • The assessment will be expensive and timely. 	<p>Seeks the amendment of the Three Waters Capacity Assessment to include a suitable threshold to trigger the requirement for the assessment.</p> <p>Any further necessary consequential amendments to achieve the general and specific feedback in the submission.</p>
Michael Webb	252.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose		<p>The submitter considers that people do not walk to the edge of the CBD but to a more central area. The section regarding the ‘Visitor Facilities Precinct’ bears no relationship or similarity to the area on the East side of the river which is currently totally residential. A big relief that resource consent is required. The submitter considers 4.4.1.5 a word salad and really does not advance its purpose.</p> <p>The submitter notes that there are geotechnical requirements beside the Waikato River regarding the flood hazard areas, Gully Hazard areas and the Waikato River stability to address which would compromise any large development; and therefore questions designating this area as a HDRZ. The submitter also notes the wastewater main, and hilly nature of this area.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about the loss of inner city aesthetics and impact on infrastructure such as waste water, road parking, traffic and safety.</p>	Amend the plan to designate this area as a General Residential Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
David Platts	253.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers there to be a lack of understanding on the impacts of the changes on any adjacent properties from intensification. The submitter considers that current intensification is having detrimental effects. The submitter considers a blanket approach to intensification could lead to significant and detrimental effects effects at a micro level. The submitter objects to the plan considering it does not offer any protections to property owners concerning loss of amenity and degeneration of their natural and lived environment.	That there is more consultation with affected communities; and That the plans as tabled be put on hold until significant changes delivering more protections to individual property owners and the environment are added.
David Platts	253.2	25.14 Transportati on	General		The submitter has concern over the increased capacity projected for dwellings. The submitter considers the current NZ infrastructure and transport amenities is inadequate at this time to support the decisions that parking spaces will not be required and considers developments will lead to significant on street parking and the resultant congestion.	No specific relief sought.
David Platts	253.3	General	General		The submitter has concern on the impact of taller buildings on natural light, solar efficiencies.	Revise the plan to deliver many more individual protections to protect the character of Hamilton.
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marelize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marelize Durandt	254.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 4.2.5.7(d) Boundary Fences and Walls requirement for retaining walls to be stepped in to increase visual amenity but considers the 1m step-in is excessive and that a smaller stepped-depth with landscaping will provide a better visual outcome with less impact on the loss of onsite land use for residents.	Seeks the amendment of Rule 4.2.5.7(d) by reducing the step-in to 0.5m and require landscaping to mitigate visual effects.
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marelize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marelize Durandt	254.2	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 25.14.4.1(h) as the current widths in the ODP are sufficient.	Seeks amendment of 25.14.4.1(h) - Crossing width Residential Zone as follows: Single dwelling = 3.0m - 5.5m 1-6 units = 3.0m - 5.5m 7 units and more = 5.5m - 6m
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marelize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marelize Durandt	254.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 4.2.5.13 c. but considers an option of not having to provide parking as parking is not required should be allowed. Also considers that the wording needs to be consistent with b.	Amend 4.2.5.13 c. by adding the wording "maximum can be provided"
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marelize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marelize Durandt	254.4	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposed the requirement in Rule 25.14.4.3a for a Travel Plan for all apartment developments as this is excessive and unreasonable for smaller scale developments particularly infill development with existing public infrastructure. The submitter also states that the time element and review of Travel Plans is unknown and will be difficult to to control and it is unclear how this will be managed.	Seeks the deletion of 25.14.4.3a i. - v. and replaced with a requirement only for for large scale developments of more than 20 units.
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and	254.5	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General	Oppose	The submitter opposed the requirement in Rule 25.14.4.3a for a Travel Plan for all apartment developments as this is excessive and unreasonable for smaller scale developments particularly infill development with existing public infrastructure. The submitter also states that the time	Seeks the amendment of Rule 25.14.4.3 - a to only require a Travel Plan where a Broad Transport Assessment is required

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt			Standards		element and review of Travel Plans is unknown and will be difficult to to control and it is unclear how this will be managed.	
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt	254.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 4.2.5.14 a. as the notified dimensions will have a significant impact on the design as it reduces internal living spaces, The submitter supports the creation of visually interesting buildings but considers a lesser degree of the proposed dimensions will also achieve the intent without compromising internal layout.	Amend Rule 4.2.5.14 a. as follows: "No wall or roofline which is parallel to or up to an angle of 30 degrees to any external boundary except the road frontage shall exceed 15m in length without there being a step in (or out), of at least 0.5m depth and 3m in length."
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt	254.7	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 23.7.3 General Residential as the 4m and 16.8m seem excessive and will reduce the useable net site area for allotments without necessarily resulting in better access.	Amend Rule 23.7.3 General Residential as follows: (e) 1-6 units = 3.6m Add: 7-14 units (fee simple) = 12m Add: 15 units and above (fee simple) = 16.8m
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt	254.8	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 23.7.4 Medium Density as the 4m and 16.8m seem excessive and will reduce the useable net site area for allotments without necessarily resulting in better access.	Amend Rule 23.7.4 Medium Density as follows: (i) 1-6 allotments = 3.6m Add: 7-14 units/ allotments (fee simple) = 12m Add: 15 units/allotments and above (fee simple) = 16.8m
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt	254.9	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.5 High Density Residential Zone		The submitter supports in part Rule 23.7.5 as the 4m and 16.8m seem excessive and will reduce the useable net site area for allotments without necessarily resulting in better access. The submitter also considers that flexibility is require in the High Density Zone for fee simple lots without requiring the access to vest as road.	Amend Rule 23.7.5 High Density as follows: (c) 1-4 allotments = 3.6m (e) 15 allotments and more (fee simple) = 16.8m [see point 10] Add: 7-14 allotments (fee simple) = 12m
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd	254.10	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.5 High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 23.7.5 as the 4m and 16.8m seem excessive and will reduce the useable net site area for allotments without necessarily resulting in better access. The submitter also considers that flexibility is require in the High Density Zone for fee simple lots without requiring the access to vest as road.	Amend Rule 23.7.5 High Density as follows: (c) 1-4 allotments = 3.6m [see point 9] (e) 15 allotments and more (fee simple) = 16.8m Add: 7-14 allotments (fee simple) = 12m

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
- Marlize Durandt						
Landform Surveys Ltd - Dan McDaid and Marlize Durandt Landform Surveys Ltd - Marlize Durandt	254.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 4.2.5.3 c. d. but considers the requirement for trees is excessive.	Amend Rule 4.2.5.3 c. d. as follows: i. Detached residential unit = 1 tree ii. Duplex dwelling = 1 per unit or 2 per duplex
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (Brian Croad)	255.1	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the inclusion of new provisions to ensure the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected but also wants to ensure that the new provisions are logical, unambiguous and provided in a way that is practical to implement and achieves the purpose of the RMA, NPS UD and Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa Waikato (Vision and Strategy).</p> <p>The submitter also considers that statement in the S32A Report where the elevation of costs and benefits of the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Overlay and TWCA identifies that <i>“Applicants will incur the costs of a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment report. This will not be dissimilar to the current costs of a Water Impact Assessment; however, the applicability will be broadened to also apply to developments of 1-3 residential units in the Overlay that are at a density of more than 1 per 150-200m2 (zone dependent).”</i> is flawed on the basis that specific provisions proposed within the Three Waters Chapter under PC12 are ambiguous and unnecessary.</p>	The submitter seeks that Council ensures the provisions and rules proposed within Section 25.13 Three Waters Chapter under PC12 are clear, directive and understandable to ensure that while the provisions and rules proposed ensure health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected. They also are efficient, clear and direct to enable good development that do not incur additional costs addressing ambiguous and extraneous provisions/ information requests.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (Brian Croad)	255.2	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The submitter considers that the matters/ information required within a TWCA and WIA under PC12 give the notion that these assessments will ensure developments address their water usage and address any adverse effects on the Waikato River Health through mitigation methods detailed as “Water Saving Techniques”. Though, a review of the individual matters for both the provisions within the Three Water rules, TWCA information required and WIA information required identified ambiguity, inconsistencies and extraneous provisions.	<p>The submitter seeks that Council ensures that the provisions and rules proposed within Section 25.13 Three Waters Chapter under PC12 are clear, directive and understandable to ensure that while the provisions and rules proposed ensure health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected. They also are efficient, clear and direct to enable good development that do not incur additional costs addressing ambiguous and extraneous provisions/ information requests.</p> <p>The submitter specifically seeks clarification regarding the inclusion of Item (iv) within table 1.2.2.5a is included within the Water Impact Assessment criteria when the benefits of having specific water-sensitive techniques for residential and non-residential developments has been determined through the 32A analysis.</p>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (Brian Croad)	255.3	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that the matters/ information required within a TWCA and WIA under PC12 give the notion that these assessments will ensure developments address their water usage and address any adverse effects on the Waikato River Health through mitigation methods detailed as “Water Saving Techniques”. Though, a review of the individual matters for both the provisions within the Three Water rules, TWCA information required and WIA information required identified ambiguity, inconsistencies and extraneous provisions.</p> <p>Specifically Rule 25.13.4.5 Water Conservation Measures details three types of water sensitive techniques yet the proposed definition of water sensitive techniques is long and arduous. The rule/provision of water sensitive techniques does not correlate with the proposed definition which provides ambiguity.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Council ensures that the provisions and rules proposed within Section 25.13 Three Waters Chapter under PC12 are clear, directive and understandable to ensure that while the provisions and rules proposed ensure health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected. They also are efficient, clear and direct to enable good development that do not incur additional costs addressing ambiguous and extraneous provisions/ information requests.</p> <p>Seeks clarification on the differences of water sensitive techniques within Rule 25.13.4.5 and the definition.</p>
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (Brian Croad)	255.4	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that the matters/ information required within a TWCA and WIA under PC12 give the notion that these assessments will ensure developments address their water usage and address any adverse effects on the Waikato River Health through mitigation methods detailed as “Water Saving Techniques”. Though, a review of the individual matters for both the provisions within the Three Water rules, TWCA information required and WIA information required identified ambiguity, inconsistencies and extraneous provisions.</p> <p>Specially the use of the term ‘Appropriately Service’ within Table 1.2.2.5a (Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment) item (ii) is another ambiguous term which provides no</p>	The submitter seeks that Council ensures that the provisions and rules proposed within Section 25.13 Three Waters Chapter under PC12 are clear, directive and understandable to ensure that while the provisions and rules proposed ensure health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected. They also are efficient, clear and direct to enable good development that do not incur additional costs addressing ambiguous and extraneous provisions/ information requests.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					certainty of clear direction and is reliant on Council to agree that a development is ‘Appropriately Serviced’	
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (298 Ruakura Road)	256.1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed zoning as it aligns to the current and future plans by TGH.	Retain zoning as notified.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (298 Ruakura Road)	256.2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	The site remains excluded from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	257.1	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for developers to pay both financial AND development contributions because this will drive up the price to buy new homes.	Remove the requirement for developers to pay both financial AND development contributions.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn	257.2	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for developers to pay both financial AND development contributions because this will drive up the price to buy new homes.	Remove the requirement for developers to pay both financial AND development contributions.
Tim Li	258.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support	The submitter supports the purpose for the High Density Residential Zone because the city should not the expended more widely, but rather there is a need to focus to build our central city.	No specific relief sought.
Tim Li	258.2	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support	The submitter supports Chapter 7 Central City Zone because Hamilton should have a better city central that is fill up with everything.	No specific relief sought.
Robyn Aimer	259.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter has concern over the type of units being built and suitability for different groups of people such as single parents. They have concern for the management of rubbish, parking and damaged trees when development is not managed.	Council provide approved development types; and Limit the number of bedsit type town houses; and Implement a requirement for accessibility in a given proportion of developments; and Requirement for futureproof, adaptable housing types
Robyn Aimer	259.2	General	General		The submitter wishes to see NZ natives given priority in suburban areas. No more pin-oaks.	Submitter would like to see NZ natives given priority, and planted where-ever possible in suburban areas.
Robyn Aimer	259.3	25.14 Transportation	General		The submitter seeks more traffic management of speeds, parking and clear pedestrian and cycle ways in high density areas.	More traffic management in high density areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Kathryn & Jessica Drew & Gilby-Todd East Street Property Trust Limited	260.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	This submission relates to 14,359m² of land, held in three registered titles (as per Figure 1of their submission), located on the south-eastern corner of Peachgrove Road and East Street. The parcels have a legal address of 164 and 174 Peachgrove Road, Claudelands. The specific elements of PC12 that the submission relates to is the zoning of the site in relation to its proximity from Five Cross Roads - the nearest suburban centre. The specific provisions that ESPT Ltd opposes and seek amendment to relates to the underlying zoning of the three registered titles noted above. The General Residential zoning is too restrictive for this site, having regard to the site characteristics and its location relative to Five Cross Roads suburban centre, public transport opportunities, schooling, open space and other commercial activities. The increased development opportunity available through a MDR zoning would allow future development of the site to greatly capitalise on these matters and make best use of readily accessible amenities.	ESPT Ltd seek that 164 to 174 Peachgrove Road is rezoned to Medium Density Residential as part of PC12.
Anna Failey	261.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	<p>The submitter supports the provisions made to protect the Waikato River and gullies.</p> <p>The submitter seeks greater consideration of other technologies in apartments, and the impact apartments might have on neighbouring properties solar panels. The submitter has concern for increased power use in apartments and unhealthy living from drying clothes indoors.</p>	<p>Seeks amendments to allow for the consideration of solar power in existing neighbouring properties; or</p> <p>That developers provide solar gain from their housing to neighbours who are loosing out, or pay the cost of repositioning the solar panel; and</p> <p>Also suggest that it is vital for the health of our planet that people have the right to dry their clothes outside, including provision for hanging washing on roof spaces.</p>
Anna Failey	261.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter seeks protection of the Hayes Paddock area and considers that there have been times were not enough has been done to protect the City's heritage. The submitter has concern over the loss of native timbers during demolition. The submitter seeks the provision of food production spaces.	<p>Seeks the protection Hayes Paddock and railway houses; and</p> <p>Ensure there is provision for food growing heritage; and</p> <p>Provide food production areas.</p>
Anna Failey	261.3	25.14 Transportation	General	Support	The submitter supports the bus and train services in Hamilton.	No specific relief sought.
Anna Failey	261.4	General	General		The submitter supports the protection of te awa and the gullies, but also seeks the protection of future generations right to grow their own food. The submitter seeks consideration of how solar energy and gain can be protected, and how more building materials can be recycled.	<p>Protect the ability for people to grow their own food; and</p> <p>Consider how solar gain and energy production can be protected; and</p> <p>Consider how more building materials can be recycled.</p>
Anna Failey	261.5	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	The submitter supports developers paying to make the city a sustainable place.	Charge developers to make the city sustainable.
Anna Failey	261.6	General	General		The submitter considers there is a need to consider green spaces for growing food as housing is intensified and seeks a commitment to protect the natural beauty of Hamilton.	<p>Seeks consideration green spaces for food growing; and</p> <p>Protect the natural beauty of Hamilton.</p>
Anna Failey	261.7	General	General		The submitter believes it is important that everyone has access to housing but is concerned that PC12 will result in poor quality housing will recreate ghetto-isation seen in the UK and US. The submitter is glad to see protection of the natural environment but also seeks protection of the health and wellbeing of people.	<p>Mitigate negative ramification from Plan Change 12; and</p> <p>Think about creative solutions to set regulations which restrict developers from having free rein to endlessly develop Hamilton for their own maximum profit with minimum thought for the wellbeing of people.</p>
Shona Mary McChinchy	262.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposal and considers slums will be created. The submitter has concern over the lack of on-site parking.	Consider opting out like Christchurch.
Shirley June Mary Wood	263.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter has concern for the lake environment which they consider is not suitable for housing, narrow roads and crowding properties. The have concern for traffic and sunlight and the sinking of properties around the lake area.	Oppose further density in the wider Hamilton City area; and Living and breathing must be protected. There is mention of some protection for the WAIKATO RIVER.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui	264.1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the zones as it aligns to the current and future plans by TGH.	Retain zoning as notified on submitters site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Group Holdings Limited (1 Northgate Boulevard)						
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (1 Northgate Boulevard)	264. 2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion of the site from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	Retain Infrastructure Capacity Overlay as notified.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings Limited (1 Northgate Boulevard)	264. 3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarity regarding the exclusion of residential zoning around The Base which is an identified Sub-regional centre. Similarly, Chartwell has been identified as a Sub-regional centre and has included MDRS provision surrounding it. Objective 3 of the NPS-UD states that district plans are meant to enable people to work in close proximity to amenities and areas of employment.	The submitter seeks clarification on the reasoning for the exclusion of residential zoning around The Base which is an identified Sub-regional centre.
Sam Shears	265. 1	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the overall plan change that seeks to accommodate housing supply and address impacts of climate change.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed residential zoning in areas identified as General Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential and seek for proposed zoning to be retained.	Retain the proposed residential zoning and clarify and/or amend the Historic Heritage Area blanket overlay to ensure that land can still be best utilised for suitable residential development without compromising other factors (e.g. residential character and amenity, streetscape, infrastructure, and any other areas of significance).
Sam Shears	265. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports 1 to 3 residential units on a site as a Permitted Activity and 4 or more residential units as a Restricted Discretionary Activity to be retained.	Retain 1 to 3 residential units on a site as a Permitted Activity and 4 or more residential units as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Sam Shears	265. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to Notification Rules relating to qualification versus quantification related standards under General Standards.	Seek clarification and/or amendment to Notification Rules relating to qualification versus quantification related standards under General Standards.
Sam Shears	265. 5	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density		The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reference minimum (as opposed to maximum) net site area of 100sqm per residential unit where this could contradict with the minimum 150sqm net site area per residential units within the Infrastructure Capacity overlay area or for example, terrace housing units that are provided with 20sqm floor outdoor living area at the ground floor/ permeable surface that conflicts with the maximum building footprint/ coverage standards.	Clarify and amend to reference minimum (as opposed to maximum) net site area of 100sqm per residential unit where this could contradict with the minimum 150sqm net site area per residential units within the Infrastructure Capacity overlay area or for example, terrace housing units that are provided with 20sqm floor outdoor living area at the ground floor/ permeable surface that conflicts with the maximum building footprint/ coverage standards.
Sam Shears	265. 6	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports building coverage standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265. 9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports permeability and landscaping standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit and understands that the minimum planted size of 80L should be clarified and/or reduced/removed as this could cause issues not only for the residential unit/ vehicle entrance's obstruction from the tree, but also should be planted to the property owners/developers discretion.	Clarify or amend the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit AND clarify and/or reduce/remove the minimum planted size of 80L.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265.10	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports permeability and landscaping standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit and understands that the minimum planted size of 80L should be clarified and/or reduced/removed as this could cause issues not only for the residential unit/ vehicle entrance's obstruction from the tree, but also should be planted to the property owners/developers discretion.	Clarify or amend the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit AND clarify and/or reduce/remove the minimum planted size of 80L.
Sam Shears	265.11	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports permeability and landscaping standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit and understands that the minimum planted size of 80L should be clarified and/or reduced/removed as this could cause issues not only for the residential unit/ vehicle entrance's obstruction from the tree, but also should be planted to the property owners/developers discretion.	Clarify or amend the number of urban trees for a duplex residential unit which should be provided with one urban tree (as opposed to two) as there is no notable land difference between a duplex unit and terrace housing unit AND clarify and/or reduce/remove the minimum planted size of 80L.
Sam Shears	265.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports building height standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports building height standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.14	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports building height standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports height in relation to boundary standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports height in relation to boundary standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.17	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports height in relation to boundary standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.18	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	The submitter supports building setback standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided.	Clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided. We also seek to include building setbacks from internal vehicle accesses within Rule 4.3.4.6 (Medium Density Residential Zone).
Sam Shears	265.19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter supports building setback standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided. They also seek to include building setbacks from internal vehicle accesses within Rule 4.3.4.6 (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided AND inclusion of building setbacks from internal vehicle accesses within Rule 4.3.4.6.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265. 20	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter supports building setback standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided.	Clarification and/or amendment to setback from internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units to be 1m or reduced where the property owners/developers dispensation is provided.
Sam Shears	265. 21	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundar y Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports fencing and walls standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable in cases for example where outdoor living areas that are northern orientated and/or adjoin the street/open space should maintain some form of privacy and screening in accordance with the District Plans objectives and policies. In addition, they seek clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.	Clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable and clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.
Sam Shears	265. 22	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundar y Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports fencing and walls standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable in cases for example where outdoor living areas that are northern orientated and/or adjoin the street/open space should maintain some form of privacy and screening in accordance with the District Plans objectives and policies. In addition, they seek clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.	Clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable and clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.
Sam Shears	265. 23	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports fencing and walls standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable in cases for example where outdoor living areas that are northern orientated and/or adjoin the street/open space should maintain some form of privacy and screening in accordance with the District Plans objectives and policies. In addition, they seek clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.	Clarification and/or amendment to increase the maximum 1.5m height to 1.8m provided 50% of that part of the fence over 1.5m is visually permeable and clarification to retaining walls in exceedance of 1.5m-2.5m and 2.51m-3.5m requiring a horizontal step of at least 1m depth that could compromise usable land area for such as areas for outdoor living, buildings, vehicle access and service areas, etc.
Sam Shears	265. 24	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interfac e	Support in part	The submitter supports public interface standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles. In addition, they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles AND they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.
Sam Shears	265. 25	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interfac e	Support in part	The submitter supports public interface standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles. In addition, they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles AND they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.
Sam Shears	265. 26	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interfac e	Support in part	The submitter supports public interface standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles. In addition, they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 20% to 10% and/or include any upper-floor level glazing that overlooks the street to provide CPTED principles AND they seek clarification for developments comprising of 4 or more residential units requiring a pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door entrance of each residential unit, ensuring this only applies to street fronting residential units and not rear units/sites where this is not practical.
Sam Shears	265. 27	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter supports outlook space standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.	Clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.
Sam Shears	265. 28	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter supports outlook space standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.	Clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265. 29	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter supports outlook space standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.	Clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 4m depth and 4m width where this could contradict with the minimum outdoor living area minimum 3m dimension that would likely cause issues of 1m encroachments over property boundaries for example.
Sam Shears	265. 30	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter supports outdoor living area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.	Clarification and/or amendment to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.
Sam Shears	265. 31	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	We support outdoor living area standards, however, we seek clarification and/or amendment to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.	The submitter supports outdoor living area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.
Sam Shears	265. 32	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter supports outdoor living area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.	Clarify and/or amend to removing ‘for four or more residential units,’ is accessible from the principal living room as this should apply to all residential units to provide suitable on-site amenity and urban design.
Sam Shears	265. 33	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports service area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure. In addition, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure AND they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.
Sam Shears	265. 34	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Area	Support in part	The submitter supports service area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure. In addition, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure AND they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.
Sam Shears	265. 35	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports service area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure. In addition, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to remove ‘clothes drying areas shall have direct access from each residential unit’ where clothes drying areas are now defined as an ancillary residential structure AND they seek clarification and/or amendment to reference the need for waste container plans to be required for apartment developments under Body Corporate management.
Sam Shears	265. 36	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.12 Storage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind storage area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions, for example, 1.2m x 1.8m equating to 2.2sqm, below all minimum volumes. In addition, they believe the minimum 1.8m height can be amended to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.	Clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions AND amend the minimum 1.8m height to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.
Sam Shears	265. 37	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.12 Storage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind storage area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions, for example, 1.2m x 1.8m equating to 2.2sqm, below all minimum volumes. In addition, they believe the minimum 1.8m height can be amended to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.	Clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions AND amend the minimum 1.8m height to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.
Sam Shears	265. 38	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.12 Storage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind storage area standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions, for example, 1.2m x 1.8m equating to 2.2sqm, below all minimum volumes. In addition, they believe the minimum 1.8m height can be amended to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.	Clarification and/or amendment to minimum volumes where they contradict the minimum dimensions AND amend the minimum 1.8m height to reference height and/or width for storage areas that can be utilised as suspended type storage boxes.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265.39	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of these standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.
Sam Shears	265.40	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of these standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.
Sam Shears	265.41	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of these standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to the provide a balance between permeable frontage and compliant vehicle driveway access.
Sam Shears	265.42	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Support	The submitter supports the built form standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.43	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.14 Built Form	Support	The submitter supports the built form standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.44	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Support	The submitter supports the built form standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.45	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universal Access	Support in part	The submitter supports universal access standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.
Sam Shears	265.46	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.15 Universal Access	Support in part	The submitter supports universal access standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.
Sam Shears	265.47	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.15 Universal Access	Support in part	The submitter supports universal access standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendments to ensure that these standards are consistent with generic universal access design standards.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265.48	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is in general support the building height and density standards proposed, however, they seek similar clarification and/or amendments to outlook space and storage areas (as per Chapter 4 submission).	The submitter seeks similar clarification and/or amendments to outlook space and storage areas (as per Chapter 4 submission).
Sam Shears	265.49	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter is in general support the building height and density standards proposed, however, they seek similar clarification and/or amendments to outlook space and storage areas (as per Chapter 4 submission).	The submitter seeks similar clarification and/or amendments to outlook space and storage areas (as per Chapter 4 submission).
Sam Shears	265.50	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind subdivision within a Historic Heritage Area, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reducing its activity status to Restricted Discretionary as opposed to Discretionary where the effects of the subdivision is merely notional around the existing lawfully established dwellings and/or in accordance with a land use consent. In addition, they seek to retain Subdivision containing a Historic Heritage Site as a Discretionary activity where this is different to the historic heritage area overlay.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reducing subdivision within a Historic Heritage Area activity status to Restricted Discretionary as opposed to Discretionary where the effects of the subdivision is merely notional around the existing lawfully established dwellings and/or in accordance with a land use consent AND retain Subdivision containing a Historic Heritage Site as a Discretionary activity where this is different to the historic heritage area overlay.
Sam Shears	265.51	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support	The submitter supports Fee Simple Subdivision around existing residential units or in accordance with a land use resource consent as a Controlled Activity and for vacant Lots as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.52	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.6.8 Subdivision in the Medium-Density Residential Zones and Rototuna Town Centre Zone (excluding Rotokauri North Medium Density Residential Zone)	Support	The submitter supports standard 23.6.8.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.53	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	The submitter supports the minimum 300m ² net site area for vacant Lots within the General Residential Zone (unless otherwise stated) to be retained, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 15m diameter shape factor circle to 13m where a compliant dwelling can comply with the 15m transport corridor frontage for vacant Lots and side yard setbacks, as well as aligning with other District Plans (e.g. Waipa/Waikato).	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum 15m diameter shape factor circle to 13m where a compliant dwelling can comply with the 15m transport corridor frontage for vacant Lots and side yard setbacks, as well as aligning with other District Plans (e.g. Waipa/Waikato).
Sam Shears	265.54	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	The submitter in general supports for subdivision within the historic heritage area, however they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum Lot size to 300m ² - 400m ² for vacant Lots only or shall not apply for subdivision around existing lawfully established residential units (as per normal subdivision within the General Residential Zone), provided that compliance is achieved with the relevant District Plan standards or otherwise authorised land use resource consent.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum Lot size to 300m ² - 400m ² for vacant Lots only or shall not apply for subdivision around existing lawfully established residential units (as per normal subdivision within the General Residential Zone), provided that compliance is achieved with the relevant District Plan standards or otherwise authorised land use resource consent.
Sam Shears	265.55	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability	Support	The submitter supports subdivision suitability standards.	No specific relief sought.
Sam Shears	265.56	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports general residential zone standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Sam Shears	265.57	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support in part	The submitter supports general residential zone standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.
Sam Shears	265.58	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.5 High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports general residential zone standards, however, they seek clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendment to reduce the minimum legal width for 1-6 allotments back to 3.6m where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for residential units for example; particularly where services and vehicle access can be provided within this standard. In addition, we seek clarification to the intention behind ‘rear lanes’.
Sam Shears	265.59	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind financial contributions, however, they seek clarification regarding the figures for three waters/transport infrastructure network, residential amenity and Te Ture Whaimana and for what specific residential development locations this applies to.	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the figures for three waters/transport infrastructure network, residential amenity and Te Ture Whaimana and for what specific residential development locations this applies to.
Sam Shears	265.60	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention behind financial contributions, however, they seek clarification regarding the figures for three waters/transport infrastructure network, residential amenity and Te Ture Whaimana and for what specific residential development locations this applies to.	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the figures for three waters/transport infrastructure network, residential amenity and Te Ture Whaimana and for what specific residential development locations this applies to.
Sam Shears	265.61	25.13 Three Waters	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the intention of the standards proposed under the Three Waters, however, they seek clarification as to stormwater disposal within residential zones for redevelopment of existing impermeable surfaces.	The submitter seeks clarification as to stormwater disposal within residential zones for redevelopment of existing impermeable surfaces.
Sam Shears	265.62	25.14 Transportation	General		The submitter supports the minimum-maximum vehicle crossing widths to be retained and supports in part the minimum internal vehicle access widths, however, they seek clarification and/or amendments to reduce the minimum 3.5m formation and 4m legal widths back to 3.0m formation and 3.6m legal widths where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200sqm net site areas for development. They also seek clarification to the interpretation of ‘rear lanes’ and/or amend the standards to remove reference to have access to a transport corridor in at least two locations.	The submitter seeks clarification and/or amendments to reduce the minimum 3.5m formation and 4m legal widths back to 3.0m formation and 3.6m legal widths where this could impact on the ability to provide compliant 200m ² net site areas for development. They also seek clarification to the interpretation of ‘rear lanes’ and/or amend the standards to remove reference to have access to a transport corridor in at least two locations.
Sam Shears	265.63	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	The submitter supports driveway visibility standard and Figure 25.14.4.1e.	No specific relief sought.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.1	General	General		WRCI has lodged a request for a private plan change with HCC to rezone part of the racecourse site from Major Facilities Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (proposed private plan change 13: "PPC13"). This proposes a Te Rapa Racecourse Medium Density Residential Precinct within that zone. WRCI has liaised with HCC officers throughout the development of PPC13 and up to lodgement. As such, PPC 13 has been prepared to ensure it does not conflict with PC12. However, due to the timing of the PC12 process and the lodgement of PPC13, the two processes will effectively run in parallel. Furthermore, there are aspects of PC12 which will have direct application to the development which will be enabled by PPC13. Accordingly, WRCI seeks to ensure that the PC12 process is integrated with the PC13 process insofar as this is practicable. Within that context, WRCI supports PC12 in principle but seeks general relief which makes appropriate reference to the outcomes sought under PPC13 to minimise procedural complications for both processes.	<p>Seeks that PC12 includes references to the Te Rapa Racecourse Precinct as appropriate to ensure that the two process are aligned and achieve an integrated approach.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that some of the matters introduced through PC12 go beyond the scope of legislation, in particular the amended assessment criteria and proposed new rules relating to permeability and tree cover, and Financial Contributions in Chapter 24 and Appendix 18.</p> <p>Grant the relief of cited in submission points or any other or similar relief having the same effect</p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver	266.2	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part but seeks integration of PPC 13 with PC12 to ensure maximum efficiency between the processes and the site is located close to the stage 1 boundary.	Amend planning maps to zone the Te Rapa Racecourse PPC13 site as Medium Density Residential and include it within the "Stage 1" overlay.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Racing Club Incorporated						
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Support	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.5 as further intensification may be appropriate and recognises this important.	Retain Objective 2.2.5
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support	The introduction of residential precincts as a framework for tailored provision of residential capacity is supported.	Retain residential precinct approach to development.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Objective 4.1.2.1 because Determining whether "development" gives effect to the Vision and Strategy - Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato is too subjective and the section 32 evaluation for the policies, rules, and methods do not demonstrate how this objective will be achieved. There is a lack of technical evidence that supports the assumptions regarding effects of intensification directed through MDRS and Policy 3 of the NPS-UD and the cause-and-effect relationship between Te Ture Whaimana and intensification. The concern relates to the effects on three waters infrastructure, not the effect of development on the River per se.	Amend wording of objective to specifically focus on the elements of development that have a cause-and effect relationship with Te Ture Whaimana, and provide section 32 evaluation which demonstrates how the objective will be achieved.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part as there is a lack of technical evidence to demonstrate how density, building size, site permeability and earthworks affects the health of the Waikato River.	Provide evidential basis for policy 4.1.2.1c
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	None stated	Retain Objective 4.1.2.2 as notified.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.8	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.2 a. ii. as it is too subjective.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.2 a. ii. by replacing words "anticipated future development" with "planned future development within the same catchment" or similar.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver	266.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies:		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.1 a. as the use of the term "avoid" is too directive.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.1 a. by deleting the word "avoid" and replacing with "manage".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Racing Club Incorporated			All Residential Zones			
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.10	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 4.1.2.2 b. but considers that that it should also be applicable to Precinct Plans as they have a similar purpose.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.2 b. by adding words "or relevant Precinct Plan"
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.11	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		Amend by deleting the word "avoid" and replacing with "minimise".	The submitter opposes Policy 4.1.2.2 e. in part as it is is not feasible in some circumstances to "avoid" potential effects such as noise from arterial transport corridors and state highways.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.12	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.3	Retain Objective 4.1.2.2
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.13	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.3 a. because the "where a qualifying matter is relevant" does not reflect the relevant provision in the RMA.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.3 a. to replace "where a qualifying matter is relevant" with "where a qualifying matter is accommodated".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.14	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.4.	Retain Objective 4.1.2.4.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.15	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.5 a. as they consider it is poorly drafted and the references to encourage and offsetting do not reflect RMA terminology.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.5 a. by replacing: "must encourage" with "enables" and; "offsetting" with "mitigates.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver	266.16	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies:		The submitter opposed in part Policy 4.1.2.6 a. as it is poorly drafted and overly verbose.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6 a. to make it clear and concise.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Racing Club Incorporated			All Residential Zones			
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.17	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.6 c. as it is poorly drafted, verbose and reads like rule standards.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6 c. so it is clear and concise.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.18	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.6 e. because the use of the word avoid is too directive in the context of residential development. Section 16 of the RMA addresses unreasonable noise in any event.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6 e.by deleting the words "avoid unreasonable" and replacing with "minimise adverse"
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports in part 4.3.1 - Purpose but considers that it needs to recognise that there may be additional MDR Zone areas in the future through private plan changes.	Amend 4.3.1 - Purpose by adding a sentence to the third paragraph as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone applies to existing residential areas that have been identified as suitable to accommodate higher density development . <u>The Medium Density Residential Zone may be extended to include new areas as part of future private plan change or Council-led plan change processes which implement the MDRS.</u> These areas are located to the north of the Central City and adjacent to the following Business Centres:
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.20	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports 4.3.1 - Purpose subject to an amendment to recognise the lodgement of PPC13 and ensure integration with PC12.	Amend 4.3.1 - Purpose by adding the following text after the Peacockes Precinct: <u>Te Rapa Racecourse Precinct:</u> <u>For any development within the proposed Te Rapa Racecourse Precinct, the MDRS standards for that precinct will apply.</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.21	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports retaining 4.3.2 b. as it will ensure integration of the PPC13 with PC12	Retain 4.3.2 b. as notified.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.22	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter opposes in part Policy Policy 4.3.2.1a as it only refers to structure plans. Precinct plans play a similar role in guiding development so should also be referred to.	Amend Policy 4.3.2.1a by inserting "or precinct plan" after "structure plan".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver	266.23	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies:		The submitter supports subject to amendment 4.3.2 Objectives and Policies provided new Objectives and Policies are added to recognise the lodged PPC13 and ensure that the PPC is integrated with PC12	Add a new set of Objectives and policies after Objectives and Policies 4.3.2.6 - Rotokauri North Residential Precinct as follows:

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Racing Club Incorporated			Medium Density Residential Zone			<p><u>Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct</u></p> <p><u>Objectives</u> <u>The Te Rapa Racecourse Medium- Density Residential Precinct provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to;</u> <u>(a) housing needs and demand; and</u> <u>(b) The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3 to 5- storey buildings</u></p> <p><u>The Te Rapa Racecourse Medium- Density Residential Precinct enables a medium density residential environment with high levels of amenity and connectivity with nearby urban services and development.</u></p> <p><u>Policies</u> <u>Apply the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) across the Precinct except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wahi tapu, and other taonga).</u></p> <p><u>Encourage development to achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces, including by providing for passive surveillance.</u></p> <p><u>Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents.</u></p> <p><u>Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status, while encouraging high-quality developments.</u></p> <p><u>Development enables a variety of housing types up to 5-storeys,including terrace housing, duplexes and apartments, together with detached residential units.</u></p> <p><u>Development includes open space and landscaped areas for amenity, visual mitigation, stormwater treatment and stormwater overland flow paths.</u></p> <p><u>Development is designed to minimize through traffic.</u></p> <p><u>Development is designed to minimize reverse sensitivity effects on the adjacent industrial area and the racecourse.</u></p> <p><u>Development integrates with and connects to the racecourse and existing residential development on the southern boundary.</u></p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.24	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.3.2.2b as it is uncertain and poorly drafted.	Amend Policy 4.3.2.2b to provide clarity to the policy and delete the word "avoid"
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.25	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.3.1 c. because the introduction of of a new permitted activity of Emergency Housing to the Medium Density Zone is outside the scope of an IPI.	Delete Rule 4.3.3.1 c.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club	266.26	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table		The submitter opposes in part the Activity Status Table 4.3.3.1 because PPC13 includes site-specific provisions as a result reverse sensitivity effects and an overland flow path that change the activity status of some residential units in Table 4.3.3.1.	<p>Amend the Activity Status Table 4.3.1.1 by adding the following:</p> <p><u>mmm. Any residential unit in this table if they are located within the Noise Sensitive Area shown on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium- Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1).</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Incorporated						<u>nnn. Any residential unit in this table if they are located within the Overland Flow Path shown on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium-Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1).</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.27	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.2 Building Coverage		The submitter opposes in part because PPC13 includes maximum site coverage of 60% for apartments regardless of whether rear access and on site carparking is required. This provides flexibility for design outcomes and is appropriate for the PPC13 site. In addition, Rule 4.3.4.2 a. does not refer to "maximum" building coverage creating uncertainty.	Amend Rule 4.3.4.2 by adding; "Maximum" before building coverage in the table, and; "Building coverage for apartments in the Te Rapa Residential Precinct; 60%".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.28	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks		The submitter opposes in part Rule 4.3.4.3 Building Setbacks because PPC13 includes a site specific setback of 30m for residential units from Industrial zoned land. to enable integration with PC12 this setback should be added to the building setback rules.	Amend Rule 4.3.4.6 by adding the following: <u>"In the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium Density Residential Precinct (see Figure 4.5-1) the minimum set back of any residential unit from the boundary of Industrial zoned land is 30m".</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.29	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.8 Ruakura Residential Precinct - One Integrated Retail Development		The submitter opposes in part Chapter 4.3 because PPC13 includes site-specific rules addressing development layout and transport upgrades. To ensure integration with PC12 these rules should be added to PC12 in a similar way to other precinct rules such as for Ruakura.	Amend Chapter 4.3 by adding the following after Rule 4.3.5.8: <u>"4.3.4.9 Development layout and transport upgrades in the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium-Density Residential Precinct</u> <u>a. All development must be in general accordance with the development layout on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium-Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1).</u> <u>b. Prior to the issue of code compliance certificates under section 95 of the Building Act 2004 for more than 60 residential units (or equivalent vehicle movements) or when the internal road network is connected to Sir Tristram Avenue, whichever comes first, the Sir Tristram Avenue/Te Rapa Road intersection must be upgraded to prevent right turns out of Sir Tristram Avenue.</u> <u>c. Prior to the issue of any code compliance certificates under section 95 of the Building ActJQ04 for any residential units the existing footpath on Ken Browne Drive must be extended to connect to footpaths within the Precinct.</u> <u>d. When the internal road network is connected to Sir Tristram Avenue;</u> <u>(i) The existing footpath on the northern side of Sir Tristram Avenue must be extended to connect to the bus stop on Te Rapa Road located approximately 110m northwest of Sir Tristram Avenue; and</u> <u>(ii) A new walking and cycling shared path must be constructed on the southern side of Sir Tristram Avenue from the road access into the Precinct, along the service lane south-eastwards on Te Rapa Road to a new raised safety platform crossing across the service lane, and to a new mid-block raised safety platform staggered signalized crossing across Te Rapa Road; and</u> <u>(iii) No vehicle connection must be provided from Sir Tristram Avenue to Mainstreet Place.</u> <u>e. The existing carpark shown on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1) must be used only for access and carparking associated with healthcare services on Lot 13 DPS 6240."</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.30	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables		The submitter opposes in part Table 23.3a because it does not refer to the Te Rapa Residential Precinct. In order to integrate PPC13 with PC12 these tables should be amended to include site-specific subdivision rules for the Precinct generally consistent with the Rotokauri North subdivision rules.	Amend the subheading to Table 23.3a by adding the following: <u>"For Rotokauri North Residential Precinct and Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct see Table 23.3C".</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato	266.31	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables		The submitter opposes in part Table 23.3c because it does not refer to the Te Rapa Residential Precinct. In order to integrate PPC13 with PC12 these tables should be amended to include site-specific subdivision rules for the Precinct generally consistent with the Rotokauri North subdivision rules.	Amend the heading of Table 23.3c to include reference to Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct and add the following to Table 23.3c; <u>"xiv. Any subdivision not in general accordance with the Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct Plan; Discretionary.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Racing Club Incorporated						<p><u>xv. Any subdivision to create lots within the low Flood Hazard Area shown on Figure 4.5-1; Restricted Discretionary.</u></p> <p><u>xvi. Items viii, ixb, ixc, ix e and ix f do not apply to the Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct".</u></p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.32	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 23.7.1 b. because the minimum net site area of 1200m ² is inconsistent with PPC13 and is unnecessarily restrictive by directing subdivision into large 'superlots' which is inconsistent with the objectives and policies which are to achieve a variety of housing types. Compliance with the Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct Plan	Amend Rule 23.7.1 b. by adding "and Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct" after Rotokauri North Residential Precinct.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.33	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 23.7.1 q. because the minimum net site area of 1200m ² is inconsistent with PPC13 and is unnecessarily restrictive by directing subdivision into large 'superlots' which is inconsistent with the objectives and policies which are to achieve a variety of housing types. Compliance with the Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct Plan	Amend Rule 23.7.1 q. by adding "and Te Rapa Racecourse Residential Precinct" after Rotokauri North Residential Precinct.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.34	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)		The submitter opposes in part Chapter 23.7 because PC13 includes site-specific subdivision rules to address infrastructure upgrades and to ensure consistency with the Precinct Plan. In order to integrate with PC12 they need to be inserted into the plan change.	<p>Amend Chapter 23.7 by adding the following after Rule 23.7.4</p> <p><u>23.7.5 Te Rapa Racecourse Medium-Density Residential Precinct</u></p> <p><u>a. All subdivision must be in general accordance with the development layout on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium-Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1).</u></p> <p><u>b. Any subdivision of lots within the Low Flood Hazard Area shown on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium- Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1) must include a flood risk assessment report in accordance with the Information Requirements in Volume 2, Appendix 1.2.2.9 that demonstrates that suitable building sites will be created and the resulting level of flood risk is acceptable.</u></p> <p><u>c. All subdivision must comply with the following standards:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Minimum local road width (to be vested) 16m</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Minimum legal width of two-way rear lane 7m</u></p> <p><u>(iii)Minimum transport corridor boundary length 10m</u></p> <p><u>(iv)Minimum lot depth 28m."</u></p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.35	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability		The submitter opposes in part Rule 23.7.2(4) [correct rule reference 23.7.2 3. i. - iii.] because it is unclear what is required.	Amend Rule 23.7.2(4) [correct rule reference 23.7.2 3. i. - iii.] to read as follows or similar: <u>4. The fee simple subdivision of any allotment with no existing residential unit, where a subdivision application /s accompanied by a land use consent application that will be determined concurrently and no vacant allotments are created.</u>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.36	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General		<p>The submitter opposes in part Chapter 24 because PC12 financial contribution amendments appear to go beyond the scope of an IPI. Where these do not relate to residential intensification the amendments should be subject to the standard RMA Schedule 1 process. While chapter 24.1 Background states that a financial contribution is for a different purpose to a development contribution, there is no clear differentiation between what is "effects" mitigation (FCs) and what is providing for growth (DCs).</p> <p>Regarding effects, the section 32 evaluation does not provide an evidential basis for what the effects will be that are required to be mitigated and therefore subject to FCs.</p> <p>Chapter 24.2.1 General purpose of financial contributions refers to effects associated with a list of matters which should be funded through DCs-three waters/transport network improvements;</p>	Amend Chapter 24 to ensure the FC provisions are vires and provide clear explanation of the basis on which FCs are required and how these are distinguished/differentiated from DCs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>three waters/transport capacity upgrades; parks/reserves/open space network enhancement/improvement.</p> <p>It is not clear why and how FCs are required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>It is unlawful to "double dip" across FCs and DCs. However, the FC chapter reads like a DC policy, despite the statement at 24.4.2 that costs "shall exclude any infrastructure works otherwise funded via Council' DC policy.</p> <p>Need to provide explanation of how the relationship between FCs and DCs will be managed and implemented.</p> <p>The section 32 evaluation for chapter 24 does not consider an appropriate range of options.</p>	
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.37	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General		<p>The submitter opposes in part Appendix 18 because PC12 financial contribution amendments appear to go beyond the scope of an IPI. Where these do not relate to residential intensification the amendments should be subject to the standard RMA Schedule 1 process. While chapter 24.1 Background states that a financial contribution is for a different purpose to a development contribution, there is no clear differentiation between what is "effects" mitigation (FCs) and what is providing for growth (DCs).</p> <p>Regarding effects, the section 32 evaluation does not provide an evidential basis for what the effects will be that are required to be mitigated and therefore subject to FCs.</p> <p>Chapter 24.2.1 General purpose of financial contributions refers to effects associated with a list of matters which should be funded through DCs-three waters/transport network improvements; three waters/transport capacity upgrades; parks/reserves/open space network enhancement/improvement.</p> <p>It is not clear why and how FCs are required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>It is unlawful to "double dip" across FCs and DCs. However, the FC chapter reads like a DC policy, despite the statement at 24.4.2 that costs "shall exclude any infrastructure works otherwise funded via Council' DC policy.</p> <p>Need to provide explanation of how the relationship between FCs and DCs will be managed and implemented.</p> <p>The section 32 evaluation for chapter 24 does not consider an appropriate range of options</p>	Amend Chapter 24 to ensure the FC provisions are vires and provide clear explanation of the basis on which FCs are required and how these are distinguished/differentiated from DCs.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.38	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control		<p>The submitter opposes in part Assessment Criteria 1.3.2 G. because it does not make any sense and any non-compliance with standards in the residential chapter will be addressed through the consenting process</p>	<p>Amend Assessment Criteria 1.3.2 G.by deleting i.</p> <p>i. the extent to which the subdivision does not increase the non compliance with the Standards within the Residential Chapter.</p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.39	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 as many of the assessment criteria are difficult to understand and are incapable of implementation. For example, use of the term "as a rule of thumb" and excessively long sentences. Furthermore, numerous criteria are presented as a de facto rule standards, which calls into question the status of any activity as being "restricted discretionary".</p> <p>Such criteria include, but are not limited to, the following: B2 Context: B2c.; B2e; B2i.; Public Realm B3b.; B3c.; B3d.; B3e., B3f.; Site Layout B4a.; B4c.; Access and Circulation: B5b.; B5c.; B6 External Appearance; B8 Waste Management, particularly B8c.; C Character and Amenity, particularly: Cl b.;</p>	Redraft the Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 to ensure these are vires, certain, and capable of assessment and implementation by applicants, plan users, and processing planners. Use consistent wording such as "The extent to which..."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			ng Assessment Criteria		Cl d.; C19 Te Ture Whaimana; G Transportation, including Gla.;Glg.;Glh.; Integrated Transport Assessment G4.; G6.; G9j.; G16;G19;G20;J8;J9;JJ	
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Waikato Racing Club Incorporated	266.40	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area		Rule 4.3.4.10 is opposed in part. PPC13 includes a site specific provision requiring outdoor living areas to be orientated away from the closest Industrial zone boundaries. In order to integrate with PC12 this rule should be added to the outdoor living space rules.	Amend Rule 4.3.4.10 by adding the following: " <u>All residential units in the Noise Sensitive Area on the Te Rapa Racecourse Medium Density Residential Precinct Plan (Figure 4.5-1) must have their outdoor living areas orientated away from the closest Industrial Zone boundaries</u> ".
Milwyn and Heather Rees	267.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that three storey buildings are too high in general suburbs.	To limit building permission in line with above submissions.
Milwyn and Heather Rees	267.2	General	General		The submitter considers that reserves should never be used for housing or any other buildings	To limit building permission in line with above submissions.
Dallas David Bain	268.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 4.	Seeks rezoning around the Lake.
Murray Kenneth Gibbs	269.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes changes to zoning which allow houses can be built multi storeyed on a section and notes that cars parked in streets are a traffic hazard.	Seeks that the Council overturn this decision to allow multi storeyed buildings on a section.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping		The submitter seeks alignment between the landscaping standard and permeable controls to avoid additional density standards that double up. Replacing the permeable area standard with an impermeable area standard would better accord with the intent of the standard to manage stormwater runoff, rather than on-site amenity. The impermeable area standard should be calculated on the basis of net site area (consistent with building coverage standard).	Amend 4.2.5.3a to create a maximum impermeable rule of 70% of net site area; and Amend the notes to rule 4.2.5.3a to refer to impermeable surfaces, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping		The submitter seeks alignment between the landscaping standard and permeable controls to avoid additional density standards that double up. Replacing the permeable area standard with an impermeable area standard would better accord with the intent of the standard to manage stormwater runoff, rather than on-site amenity. The impermeable area standard should be calculated on the basis of net site area (consistent with building coverage standard).	Amend 4.3.4.3a to create a maximum impermeable rule of 70% of net site area; and Amend the notes to rule 4.3.4.3a to refer to impermeable surfaces, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.3	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping		The submitter seeks alignment between the landscaping standard and permeable controls to avoid additional density standards that double up. Replacing the permeable area standard with an impermeable area standard would better accord with the intent of the standard to manage stormwater runoff, rather than on-site amenity. The impermeable area standard should be calculated on the basis of net site area (consistent with building coverage standard).	Amend 4.4.5.3a to create a maximum impermeable rule of 70% of net site area; and Amend the notes to rule 4.4.5.3a to refer to impermeable surfaces, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface		The submitter seeks the achievement of urban design outcomes concerning units facing the street where there are for or more units.	Amend rule 4.2.5.8c to ensure that the front door of the unit facing the street also faces the street; and Assessment criteria B3 and B4 to ensure this is achieved.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.5	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables		The submitter notes that unit-title subdivision should be a controlled activity.	Amend activity status table 23.2 to provide for unit-title subdivision as a controlled activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.6	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables		The submitter notes a typographical error where 23.7.2b was referenced but the correct reference is to rule 23.7.2c.	Amend Rule 23.3v as follows: “Fee simple subdivision that complies with Rule 23.7.2b) 23.7.2c) within the General, Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones (excluding subdivision provided in xii, xiii and xiv).*”
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter seeks an update to the activity status table in 19.3.2 to reflect the MDRS.	Amend activity status table 19.3.2 to reflect the MDRS and include the terms “up to three residential units” and “four or more residential units” where appropriate.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Historic Heritage Areas - Density		The submitter seeks an update to Rule 19.4.2 to reflect the MDRS.	Amend rule 19.4.2 to reflect the MDRS and include the terms “up to three residential units” and “four or more residential units” where appropriate.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter notes that the activity table does not provide for duplexes on rear sites in HHA’s other than the Hamilton East and Hayes Paddock HHA.	Add a new activity status that provides for duplex dwellings on rear sites within HHA’s other than Hamilton East and Hayes Paddock.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Site Coverage		The submitter notes that Chapter 19 are also impacted by Plan Change 9 which is working concurrently with PC12. These provisions will be affected by the outcomes of PC9 and may need to be further refined.	Review and refine these standards to reflect the submissions received through PC9, and further consequential amendments and technical work on bespoke standards for each HHA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting		The submitter notes that Chapter 19 are also impacted by Plan Change 9 which is working concurrently with PC12. These provisions will be affected by the outcomes of PC9 and may need to be further refined.	Review and refine these standards to reflect the submissions received through PC9, and further consequential amendments and technical work on bespoke standards for each HHA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height		The submitter notes that Chapter 19 are also impacted by Plan Change 9 which is working concurrently with PC12. These provisions will be affected by the outcomes of PC9 and may need to be further refined.	Review and refine these standards to reflect the submissions received through PC9, and further consequential amendments and technical work on bespoke standards for each HHA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.6 Historic Heritage Areas - Height in Relation to Boundary		The submitter notes that Chapter 19 are also impacted by Plan Change 9 which is working concurrently with PC12. These provisions will be affected by the outcomes of PC9 and may need to be further refined.	Review and refine these standards to reflect the submissions received through PC9, and further consequential amendments and technical work on bespoke standards for each HHA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas -		The submitter notes that Chapter 19 are also impacted by Plan Change 9 which is working concurrently with PC12. These provisions will be affected by the outcomes of PC9 and may need to be further refined.	Review and refine these standards to reflect the submissions received through PC9, and further consequential amendments and technical work on bespoke standards for each HHA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Building Setbacks			
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.4 Historic Heritage Areas - Permeable Surface and Planting		The submitter notes that changes made to rules 4.2.5.3a, 4.3.4.3a and 4.4.5.3a relating to impermeable surfaces should be carried through to this rule for consistency and efficiency.	Amend to reflect the changes sought in rules 4.2.5.3a, 4.3.4.3a and 4.4.5.3a
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.5 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Height		The submitter notes potential application and monitoring issues from this rule. Where sites in an HHA adjoin a 6-storey enabled site, this could impact on the heritage and values of the HHA.	Amend rule 19.4.5a(ii) to provide for a maximum building height of 8m; and Amend rule 19.4.7a to provide for a maximum building setback of 5m in HHAs other than Temple View.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks		The submitter notes potential application and monitoring issues from this rule. Where sites in an HHA adjoin a 6-storey enabled site, this could impact on the heritage and values of the HHA.	Amend rule 19.4.5a(ii) to provide for a maximum building height of 8m; and Amend rule 19.4.7a to provide for a maximum building setback of 5m in HHAs other than Temple View.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas - Building Setbacks		The submitter notes that Rule 19.4.7e has been incorrectly transcribed into the table where the setback from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area is 6m and this rule applies city-wide.	Amend rule 19.4.7e to reflect that the setback should be 6m from the edge of the overlay.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.19	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development		The submitter notes that accurate information and costs were not available to staff to include the recognition of cultural sites in the notified charges. This has since been developed and rules 24.4.2b(iii) and Rule 24.4.3b(ii) and Appendix 18 need to be updated to reflect this information.	Amend Appendix 18 to incorporate the cost of recognising, protecting, enhancing, and commemorating historic resources and sites of significance.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.20	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.3 Non-residential Development		The submitter notes that accurate information and costs were not available to staff to include the recognition of cultural sites in the notified charges. This has since been developed and rules 24.4.2b(iii) and Rule 24.4.3b(ii) and Appendix 18 need to be updated to reflect this information.	Amend Appendix 18 to incorporate the cost of recognising, protecting, enhancing, and commemorating historic resources and sites of significance.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.21	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General		At the time Plan Change 12 was notified accurate information and costs were not available to staff to include the recognition of cultural sites in the notified charges. This has since been developed and rules 24.4.2b(iii) and Rule 24.4.3b(ii) and Appendix 18 need to be updated to reflect this information.	Amend Appendix 18 to incorporate the cost of recognising, protecting, enhancing, and commemorating historic resources and sites of significance.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.22	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development		Then submitter notes that provisions have been included for upgrades to existing parks and open spaces that provide access to the river, gullies, lakes and stream, but that provision has not yet been made to provide for Council's ability to provide new parks. Parks and open space are an important service and amenity for communities to enjoy where they live and provide space for leisure, recreation and to be amongst the natural environment. Council suggests that a financial contribution could also be used to fund the acquisition of land for the purposes of establishing new parks and for their maintenance.	Amend the policy framework of Chapter 24 and Appendix 18 so that it is clear that the Plan can require a financial contribution for the purposes of acquiring land for new parks and the maintenance of parks.
Hamilton City Council	270.23	Chapter 24 Financial	General		The submitter notes that operative provisions enable Council to utilise its discretion when applying the rules. This should be carried through to the proposed rules so that flexibility in terms of the amount of contribution required is provided in the Plan. Chapter 24 could be clearer in articulating	Include a general rule that enables Council to utilise its discretion when calculating the level of financial contribution required; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
- Mark Davey		Contributio ns			its application to greenfield development areas. Greenfield developments generally have high development contribution fees, and it is not Council’s intention to create barriers to development by imposing unrealistic development fees. To this extent, more thought should be given to how Chapter 24 applies to greenfield development areas.	Include a provision that clearly articulates the application of the financial contribution rules to greenfield development areas.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 24	Chapter 24 Financial Contributio ns	General		The submitter notes that the provisions as notified do not clarify whether the contributions required are inclusive or exclusive of GST.	Make amendments to Chapter 24 to clarify that the costs and contributions included in the provisions are GST exclusive.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 25	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter notes that a number of amendments to Rule 25.13.4.5 are required to clarify the requirements and standards as they relate to residential developments of varying sizes	Amend the table in rule 25.13.4.5 to clarify appropriate tank size and the number of tanks required for multi-unit residential developments; and Amend the second column table heading of 25.13.4.5a to Conservation measures.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 26	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter considers the use of 'net density' creates uncertainty about its definition and how its applied in the context of this rule.	Amend provisions (1) in Table 25.13.4.6 column A to state 'average net site area' rather than 'net density'.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 27	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Three Waters		The submitter notes references to 'water sensitive' techniques/designs which should be changed to 'water conservation measures' to ensure consistency and efficiency.	Replace the phrase “water sensitive techniques” with “water conservation measures” and; Include a definition for “water conservation measures” in Appendix 1.1.1.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 28	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter notes references to 'water sensitive' techniques/designs which should be changed to 'water conservation measures' to ensure consistency and efficiency.	Replace the phrase “water sensitive techniques” with “water conservation measures” and; Include a definition for “water conservation measures” in Appendix 1.1.1.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 29	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustaina ble City		The submitter seeks amendment with Policy 2.2.3b(ii) for consistency purposes.	Amend policy 2.2.3b(ii) as follows: “Prioritising walking, cycling, <u>micro-mobility</u> , and the use of public transport.”
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 30	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter considers the wording in 25.14.4.1j(i) ambiguous and could imply that one-way rear lanes are acceptable, which is not the case.	Amend rule 25.14.4.1j(i) as follows: “j. Any rear lane must: i. Have a minimum legal width of 7m for a two-way rear lane <u>and provide for two-way vehicle movement.</u> ”
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 31	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter notes that there are no rules for on-site drop-off car spaces, which are referenced in Table 15-1a of the operative district plan for "e" (Childcare facilities for six or more children) and "ii" (schools).	Make amendments to Rule 25.14.4.2 that reference on-site drop-off car spaces and micro-mobility spaces as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 32	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds		The submitter considers that the exemption to provide accessible car parks in the Central City Zone and Business 1, 5, 6, and 7 Zones for retail activities within existing buildings where there is no ability to provide customer or staff parking on the site should extend to all activities. In the circumstances described and irrespective of the type of activity within the building, there is no ability to provide customer or staff parking on the site.	Amend 25.14.4.2c to extend exemption to the provision of accessible car park spaces to all activities where there is no ability to provide customer or staff parking, as provided.
Hamilton City Council	270. 33	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General		The submitter notes that figure 15-1m needs to be referenced in Rule 25.14.4.2e(i)	Amend the plan so that 15-1m is referenced in Rule 25.14.4.2e(i), as provided.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
- Mark Davey			Standards			
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.34	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		The submitter notes that childcare facilities for six or more children should be included in the list of activities for which 10% of all cycle parking spaces must be designed to accommodate large cycles.	Amend Rule 25.14.4.2aa to include childcare facilities for six or more children; and Include a note on the layout of cycle parking and signage, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.35	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation		The submitter considers that the minimum dimension of gear lockers provided in the definition would be more efficient for plan users if it were located in the standard.	Amend Rule 25.14.4.2.ab to include the gear locker dimensions, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.36	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		The submitter requests clarification to the intent of rule 25.14.4.3a.	Amend rule 25.14.4.3a to provide clarification, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.37	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation		The submitter considers that the provisions do not provide for the protection of existing street trees in the objectives and policies for the transport network.	Amend 25.14.2.1 to protect existing trees along the transport network, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.38	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		The submitter considers there a gap where there are no standards relating to compliance with sight distances.	Amend rule 25.14.4.1 to ensure that local roads with a posted speed limit of 50km/h or less where compliance with sight distances cannot be achieved, that the proposed vehicle crossing shall be located to achieve the maximum sight distance as possible.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.39	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		The submitter considers that Figure 24.14.4.1 should be updated to be in accordance with guidance from Waka Kotahi.	Amend Figure 25.14.4.1d to align with Waka Kotahi's diagram and rename to “Lines of Clear Sight”:
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.40	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures		The submitter notes that there are no rules for on-site drop-off car spaces for childcare facilities for six or more children and schools. This gap in the plan needs to be remedied to ensure a well-functioning urban area is achieved as residential development throughout the city intensifies.	Amend the title of Table 15-1h in Appendix 15 as follows: “Table 15-1h: Minimum dimensions for on-site parking spaces, on-site drop-off car spaces, and manoeuvring areas”
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.41	Appendix 15 Transportati on	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables		The submitter considers that the design statement needs to include consideration of charging for electric vehicles.	Amend Appendix 15Table 15-2a Simple ITA checklist to include reference to charging for electric vehicles, as provided.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.42	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables		The submitter considers that Table 15-2b Broad ITA checklist needs to include consideration of charging for electric vehicles.	Amend Table 15-2b Broad ITA checklist to include reference to charging for electric vehicles, as provided.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.43	Planning Maps	General		The submitter notes that Plan Change 12 has erroneously notified general residential zoning on the southern side of Riro Street and medium density residential zoning on the northern side where an HHA applies via Plan Change 9.	Amend the planning maps so that within the HHA over Riro Street is changed to general residential zoning.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.44	Planning Maps	General		The submitter notes that Plan Change 12 has erroneously notified high density residential zoning throughout this area.	Amend the planning maps so that the high density residential zone within the HHA over Anglesea Street is changed to general residential zoning.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.45	Planning Maps	General		The submitter notes that Plan Change 12 has erroneously notified the residential area on Victoria Street and Kotahi Avenue as general residential rather than high density residential zone. Supporting documentation to the plan change recommends that this area should be zoned high density residential.	Amend the general residential zone of the Victoria Street and Kotahi Avenue area to high density residential zoning.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.46	Planning Maps	General		The submitter notes that 362 River Road and 1 Oakley Avenue are both partially affected by the Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA). Plan Change 12 has zoned the driveway and access leg as general residential where they overlap with the HHA and high density residential for the remainder of the property. To ensure that the provisions of the HHA can be applied effectively and as they are intended, the residential zoning should follow the boundaries of the HHA.	Amend the planning maps so that the driveway to 362 River Road and the access leg to 1 Oakley Avenue are zoned high density residential zone.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.47	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter notes that the definition refers to 'public transport service that operates at a frequency of no less than one service per 15 minutes' but does not specify the times of day that this service level should be met.	Include additional definitions of Major Public Transport Interchange and Primary Public Transport Interchange; and Amend the definition to include the times of day the public transport service is required to meet the level of service to meet the definition.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.48	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter considers that the definitions of Passenger Transport Facility and Public Transport Facility need to be the same to avoid confusion.	Amend the definitions of Passenger Transport Facility and Public Transport Facility so that they are the same.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.49	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter considers that in order to provide clarity, additional text is needed to explain Mode 2 and Mode 3 as well as a link.	Amend the definition to provide clarity, as well as a link, as provided by the submitter.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270.50	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter notes that there are three definitions in the ODP that relate to net site area.	Amend the definition of “Average Net Site Area” as provided, and delete the definitions “Net Site Area” and “Net Site Area for Duplex Dwellings in the Residential Intensification Zone”.
Hamilton City Council	270.51	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General		The submitter has not provided any further details on water conservation measures in their submission.	The submitter has not provided any further details on water conservation measures in their submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
- Mark Davey						
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	270. 52	General	General		The Hamilton City Council has made a submission to Plan Change 12.	Seeks that identified drafting, or the broader relief, or such similar relief as is necessary to address the matters set out in the submitter's submission be granted.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	271. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter notes that overall PC12 appears rushed and not thought through or consulted on, and highlights concerns with the treatment of Historic Heritage Areas and trees. Specifically, the submitter mentions Chapters 2,4,5,19,25.15.	The submitter seeks that their concerns on several matters are addressed, including that HCC should push back on intensification proposals under they are better considered and consulted with alongside the community. Further detail on the relief sought is contained in the following submission points below where relevant.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	271. 2	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the changes to Chapters 5 and 19 as they believe that there is insufficient protection afforded under PC12. The submitter opposes the change to allow 3 buildings of 3 storeys to be constructed on rear sections, considering these as undesirable eyesores which will dominate the landscape, overlook and shadow adjacent neighbours (straining interpersonal relations between residents), and strip all areas of character and charm. The submitter urges that buildings should be considered as part of the wider environment and not just in isolation.</p> <p>The submitters oppose the demolition of existing buildings within 800m of the CBD or 400m from Grey street, noting that this is an arbitrary metric which takes no account of the existing environment or future impacts of new development, and will lead to an indelible mistake. They note that high and medium density buildings can be constructed but should be designed well and located correctly.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that heritage buildings presently in high density residential areas are reconsidered, and request these to be included in heritage protection zones areas even if they are located in high residential areas. The submitter also seeks several other amendments and changes to PC12, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage items presently located in High Residential Areas (particularly Hamilton East) should be rezoned to Heritage Areas, and 3 units of 3 storeys excluded from HHAs. Mandatory assessment of design standards by the Design Panel Further consideration of shading impacts in residential rules. Concentration of high and medium density development in newer areas and the CBD, and consideration of the whole environment before approving such dwellings.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	271. 3	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the zoning of Steele Park and its surrounds and requests rezoning to commercial or residential. The submitter notes this is a golden opportunity to achieve the objectives of PC12 in an area that will be improved by increased residential density. The submitter believes the provision of multi-storey mixed use developments that are attractive and well-designed would enhance the area and provide additional amenities for new and existing residents. However, to achieve this the submitter considers that the Design Panel would need to be reinforced with new design guidelines to allow spatial planning to be carried out by those other than developers.	Rezone around Steele Park to commercial or residential zones.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	271. 4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		<p>The submitter opposes the changes to Chapters 5 and 19 as they believe that there is insufficient protection afforded under PC12. The submitter opposes the change to allow 3 buildings of 3 storeys to be constructed on rear sections, considering these as undesirable eyesores which will dominate the landscape, overlook and shadow adjacent neighbours (straining interpersonal relations between residents), and strip all areas of character and charm. The submitter urges that buildings should be considered as part of the wider environment and not just in isolation.</p> <p>The submitters oppose the demolition of existing buildings within 800m of the CBD or 400m from Grey street, noting that this is an arbitrary metric which takes no account of the existing environment or future impacts of new development, and will lead to an indelible mistake. They note that high and medium density buildings can be constructed but should be designed well and located correctly.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that heritage buildings presently in high density residential areas are reconsidered, and requests these be included in heritage protection zones areas even if they are located in high residential areas. The submitter also seeks several other amendments and changes to PC12, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage items presently located in High Residential Areas (particularly Hamilton East) should be rezoned to Heritage Areas, and 3 units of 3 storeys excluded from HHAs. Mandatory assessment of design standards by the Design Panel Further consideration of shading impacts in residential rules. Concentration of high and medium density development in newer areas and the CBD, and consideration of the whole environment before approving such dwellings.
Arthur Henry Soper	272. 1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	<p>Amend Chapter 2 to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off.</p> <p>Amend Chapter 2 to direct developers to upgrade infrastructure especially sewerage rather than Council take an extra financial contribution to be held in general funds. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes above.</p>
Arthur Henry Soper	272. 2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Natural Environment	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2-2-11 to disallow any concentrated development within 100 metres of the Waikato River and/or gully systems.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Arthur Henry Soper	272. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Chapter 4 however notes that they foresee problems from increased traffic being funnelled down right of ways to rear sections. The submitter believes that there will be congestion and a lack of parking and most importantly restricting access for emergency vehicles. The submitter is also concerned about 3 storey buildings affecting privacy & access to sunlight in restricted areas. There will be an accompanying increase in noise levels in a restricted space.	Seeks amendment of Chapter 4 to disallow multi-dwelling 3 storey development on rear sections and rights of way. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes sought.
Arthur Henry Soper Ronald Braithwaite 48a Braid Road	273. 1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2 to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Amend Chapter 2 to direct developers to upgrade infrastructure especially sewerage rather than Council take an extra financial contribution to be held in general funds. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes above.
Arthur Henry Soper Ronald Braithwaite 48a Braid Road	273. 2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Natural Environ ment	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2-2-11 to disallow any concentrated development within 100 metres of the Waikato River and/or gully systems.
Arthur Henry Soper Ronald Braithwaite 48a Braid Road	273. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Chapter 4 however notes that they foresee problems from increased traffic being funnelled down right of ways to rear sections. The submitter believes that there will be congestion and a lack of parking and most importantly restricting access for emergency vehicles. The submitter is also concerned about 3 storey buildings affecting privacy & access to sunlight in restricted areas. There will be an accompanying increase in noise levels in a restricted space.	Seeks amendment of Chapter 4 to disallow multi-dwelling 3 storey development on rear sections and rights of way. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes sought.
Arthur Henry Soper Lenva Joy Calcott-Rumney 46 Braid Road	274. 1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2 to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Amend Chapter 2 to direct developers to upgrade infrastructure especially sewerage rather than Council take an extra financial contribution to be held in general funds. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes above.
Arthur Henry Soper Lenva Joy Calcott-Rumney 46 Braid Road	274. 2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Natural Environ ment	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2-2-11 to disallow any concentrated development within 100 metres of the Waikato River and/or gully systems.
Arthur Henry Soper Lenva Joy Calcott-Rumney 46 Braid Road	274. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Chapter 4 however notes that they foresee problems from increased traffic being funnelled down right of ways to rear sections. The submitter believes that there will be congestion and a lack of parking and most importantly restricting access for emergency vehicles. The submitter is also concerned about 3 storey buildings affecting privacy & access to sunlight in restricted areas. There will be an accompanying increase in noise levels in a restricted space.	Seeks amendment of Chapter 4 to disallow multi-dwelling 3 storey development on rear sections and rights of way. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes sought.
Arthur Henry Soper Johan Hofmeyr Louw 28A Braid Road	275. 1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	Amend Chapter 2 to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Amend Chapter 2 to direct developers to upgrade infrastructure especially sewerage rather than Council take an extra financial contribution to be held in general funds. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes above.
Arthur Henry Soper Johan Hofmeyr	275. 2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Natural Environ ment	Support in part	The submitter generally agrees with Chapter 2. However we would like it amended to minimise impervious surfaces and disallow raising of ground levels causing run-off. Climate change is real. In 30/60 years of living on a gully we have seen a great increase in water exiting the sides of the gully	Amend Chapter 2-2-11 to disallow any concentrated development within 100 metres of the Waikato River and/or gully systems.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Louw 28A Braid Road					and higher on the banks. We have seen 3 major slips exposing liquid clay. One of the properties has glow worms & bats.	
Arthur Henry Soper Johan Hofmeyr Louw 28A Braid Road	275.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Chapter 4 however notes that they foresee problems from increased traffic being funnelled down right of ways to rear sections. The submitter believes that there will be congestion and a lack of parking and most importantly restricting access for emergency vehicles. The submitter is also concerned about 3 storey buildings affecting privacy & access to sunlight in restricted areas. There will be an accompanying increase in noise levels in a restricted space.	Seeks amendment of Chapter 4 to disallow multi-dwelling 3 storey development on rear sections and rights of way. Alternatively, any other relief to achieve the outcomes sought.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.1	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of the Three-Waters Connections Policy by reference. Fire and Emergency support the additional mechanism to ensure that Council have the ability to assess and ensure that new developments are able to adequately connect to the water supply network and that the network is able to adequately service the proposed activity, without having any adverse effects on councils infrastructure and the wider environment. It is important that new developments have adequate firefighting water supply available to service the site and subsequent land use.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	Fire and Emergency support this policy (2.2.2a) insofar that (v) requires new subdivision and development to incorporate water-sensitive techniques to reduce demand for water supply and (vii) that requires the management of infrastructure to ensure sufficient capacity to support residential intensification. This is important to Fire and Emergency from both a water supply and transportation network perspective.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	Fire and Emergency support the City Urban Form objective and policy framework insofar that it requires Council to provide for a well-functioning urban environment and enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future (Objective 2.2.14). Fire and Emergency also support policy 2.2.14e insofar that it requires subdivision to create a connected, legible, and universally accessible transport network. This policy framework would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		Fire and Emergency support Policies 4.1.2.1a, 4.1.2.1e, 4.1.2.2a, 4.1.2.2b. Fire and Emergency support the Medium Density Residential Standards objective and policy framework insofar that it requires Council to provide for a well-functioning urban environment and enables all people and communities to provide for their health and safety, now and into the future (Objective 4.1.2.3). Fire and Emergency also support policy 4.1.2.3c insofar that it requires housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. This policy framework would include consideration of, and the requirement to provide an adequate firefighting water supply and adequate emergency access and egress in the event of an emergency.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support in part the provision of non-residential activities in residential zones where they remain compatible with residential amenity values. Fire and Emergency however request that Policy 4.1.2.4a be amended to include consideration of the health and wellbeing benefits of non-residential activities such as emergency service facilities within residential neighbourhoods. Fire and Emergency note in the explanation that some other non-residential activities may be appropriate in the Residential Zones which specifically includes emergency service facilities.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.4a as follows: 4.1.2.4a Manage the effects of non-residential activities, while recognizing that there are social, economic, <u>community health and safety</u> , and environmental benefits to be had from locally available non-residential activities within neighbourhoods.
Alec Duncan Fire and	276.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and	Support	Fire and Emergency support Policy 4.1.2.6c insofar that it requires that building and development design achieves quality on-site amenity. Specifically, Fire and Emergency support (vii) whereby	Retain Policy 4.1.2.6c as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Emergency New Zealand			Policies: All Residential Zones		<p>public access and, where offered, parking and manoeuvring areas on-site are to contribute positively to onsite amenity and meet the needs, safety and convenience of residents.</p> <p>Good design of housing is a critical component in the provision of adequate emergency service access.</p>	
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table		<p>4.2.3.1 Activity status table</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the provision of emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary activity in the General Residential Zone.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that Rule 4.2.5.6 incorporates the density standards required by Part 2 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.</p> <p>As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission, Fire and Emergency have concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 4.2.5.6 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add advice note to Rule 4.2.5.6:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u></p> <p><u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support Rule 4.2.5.8 insofar that it requires all residential developments comprising 4 or more residential units to have pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door of each residential unit, or to the single front door and lobby of an apartment building.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency strongly support 4.2.5.8(c)(i) whereby the pedestrian access must be step-free and separate from and clear of any obstructions. This is important in providing efficient emergency service personnel access to buildings.</p> <p>Provided that 4.2.5.8(d)(i) is not intended for pedestrian only access development and carriageways are still required (in addition the pedestrian access requirements), Fire and Emergency support the pedestrian access width requirements specified.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is designed and consequential site layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent stage so that Council are able to assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with 4.2.5.8 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add an advice note to Rule 4.2.5.8:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u></p> <p><u>Access requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.</p>	Retain as notified

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of emergency service facilities as a discretionary activity in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that Rule 4.3.4.6 incorporates the density standards required by Part 2 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.</p> <p>As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission, Fire and Emergency have concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 4.3.4.6 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add advice note to Rule 4.3.4.6:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support Rule 4.3.4.8 insofar that it requires all residential developments comprising 4 or more residential units to have pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door of each residential unit, or to the single front door and lobby of an apartment building.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency strongly support 4.3.4.8(c)(i) whereby the pedestrian access must be step-free and separate from and clear of any obstructions. This is important in providing efficient emergency service personnel access to buildings.</p> <p>Provided that 4.3.4.8(d)(i) is not intended for pedestrian only access development and carriageways are still required (in addition the pedestrian access requirements), Fire and Emergency support the pedestrian access width requirements specified.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are brought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is designed and consequential site layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent stage so that Council are able to assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with 4.3.4.8 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add an advice note to rule 4.3.4.8:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u> <u>Access requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency	276.15	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
New Zealand						
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.17	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of emergency service facilities as a discretionary activity in the High Density Residential Zone.	Retain as notified
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.18	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that Rule 4.4.5.6 incorporates the density standards required by Part 2 of Schedule 3A of the RMA.</p> <p>As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission, Fire and Emergency have concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) however consider it important that these controls are bought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 4.4.5.6 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add advice note to Rule 4.4.5.6:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.19	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support Rule 4.4.5.8 insofar that it requires all residential developments comprising 4 or more residential units to have pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door of each residential unit, or to the single front door and lobby of an apartment building.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency strongly support 4.4.5.8(b)(i) whereby the pedestrian access must be step-free and separate from and clear of any obstructions. This is important in providing efficient emergency service personnel access to buildings.</p> <p>Provided that 4.4.5.8(c) and (d) is not intended for pedestrian only access development and carriageways are required (in addition the pedestrian access requirements), Fire and Emergency support the pedestrian access width requirements specified.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements are managed through the NZBC however consider it important that these controls are bought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. The NZBC requirements will have an influence over how a site is deigned and consequential site layout therefore Fire and Emergency consider it important that developers incorporate these requirements into their site layout at resource consent stage so that Council are able to assess this design to ensure compliance with the RMA.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with 4.4.5.8 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add an advice note to rule 4.4.5.8:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u> <u>Access requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. This includes the provision for firefighter access to buildings and egress from buildings. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency	276.20	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.	Retain as notified

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
New Zealand						
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.21	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas		Fire and Emergency support the provision of an outdoor living area and waste management and service areas on the premise that while not directly intended, may provide access for emergency services and space for emergency egress.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.22	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	Fire and Emergency support the provision of emergency service facilities as a discretionary activity in the Large Lot Residential Zone.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.23	4.5 Large Lot Residential Zone	4.5.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	<p>As set out in section 1.2.4 of this submission, Fire and Emergency have concerns around the increased risk of fire spreading as a result of reduced boundary setbacks. Reduced setbacks can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source or other emergency. The difficulty of access may also increase the time for fire to burn, thereby increasing the heat radiation in a confined area.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency acknowledge that firefighting access requirements and building setback controls are managed through the New Zealand Building Code (NZBC) however consider it important that these controls are bought to the attention of plan users (i.e. developers) early on in the resource consent process so that they can incorporate the NZBC requirements early on in their building design. Fire and Emergency therefore request that, as a minimum, an advice note is included with Rule 4.5.4.6 directing plan users to the requirements of the NZBC.</p>	<p>Add advice note to Rule 4.5.4.6:</p> <p><u>Advice note:</u> <u>Building setback requirements are further controlled by the Building Code. Plan users should refer to the applicable controls within the Building Code to ensure compliance can be achieved at the building consent stage. Issuance of a resource consent does not imply that waivers of Building Code requirements will be considered/granted.</u></p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.24	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>By way of background, for fire appliances to access an emergency, adequate accessway width, height and gradient is necessary. A 95th percentile pumping appliance has a width of 2.5m, a height of 3.55m and a length of 8.72m. Vehicular roading and access widths, surface and gradients should support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. These requirements are set out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The minimum roading and carriageway widths should not be less than 4m. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliance to access hoses and pumps. ● A clear vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings. ● A height clearance at vehicle crossings and along carriageways should not be less than 4m. ● The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5, but in general the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. <p>Carriageways should be wide enough to allow fire and emergency vehicles to get through them easily and to allow Fire and Emergency to carry out emergency operations. This means that when the fire appliance vehicle is parked, Fire and Emergency personnel can easily open and exit the doors, access equipment from its compartments and safely connect the hose to the pump.</p> <p>To accommodate a Fire and Emergency vehicle, carriageways should have a minimum width of 4m which excludes parking bays as parked cars on a narrow road or private way will obstruct Fire and Emergency from moving along the carriageway. This can be reduced to a minimum width of 3.5m at site entrances (vehicle crossings), provided tight turns are not required. Refer to Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the amendment to 23.7.3(e) that sets the minimum private way width serving 1-6 allotments or residential units to 4m.</p>	Amend 23.7.3(i) to include the requirement of the passing bay to be designed to align with the minimum requirements for a hardstanding as set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>Fire and Emergency also specifically support the 1:5 gradient and the maximum private way length at 100m with the requirement to provide for passing every 50m. It is important that this passing bay is designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements to facilitate an emergency service vehicle in the event of a fire or other emergency.</p> <p>A vehicle hard-standing is a designated area that can withstand the laden weight and associated loads of the Fire and Emergency vehicle and its crew and facilitate firefighting operations. These requirements are set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide. An amendment is sought to this effect.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency further support 23.7.3(l) i. – v. which seek to ensure rear lanes are designed to facilitate emergency service vehicles.</p>	
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.25	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support 23.7.4 insofar that it meets the minimum requirements for emergency service access for subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>It is important that this passing bay is designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements to facilitate an emergency service vehicle in the event of a fire or other emergency.</p> <p>A vehicle hard-standing is a designated area that can withstand the laden weight and associated loads of the Fire and Emergency vehicle and its crew and facilitate firefighting operations. These requirements are set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide. An amendment is sought to this effect.</p>	Amend 23.7.4(k) to include the requirement of the passing bay to be designed to align with the minimum requirements for a hardstanding as set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.26	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.5 High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support 23.7.5 insofar that it meets the minimum requirements for emergency service access for subdivision within the High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency note that 23.7.5(h) does not require a passing bay every 50m.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency request that the requirement for a passing bay is included and that this passing bay be designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements to facilitate an emergency service vehicle in the event of a fire or other emergency.</p> <p>A vehicle hard-standing is a designated area that can withstand the laden weight and associated loads of the Fire and Emergency vehicle and its crew and facilitate firefighting operations. These requirements are set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.</p>	Amend 23.7.5(h) to include the requirement of the passing bay to be designed to align with the minimum requirements for a hardstanding as set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.27	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.8 Within a Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency recognise the historic heritage areas are unique and require careful consideration when it comes to transport provisions. Fire and Emergency note that the minimum private way width serving 1-6 allotments has been set at 3.6m but note that the maximum private way length is 100m requiring a passing bay every 50m. It is important that, given the shortfall in private way width, this passing bay is designed to meet the minimum hardstand requirements to facilitate an emergency service vehicle in the event of a fire or other emergency.</p>	Amend 23.7.8(f) to include the requirement of the passing bay to be designed to align with the minimum requirements for a hardstanding as set out in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.28	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency generally support the imposition of financial contributions as a mechanism to recover infrastructure network costs associated with residential development.</p> <p>It is important that development does not proceed if the adverse effects of residential development on the water supply network and transport network cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated either via network improvements or capacity upgrades, should there be deficiencies.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.29	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	<p>Objective 25.13.2.3 and Policy 25.13.2.3a</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the intent to require measures to facilitate the efficient use of water resources. It is important to Fire and Emergency that demand on the reticulated water supply network is carefully managed and that development does not proceed if there are deficiencies in the network.</p>	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.30	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support the amendment of Objective 25.13.2.4 which now requires the three waters infrastructure to be provided in a way that is resilient. Fire and Emergency’s Statement of Intent (SOI) outlines how the activities Fire and Emergency undertake, and services Fire and Emergency provide contributes to a safer environment for all New Zealanders. This includes reducing the likelihood of unwanted fires, reducing consequences from emergencies, and helping build resilient communities.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency further support the amendment to policy 25.13.2.4b which specifies that subdivision and development should not occur unless the required infrastructure is available.</p> <p>It is paramount to Fire and Emergency that sufficient firefighting water supply is available to service new subdivision and development so that Fire and Emergency are able to provide efficient and effective emergency services to the Hamilton community and meet their primary objective which is to reduce the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.31	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	<p>Policy 25.13.2.5(a) – (h)</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the new policy framework for urban development, re-development, and infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the identification of areas where existing three waters infrastructure has insufficient capacity to accommodate planned additional subdivision or development (25.13.2.5a). Fire and Emergency further support the progressive amendment to this area once three waters infrastructure is upgraded and replaced with sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated housing densities (25.13.2.5g). It will be important that Council have a suitable model in place to keep track of network capacity.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency also support 25.13.2.5b that requires subdivision or developments of a medium to high density in all residential zones to prepare a three waters infrastructure capacity assessment where they are located in areas of constrained three waters infrastructure. The subsequent avoidance of intensification in areas where there is inadequate three waters infrastructure for the planned built environment, and necessary upgrades and improvements are not feasible in the short to long term is also supported. This will ensure that development does not progress in situations where there is adequate infrastructure to support the planned built environment.</p>	Retain as notified
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.32	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	Fire and Emergency support the requirement of a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment and that this triggers the need for resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity.	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.33	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support the requirement for at least one water sensitive technique for stormwater in non-residential zones and that one option be by way of rainwater tank for non-potable reuse system. Fire and Emergency further support the Note 7 that specifies that to be effective, rainwater tanks for new buildings should have a capacity of at least 5,000 litres or should be appropriately designed considering the specific site constraints.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency consider that developers should consider the use of this non-potable water supply as firefighting water supply, should additional capacity be required over what can be reasonably provided by the public reticulated network.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.34	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support 25.13.4.2A(i) that provides an exemption for bulk and location provisions for rainwater tanks with a capacity of <10,500 litres.</p> <p>This will enable communities to be resilient by enabling the storage and use of non-potable water supply in the urban environment.</p>	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.35	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency support the requirement for Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment in the scenarios set out in 25.13.4.6(1)((i – vi) and (2)(i - iii).</p> <p>This should enable Council to ensure that subdivision and developments can be adequately serviced at the time of resource consent.</p> <p>It is paramount to Fire and Emergency that the Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment includes an assessment of capacity in relation to firefighting water supply and that capacity and pressure be in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 (SNZ PAS 4509:2008) to ensure the proposed development can be adequately serviced.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency therefore request that direct reference is made to firefighting water supply capacity and SNZ PAS 4509:2008 in Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements (Submission point 36).</p> <p>Fire and Emergency further support the retention of the requirement for a Water Impact Assessment in all zones other than a Residential zone where subdivision or development is proposed.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.36	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency broadly support the amendments to the objective and policy framework that seeks to ensure an integrated transport network.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency specifically support the following policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Policy 25.14.2.1e that recognises the need to accommodate growth in the roading network including the widening of transport corridors to accommodate this growth. ● Policy 25.14.2.1h that recognises the need to manage the design and location of parking infrastructure in a way that seeks to minimise adverse safety and efficiency effects on emergency services (Policy 25.14.2.1h(iv)((c)). ● Policy 25.14.2.1m that requires an Integrated Transport Assessment for new subdivision, use and or development activities of a nature, scale or location that has the potential to generate significant adverse transportation effects. ● Policy 25.14.2.1o that requires the design, management, and maintenance of rear lanes to provide unrestricted access for emergency vehicles. <p>This framework will ensure that Council and the community are still able to consider any positive or adverse effects and ensure any adverse effects on the transport network can be avoided, remedied and mitigated. This would likely be most appropriate for large development applications with a significant under-provision of parking for the type and location of the activity.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.37	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	<p>25.14.4 Rules – General Standards - 25.14.4.1 Vehicle Crossings and Internal Vehicle Access - Design and Access Widths</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support the minimum vehicle crossing width of 5.5m for two or more residential units (including a duplex). Fire and Emergency note that a minimum width has not been specified for vehicle crossings servicing single residential unit (including an ancillary residential unit) and request that this be no less than 3.5m.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency further support the minimum legal width amendments for internal vehicle access widths. It will be important that these are consistent with the terminology and minimum legal widths set out in Appendix 15 Transportation.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency also support 25.14.4.1(j) which addresses emergency vehicle access requirements associated with rear lane.</p>	Amend 25.14.4.1(h)(i) table to include 3.5m with as a minimum requirement for single residential units in the residential zones.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.38	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Support	<p>Fire and Emergency support the requirement for an urban design assessment to be completed as part of the assessment of environmental effects for proposals of four or more residential units.</p> <p>Chapter 25.15 (Urban Design) of which the proposal requires assessment against should be robust and reflect high quality outcomes including provision of emergency service access.</p>	Retain as notified.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.39	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency request that 1.2.2.5a is amended to specifically require Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment to include an assessment of firefighting water supply capacity in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</p> <p>This will ensure development provides water at the appropriate pressure for its intended use. This is critical in supporting the health and well-being of communities.</p>	Amend 1.2.2.5a to include the specific requirement to assess firefighting water supply capacity in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.40	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency request that the explanation for design and layout be amended to include reference to emergency service access.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support B5 insofar that the assessment criteria adequately address vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation associated with a site. These provisions will support the movement of emergency service vehicles and personnel.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support B8 insofar that it requires driveways to be designed to include truck turning circles and accommodate up to a 20-tonne truck. This will also support the effective operation of a fire appliance in a fire or other emergency.</p>	<p>Amend B(4) as follows:</p> <p>4. Access – has safe circulation to and through the site been provided for all modes including pedestrians <u>and emergency services</u>.</p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.41	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency broadly support ‘G – Transportation’ assessment criteria proposed as they are robust enough to award Council sufficient discretion to assess proposals as to the level of effect development will have on the transport network, in particular, access, parking and new transport corridor design. This will enable Council the ability to decline an application or impose suitable conditions of consent in order to address any adverse effects that may result from development.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support G10(a) which requires an assessment of the extent to which the proposal is designed to accommodate manoeuvring of large rigid trucks including ‘fire’ vehicles within the transport corridor. However, Fire and Emergency suggest that the term ‘fire’ be updated to ‘emergency’ in order to be consistent with terminology used within the wider plan.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency request that G10(c) also be amended to include ‘emergency vehicles’.</p> <p>A similar amendment is sought to G34(b).</p>	<p>Amend G10(a) and (c) as follows:</p> <p>a. Accommodate manoeuvring of large rigid trucks such as public transport, fire <u>emergency</u>, and rubbish, food scraps, and recycling collection vehicles within the transport corridor.</p> <p>c. Provide adequate on-site manoeuvring and circulation to allow <u>emergency</u>, rubbish, food scraps, and recycling collection vehicles to enter and leave the site without reversing on or off the transport corridor.</p> <p>Amend G34(b) as follows:</p> <p>b. The lane is designed to accommodate the passage of large rigid trucks-vehicles such as fire <u>emergency</u>, rubbish, food-scrap, and recycling-collection trucks-vehicles (where these are propose to enter the rear lane).</p>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.42	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>Fire and Emergency broadly support the assessment criteria set out in J9 which awards Council sufficient discretion to assess proposals as to the level of effect a development will have on the water supply network based on the result of a Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessment.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency however request that in addition to the amendments sought in Volume 2, Appendix 1.2, that J9.1(a) be amended to include direct reference to firefighting use.</p>	<p>Amend J9.1(a) as follows:</p> <p>a. Access to and use of an appropriate and sustainable water source <u>for both potable and firefighting use</u>.</p>
Alec Duncan Fire and	276.43	Appendix 15	15-1 Parking, Loading	Support	Table 15-1a - i. Emergency service facilities	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Emergency New Zealand		Transportation	Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures		Fire and Emergency support the new requirement for 1 cycle parking space per 5 full time employed staff.	
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.44	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables - Table 15-2a: Simple ITA checklist</p> <p>Fire and Emergency request that the information requirements in (e) design statement be amended to include consideration of emergency service access.</p>	<p>Amend Table 15-2a (e) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Emergency service access;</u>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.45	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support in part	<p>Table 15-2b: Broad ITA checklist</p> <p>Fire and Emergency request that the information requirements in (g) design statement be amended to include consideration of emergency service access.</p>	<p>Amend Table 15-2b (g) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Emergency service access;</u>
Alec Duncan Fire and Emergency New Zealand	276.46	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-5 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Support in part	<p>Table 15-5a)i: Criteria for the form of Internal Vehicle Access</p> <p>Fire and Emergency support in part the amendment to the minimum legal and carriageway widths for private ways serving 1-6 units.</p> <p>It is noted that the minimum carriageway width for emergency service vehicles to operate effectively and efficiently is 4.0m. However, Fire and Emergency recognise that 4.0m in the urban environment may not be pragmatic in circumstances where higher densities are sought and consider that a minimum carriageway width of 3.5m is acceptable.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency note that the Subdivision Design Standards for residential zones require a passing bay every 50m with a maximum private way length of 100m. It will be important that the passing bay is designed to meet the requirements of a hardstand to facilitate emergency service vehicle operations.</p> <p>This is supported on the basis that the amendments sought in relation provision of an adequate hardstanding be accepted as requested in chapter 23 (submission points 21-24).</p>	Retain as notified.
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings (310 Ruakura Road)	277.1	3.7 Ruakura	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed zoning as it aligns to the current and future plans by TGH.	Nil

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Barker and Associates - Fraser McNutt Tainui Group Holdings (310 Ruakura Road)	277.2	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion from the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay.	Nil
Steve Burgess The Porter Group - Murray Porter	278.1	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of financial contributions from greenfield development to subsidise brownfield development. The way the FC charges have been constructed suggests that HCC does not consider growth resulting from intensification in brownfields areas as growth. HCC's methodology to mitigate the effects of intensification therefore seeks to share the costs of intensification in these brownfields areas with the greenfield areas of Hamilton, despite greenfield areas receiving little or no benefit from these works. The proposed Citywide approach to these charges provides no recognition of the substantial costs that greenfield developments are now required to incur to satisfy resources consent conditions to mitigate adverse environmental effects relative to comparable historical and/or brownfield development.	The submitter seeks to have greenfields development exempt from subsidising brownfields developments in the city.
NZ Lone Worker - Chris Mangan	279.1	Planning Maps	General		The submitter objects the plan relating to Tamihana Avenue due to concerns regarding geotechnical information requirements regarding the flood hazard areas and the Waikato River stability, waste water mains, considers that the area is not within 800m of the Central City Zone, does not consider the area to have access to amenities such as jobs, community services, entertainment precincts or natural spaces, that there is no consideration of biodiversity in the area, notes the heritage of the area and considers the area not a natural fit for high density nor achieve the objective of the legislation.	That the designation of a High Density Residential Zone for the prescribed area be re-zoned Minimum Density Residential Zone.
Julie Norma Smith	280.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter considers the built heritage overlay poorly defined.	No specific relief sought.
Julie Norma Smith	280.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the the proposal encourages developers to appropriate the natural environment for the erection of multi-storied, unsightly human warrens in the absence of a resource consent. The submitter considers that a consequence of the incursion of intensification, central city streets are choked and toxic due to a lack of parking spaces. The submitter considers market prices are falling leaving enough housing to actually meet supply and demand. The submitter considers the plan change an unconscionable act of violation, and abuse which is cultivating a climate of stark inequality where the average home owner is assessed as worthless with no property rights against the elite, untouchable status of investor/developers.	No specific relief sought.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.1	General	General		The submitter is concerned that some of the matters introduced in PC12 go beyond the scope of the RMA direction for including MDRS. Some of the proposed rules in the residential zone have been made more onerous through PC12, including the amended assessment criteria, permeability rules and tree cover and financial contributions.	Seeks amendments and any consequential amendments to give effect to the specific relief sought in specific submission points, including such amendments required to any part of the District Plan to give effect to the relief sought. Seeks any other relief that will achieve the same or a similar outcome. Such other or consequential relief to address matters outlined in this submission and to give full effect to sections 5, 6, 7 and 32 of the RMA 1991 and otherwise promote the sustainable management purpose of the Act.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Objective 4.1.2.1 because determining whether development gives effect to the Vision and Strategy - Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato is vague and uncertain and the section 32 evaluation for the policies, rules, and methods does not demonstrate how this objective will be achieved through the PC12 provisions. There is a lack of technical evidence to support the assumptions regarding the effects of intensification on three waters infrastructure and hence on the River.	Seeks a reconsideration and amendment of the wording for Objective 4.1.2.1 and provide a section 32 evaluation which demonstrates how the objective will be achieved.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub- section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		Use of the term 'avoid' in Policy 4.1.2.1a is too directive.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.1a by deleting the word "avoid" and replace with "manage".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.1c because there is a lack of technical evidence which demonstrates how density, building size, site permeability, and earthworks interrelate and affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River, taking into account the high amenity values and the imperative to achieve density targets in the high density areas, particularly within the 800m walkable catchment of the CBD.	Seeks that Policy 4.1.2.1c is reconsidered and amended, along with providing evidential basis for the policy.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.2a because it is unclear and subjective.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.2a by replacing "anticipated future development" with "planned and permitted future development within the same catchment" or similar.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.2e because it is not feasible in all circumstances to 'avoid' potential effects such as noise from arterial transport corridors and state highways.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.2e by deleting the word 'avoid' and replacing with 'minimise'.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.5a because it is poorly drafted and difficult to understand.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.5a so it is clear and concise. Amend Policy 4.1.2.5a by replacing 'must encourage' with 'enable'; and replace 'offsetting' with 'mitigates'
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281. 8	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes Policy 4.1.2.6a because it is poorly drafted and overly complex wording	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6a so it is pragmatic, clear and concise.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.6c because it is poorly drafted, overly complex and reads like rule standards.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6c so it is clear and consise.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.10	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.6e because the word avoid is too directive in the context of residential development	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6e by deleting "avoid unreasonable" and replace with "minimise adverse".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.3.2.2bii because the policy is uncertain and poorly drafted.	Amend Policy 4.3.2.2bii to provide clarity and delete the word "avoid".
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.12	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 23.7.1 d. because the rule requires a minimum lot size of 1200m ² , which forces subdivision into large lots, presumably for large apartment buildings or other comprehensive multi-unit development. This is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of achieving a variety of housing types, which rely on a variety of lot sizes.	Amend Rule 23.7.1 d. by changing the minimum lot size to 300m ² .
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.13	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability		The submitter opposes in part Rule 23.7..2(4) [correct rule reference 23.7.2 3. i. - iii.] because it is unclear what is required.	Amend Rule 23.7.2(4) [correct rule reference 23.7.2 3. i. - iii.] to read as follows or similar: 4. The fee simple subdivision of any allotment with no existing residential unit, where a subdivision application /s accompanied by a land use consent application that will be determined concurrently and no vacant allotments are created.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.14	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General		<p>The submitter opposes in part Chapter 24 because:</p> <p>PC12 financial contribution amendments appear to go beyond the scope of an IPI. Where these do not relate directly to residential intensification the amendments should be subject to the standard RMA Schedule 1 process. While Chapter 24.1 Background states that a financial contribution is for a different purpose to a development contribution, there is no clear differentiation between what is 'effects' mitigation (FCs) and what is providing for growth (DCs).</p> <p>The section 32 evaluation does not provide an evidential basis of the effects of intensification that are required to be mitigated and therefore subject to FCs.</p> <p>Chapter 24.2.1 General purpose of financial contributions refers to effects associated with a list of</p>	Amend Chapter 24 to ensure the financial contribution provisions provide clear explanation of the basis on which they are required and how these are distinguished/differentiated from DCs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>matters which should be funded through DCs - three waters/transport network improvements; three waters/transport capacity upgrades; parks/reserves/open space network enhancement/improvement.</p> <p>It is not clear why and how FCs are required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>It is unlawful to 'double dip' across FCs and DCs. However, the FC chapter reads like a DC policy, despite the statement at 24.4.2 that costs 'shall exclude any infrastructure works otherwise funded via Council' DC policy.</p> <p>There is a need to provide an explanation of how the relationship between FCs and DCs will be managed and implemented.</p> <p>The s32 evaluation does not address alternative sources of funding for infrastructure upgrades such as the Nature in the City Programme or the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund. These sources should be considered alongside FCs to avoid "double dipping".</p>	
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.15	Appendix 18 Financial Contributions	General		<p>The submitter opposes in part Chapter 24 because:</p> <p>PC12 financial contribution amendments appear to go beyond the scope of an IPI. Where these do not relate directly to residential intensification the amendments should be subject to the standard RMA Schedule 1 process. While Chapter 24.1 Background states that a financial contribution is for a different purpose to a development contribution, there is no clear differentiation between what is 'effects' mitigation (FCs) and what is providing for growth (DCs).</p> <p>The section 32 evaluation does not provide an evidential basis of the effects of intensification that are required to be mitigated and therefore subject to FCs.</p> <p>Chapter 24.2.1 General purpose of financial contributions refers to effects associated with a list of matters which should be funded through DCs - three waters/transport network improvements; three waters/transport capacity upgrades; parks/reserves/open space network enhancement/improvement.</p> <p>It is not clear why and how FCs are required to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana.</p> <p>It is unlawful to 'double dip' across FCs and DCs. However, the FC chapter reads like a DC policy, despite the statement at 24.4.2 that costs 'shall exclude any infrastructure works otherwise funded via Council' DC policy.</p> <p>There is a need to provide an explanation of how the relationship between FCs and DCs will be managed and implemented.</p> <p>The s32 evaluation does not address alternative sources of funding for infrastructure upgrades such as the Nature in the City Programme or the Infrastructure Acceleration Fund. These sources should be considered alongside FCs to avoid "double dipping".</p>	Amend Appendix 18 to ensure the financial contribution provisions provide clear explanation of the basis on which they are required and how these are distinguished/differentiated from DCs.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.16	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria		<p>The submitter opposes in part the Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 as many of the assessment criteria are difficult to understand and are incapable of implementation. For example, use of the term "as a rule of thumb" and excessively long sentences. Furthermore, numerous criteria are presented as a de facto rule standards, which calls into question the status of any activity as being "restricted discretionary".</p> <p>Such criteria include, but are not limited to, the following: B2 Context: B2c.; B2e; B2i.; Public Realm B3b.; B3c.; B3d.; B3e., B3f.; Site Layout B4a.; B4c.; Access and Circulation: B5b.; B5c.; B6 External Appearance; B8 Waste Management, particularly B8c.; C Character and Amenity, particularly: Cl b.; Cl d.; C19 Te Ture Whaimana; G Transportation, including Gla.;Glg.;Glh.; Integrated Transport Assessment G4.; G6.; G9j.; G16;G19;G20;J8;J9;JJ</p>	Redraft the Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 to ensure these are clear, certain, and capable of assessment and implementation by applicants, plan users, and processing planners. Use consistent wording such as "The extent to which..."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.17	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.3.1 e. because the non-complying activity status for single residential units is inconsistent with Objective 4.4.2.1 which Provides for high density living that contributes to housing choice in areas with good accessibility to the Central City via public transport and active modes and Policy 4.4.2.1 which is to <i>Enable a variety of housing storey apartment buildings</i> . typologies, including multi-storey apartment buildings. This objective and the policy give effect to Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement - Urban Development. The non-complying activity status is likely to discourage development, meaning such sites may remain vacant or underutilized, again in conflict with the overall purpose of the NPS-UD and PC 12 to increase the supply and the range of housing.	Amend activity status of Rule 4.4.3.1 e. to Permitted
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.18	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the discretionary activity status for duplexes is inconsistent with Objective 4.4.2.1 which Provides for high density living that contributes to housing choice in areas with good accessibility to the Central City via public transport and active modes and Policy 4.4.2.1 which is to Enable a variety of housing typologies, including multistorey apartment buildings. There is no reason for the High Density Residential zone to have a more onerous activity status than other zones for duplexes.	Amend the activity status for Rule 4.4.3.1 f. to permitted activity.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.19	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.5.1 a. because the maximum net site area of 100m ² per unit is unnecessarily restrictive and inflexible, leading to duplexes only on very small sites. This is inconsistent with enabling a variety of housing types.	Delete Rule 4.4.5.1 a.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.20	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.6.8 Pruning and maintenance of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy overhangs the boundary of a Significant Natural Area in Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the maximum amount of foliage that can be removed per calendar year is 15% because they consider this is too restrictive if the tree is close to the boundary and could significantly reduce the development potential of High Density sites, particularly as many sites in the zone adjoin the Waikato Riverbank.	Amend Rule 4.4.6.8 a. i. by deleting 15% and replacing it with 25%.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.21	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.2 Building Coverag e	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.5.2 a. because they consider that the 60% maximum site coverage is insufficient to achieve the density anticipated in the High Density Zone, particularly for sites such as the submitters that adjoin a major transport corridor with the Central City zone across the road.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.2 a. by amending the site coverage to 80%.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.22	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permea ble Surface and Landsca ping	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.5.3 because the 20% permeability requirement is too high for a High Density Zone and will reduce the opportunity to achieve the intensity of development intended in the zone, given the zone covers relatively small areas.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.3 minimum permeability to 10%.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.23	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General		The submitter opposes in part Chapter 4.4 - High Density Residential Zone because the PC12 provisions do not adequately recognize that parts of the High Density Zone interface or are adjacent to the Central City zone and major arterial roads where the environment is affected by the mixed use commercial nature of the surroundings and the impacts of traffic flows. These sites could accommodate some limited mixed use to encourage use of land that is less suited to residential use because of these interface issues.	Seeks the identification of sites at the interface with Central City zones and/or impacted by traffic from major arterial roads and provide for offices up to 1000m2 GFA per site, restaurants and cafes and ancillary offices as Restricted Discretionary activities, and other provisions of the Central City Zone considered appropriate and relevant.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - John Olliver Peter John Findlay & Donna Margaret Findlay	281.24	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.5.7 fencing standards are inappropriate given the location of the zone near the CBD in areas where there are issues of security and crime. Front fences are essential for security purposes.	Amend 4.4.5.7 to specify that fences of up to 1.8m height are permitted on all boundaries.
Paul Robert Taylor	282.1	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provision of the medium density residential zoning near suburban centre. The submitter considers zoning under Plan Change 12 which allows for up to five storey development is highly vulnerable to a loss/reduction of sunlight and privacy under the proposed changes. There is a strong sense of powerlessness over what now confronts the submitter after a lifetime of working toward and achieving a relatively pleasant home and lifestyle. The submitter is concerned that current homeowners will subsidise the proposed system by absorbing the reduction in life-style value of their properties as the increasing density progresses, such as via increased shading and reduced privacy that threatens wellbeing. The submitter considers the proposal will have a negative effect on the character of the residential environment around suburban centres such as that in Chartwell. The submitter is concerned about the loss of commitment to maintaining properties from renters and the plan change.	That the HCC revise and amend their decision on medium density residential zoning near suburban centres to a more flexible regarding lower maximum stories where the current rate of home ownership is high; and That there be ongoing public discussion on such amendments as well as details of the timing and implementation of the residential development, with the opportunity to influence these decisions and the rate at which increased density proceeds.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	283.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes apartments and high density in Frankton. The submitter wants the railway village to have controls on heights and where you can build. The submitter opposes infill, subdivision and new buildings in the railway village apart from garages and sheds in the railway village. The submitter is annoyed that it was not made clear as to what was happening in their area.	The submitter seeks strict controls that keeps building behind the rear line of the back of the railway houses. In the railway village the submitter wants: No subdivision No infill building No buildings apart from the existing house , with garages and sheds in keeping with the houses. No garages attached to the side of the houses. No relocated buildings heights for alterations and additions to be the same as the old house and same style.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						And Council to come to the village and talk to us about why the character area is being removed and what a historic area means.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	283. 2	General	General		The submitter does not agree uncontrolled poor quality housing and that includes the three storey housing like in the university areas. Everyone should have a good environment.	No high rise apartments in old areas, especially Frankton and Maeroa.
Patricia Maria Lundy	284. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter opposes three storey developments in suburbs because of the traffic impacts, noise, lack of privacy and outdoor areas may lack sunlight.	Seeks that Council resist three storey homes in suburbs and restrict the number of dwellings on some sections. The submitter would also like to see more greenfield development with a variety of homes including more affordable for first home buyers who may want a garage, off street parking and a back or front yard! Quality of life means more choice, not one size fits all. Developers have priced them out of the other market. Lifestyle blocks - Can something be done to put caveats on sale or purchase of these if they are suitable for more housing or fertile land for growing produce?
Colin Rose	285. 1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 and the issues arising from multi homes, homes like this should be located in a new subdivision area of Peacocks.	Reject Plan Change 12
Colin Rose	286. 1	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes cars being parked on footpaths, grass verges and practically on verge and road.	Seeks amendment to require suitable street parking for new homes.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287. 1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter, the Waikato Housing Initiative (WHI), is broadly supportive of Plan Change 12, but seeks additions and amendments. The submitter notes the need not just more housing supply, but the right kind of housing supply – that is, more affordable homes. WHI's view is that infrastructure capacity, and new infrastructure, should prioritise master planned communities that will deliver integrated affordability. WHI seeks for PC12 to have provisions that direct that affordable housing must be supplied. The submitter wants to pepper pot affordable housing through our communities. Integrated affordability is best achieved through master planned mixed use communities. Effective developer-led master planning can achieve well designed communities that have a range of typologies and tenures – including integrated affordability.3 Developers and their consultants are best placed to take the lead on this, in collaboration with Council as consenting authority.	The submitter seeks amendments to the objectives and policies, to better encourage integrated affordability; and The removal of plan provisions which assume adverse effects on neighbours from development; and An exemption for Community Housing from financial contributions.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter seeks amendment to Objective 4.1.2.2 to recognise integrated affordable housing and the present and future needs for housing.	Amend Objective 4.1.2.2 to recognise integrated affordable housing and the present and future needs for housing. 'Development maximises the use of land by providing a range of housing typologies (<u>including integrated affordable housing</u>) that are consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character <u>and present and future needs for housing</u> while ensuring the provision of infrastructure services as part of any development'.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter seeks addition to Policy 4.1.2.2a(vi) to incorporate integrated affordable housing, where appropriate.	The submitter seeks addition to Policy 4.1.2.2a(vi) to incorporate integrated affordable housing, where appropriate. ' <u>(vi) Include integrated affordable housing, where appropriate</u> '.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287. 4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter seeks additions to 4.1.2.2 to include recognition of Development that delivers integrated affordable housing is encouraged.	Add 4.1.2.2g to include recognition of Development that delivers integrated affordable housing is encouraged. ' 4.1.2.2g Development that delivers integrated affordable housing is encouraged '.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato	287. 5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and		The submitter seeks amendment to Objective 4.1.2.3 to include recognition of community needs for affordable housing. 'The Residential Zones and development within these zones positively contribute to achieving a wellfunctioning urban environment that enables all people and	Amend Objective 4.1.2.3 to include recognition of community needs for affordable housing.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Housing Initiative			Policies: All Residential Zones		communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, <u>including community needs for affordable housing</u> , now and into the future'.	
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter seeks an addition policy to 4.1.2.3 that provides for integrated affordable housing.	Add policy 4.1.2.3e that provides for integrated affordable housing. '4.1.2.3e <u>Provide for integrated affordable housing</u> '.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		The submitter seeks amendment to 4.3.2.2 to include reference to the need for integrated affordable housing. 'i. Housing needs and demand (<u>including the need for integrated affordable housing</u>); The neighbour- hood’s planned urban built character, including 3 to 5 storey buildings.	Amend objective 4.3.2.2 to include reference to the need for integrated affordable housing.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		The submitter seeks amendment to 4.3.2.2a that includes integrated affordable homes.	Amend 4.3.2.2a to include integrated affordable homes. '4.3.2.2a Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including <u>integrated affordable homes</u> , 1, 2 and 3-storey attached and detached residential units'.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		Delete policy 4.2.2.2b.	Delete policy 4.2.2.2b.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.10	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter seeks the inclusion of integrated housing within Objective 4.3.2.2.	Amend Objective 4.3.2.2. to include reference to integrated affordable housing. 'ii. Housing needs and demand (<u>including the need for integrated affordable housing</u>)'.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter seeks amendment to policy 4.3.2.2a that includes reference to integrated affordable homes. '4.3.2.2a Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including integrated affordable homes, 3 to 5 storey terrace residential and apartment buildings'.	Amend policy 4.3.2.2a to include reference to integrated affordable homes.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter seeks the deletion of policy 4.3.2.2b.	Delete policy 4.3.2.2b.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.13	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision		The submitter seeks amendment to Objective 23.2.2 to include reference to the delivery of integrated affordability in housing.	Amend Objective 23.2.2 to include reference to the delivery of integrated affordability in housing. 'Subdivision contributes to the achievement of functional, attractive, sustainable, safe and well-designed environments <u>and the delivery of integrated affordability in housing</u> '.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.14	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision		The submitter seeks an additional policy in 23.2.2a that encourages integrated affordable housing.	Add a new policy in 23.2.2a that encourages integrated affordable housing. '23.2.2a <u>(xvi) Encourages integrated affordable housing</u> '.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.15	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision		The submitter seeks additions to Objective 23.2.5 that encourages the delivery of integrated affordable housing.	Amend Objective 23.2.5 to encourage the delivery of integrated affordable housing. '23.2.5 Subdivision occurs in a manner that recognises historic heritage and natural environments and encourages the delivery of integrated affordable housing'.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.16	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.3 Objectives and Policies		The submitter seeks an additional Policy and rule that does not require Community Housing Providers to pay Financial contributions.	Add 24.3.1a to not require Community Housing Providers pay Financial contributions. '24.3.1a(vi) Financial contributions will not be required from Community Housing Providers (CHPs) delivering social and/or affordable housing on a not-for-profit basis'.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.17	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.1 General Rules		The submitter seeks an additional Policy and rule that does not require Community Housing Providers to pay Financial contributions.	Add 24.4.1e to not require Community Housing Providers pay Financial contributions. Addition of Policy 24.3.1a(vi) <u>“Financial contributions will not be required from Community Housing Providers (CHPs) delivering social and/or affordable housing on a not-for-profit basis”</u> .
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Housing Initiative	287.18	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter seeks an additional definition - Integrated affordability, based on their previous comments and full submission.	Add a new definition - <u>Integrated affordability</u> .
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part the proposed plan change, particularly those provisions in the Plan Change which enable development of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in several residential zones, as well as the High Density Residential zoning of the Wilson Carlile Village. The specific provisions that are supported or opposed are further detailed in the additional submission points below.</p> <p>The submitter also notes the importance of retirement villages in catering for the needs and lifestyle of older people (who are some of the most vulnerable members of the community) alongside the particular benefits which retirement villages provide back to communities in the form of eased pressure on services and housing supply. With demand for retirement villages rising, the submitter considers it critical that PC12 recognizes developmental constraints which impact the establishment of retirement villages, provide clear direction on appropriate locations for them, and clear objectives, policies, and rules recognise their functional and operation needs .</p>	<p>Generally, the submitter supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HDR zoning of the Wilson Carlile Village; • Provisions which enable the development of retirement villages as a Restricted Discretionary activity in the MDR and HDR zones. <p>In addition, the submitter seeks several amendments to PC12, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning of Forest Lake Gardens to Medium Density Residential • Rezoning of part of the Hamilton Racecourse to Medium Density Residential • Amendment of the plan change to ensure ensure the relevant objectives, policies, rules, and standards recognize the associated benefits and provide for the needs of retirement villages. <p>The specific provisions where relief is sought by the submitter is captured in the following submission points below.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitter seeks any such additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.</p>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies:	Support in part	The submitter generally supports Objective 4.1.2.2, but note that the requirement for consistency with planned built character is inappropriate given that housing typologies may change over time.	<p>The submitter seeks that Objective 4.1.2.2 is amended as follows:</p> <p>Development maximises the use of land by providing a range of housing typologies that <u>support</u> are consistent</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			All Resident ial Zones			with the needs of the community and the neighbourhood’s planned urban built character while ensuring the provision of infrastructure services as part of any development.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter supports Objective 4.1.2.3 and Policies 4.1.2.3b, 4.1.2.3c and 4.1.2.3d.	The submitter seeks that Objective 4.1.2.3 and Policies 4.1.2.3b, 4.1.2.3c and 4.1.2.3d are retained as notified
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support in part	The submitter opposes Objective 4.1.2.4 in its requirement for non-residential activities to remain compatible with residential amenity values, which they consider does not recognize and provide for the essential non-residential activities required for the operation of retirement villages.	The submitter seeks that Objective 4.1.2.4 is amended as follows: Residential activities remain the dominant activity in the Residential Zones and non-residential activities <u>(that are not directly associated with the operation of a residential activity)</u> remain compatible with residential amenity values.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter opposes Policy 4.1.2.4e as they consider it does not recognize the scope of non-residential activities associated with retirement villages (serving only the villages they are related to and not the local residential area).	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 4.1.2.4e as follows: Non-residential activities must only that serve the local residential area and must be of a size <u>scale</u> that reflects the anticipated residential amenity of the neighbourhood.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objective 4.1.2.6, and Policies 4.1.2.6a, 4.1.2.6b, 4.1.2.6c, 4.1.2.6h as they consider that these provisions fail to recognize the different amenity requirements and functional/operational needs of retirement villages when requiring consistency with the planned built environment, and are inappropriate and non-applicable in some instances. The submitter considers that more flexibility is required in these provisions in order to not lead to adverse outcomes or constrained development.	The submitter seeks the following relief in regard to the concerns with PC12 provisions outlined above (or wording to similar effect): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment of Objective 4.1.2.6: Residential developments are designed and developed to create an attractive and safe urban environment, providing a level of amenity <u>that supports consistent with</u> the planned urban environment while <u>recognising the functional and operational needs of activities</u>:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. On site for residents ii. On adjoining sites; and iii. For the transport corridor and public open spaces. Amendment of Policy 4.1.2.6a: Ensure that all development has a public ‘front’, where neighbours and visitors will access and primarily experience the development from and a private ‘back’, where public access is restricted and by invitation only. Require development to compatibly configure its fronts and backs with those of adjacent development so as to positively contribute <u>to</u> the amenity of well-defined public and publicly accessible spaces, and private spaces. Amendment of Policy 4.1.2.6b: Encourage <u>Require</u> buildings as structures adjacent to the boundary of public and publicly accessible areas (including transport corridors) to incorporate CPTED principles <u>where appropriate</u>. Amendment of Policy 4.1.2.6c: Building and development design achieves quality on-site amenity <u>while recognising the needs of the residents by providing</u>:- Deletion of Policy 4.1.2.6c (i – xiii). Deletion of Policy 4.1.2.6f. Amendment of Policy 4.1.2.6h: Require the provision of <u>Provide for</u> landscaping to mitigate potential adverse effects of activities and to contribute to the overall amenity of residential areas. Amendment of Policy 4.1.2.6j: Ensure any development is well designed and minimises building bulk and visual dominance effects and mitigates visual dominance effects on adjoining sites, including minimising opportunities for overlooking adjoining properties.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter generally opposes Chapter 4.1 as they consider that specific objectives and policies within these residential zones will be in conflict with the more general objectives and policies, which is difficult to reconcile without guidance in the plan as to which provisions take precedence.	The submitter seeks to add a new provision in Chapter 4.1 as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>In the event of conflict between the objectives and policies in 4.1 and the objectives and policies in the residential zone that applies, the objectives and policies in the residential zone shall prevail.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.8	Planning Maps	General		The submitter opposes the zoning of Forest Lake Gardens site (shown in Figure 2, page 7 of the attached submission document) as General Residential Zone, noting that the site is a pocket of residential land which would be appropriate to zone more intensively to remain consistent with other proposed rezonings under PC12.	The submitter seeks to rezone the Forest Lake Gardens site to Medium Density Residential.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.2.2.1 as it provides for integrated development in the General Residential Zone.	The submitter seeks that Objective 4.2.2.1 is retained as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 4.2.2.2 as it provides for a variety of housing types and size, but considers that the provision should be expanded to recognize the changing needs of residents, particularly due to housing affordability and the aging population.	<p>The submitter seeks to ammend Objective 4.2.2.2 as follows (or wording to similar effect):</p> <p>The General Residential Zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:</p> <p>i. <u>The diverse and changing H</u>ousing needs and demand; and</p> <p>ii. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including 1 to 3 storey buildings.</p>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports Policy 4.2.2.2a and its recognition of the variety of housing typologies and densities.	The submitter seeks to retain Policy 4.2.2.2a as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 4.2.2.2bin part, particularly the recognition that values will change, however they consider that qualifications to the policy are already addressed by the relevant development standards and thus not required within the provisions.	<p>The submitter seeks to amend Policy 4.2.2.2b as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete “and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):” Delete provisions 4.2.2.2b (i) and (ii).
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.13	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status of Rule 4.2.3.1g.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.2.3.1g as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.14	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status of Rule 4.2.3.1oo	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.3.1oo is retained as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status of Rule 4.2.3.1qq.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.2.3.1qq as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.16	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5 Rules – General Standards – General Residential Zone.	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the Standards in 4.25 related to retirement villages in the General Residential Zone.	The submitter seeks to retain the Standards in 4.2.5 as notified (except where changes are requested, as covered in further submission points below).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.17	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage	Oppose	The submitter opposes Standard 4.2.5.2 as they consider that the maximum building coverage for retirement villages should be 60% in order to enable more efficient use of land for the additional services and amenity areas which need to be provided.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.2.5.2 as follows: (b) Maximum building coverage for <u>retirement villages</u> and any terrace housing units and apartments where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear lane.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.18	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes the standards requiring 20% landscaping per residential unit at the ground floor as they consider that this would be would be onerous for a retirement village development. The submitter also considers that on front, corner sites and through sites, as well as the yard area, landscaping forward of the front building line should be a minimum of 40% for retirement villages.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.2.5.3 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Standard 4.2.5.3(b) to provide that it does not apply to retirement villages. Add a new (vi) to Standard 4.2.5.3(c) as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (c) On front, corner sites and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required <u>in the yard</u> forward of the front building line. ... <u>(iv) Retirement villages: Minimum 40%</u>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.19	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Oppose	Metlifecare considers that the minimum outlook space for a principal living room in a retirement village should be 3m by 3m rather than 4m by 4m. An outlook space of 4m by 4m is difficult to achieve for all units in a comprehensive retirement village development as a standard room dimension for most dwellings is 3m. From Metlifecare's experience, it is confident that a high level of amenity for residents can be achieved by a 3m by 3m outlook space, particularly where other outdoor communal and recreational spaces are provided.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.2.5.9 as follows: (b) A principal living room (<u>other than in a retirement village unit</u>) must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 4 metres in depth and 4 metres in width. <u>(ba) a principal living room in a retirement village unit must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 3 metres in depth and 3 metres in width.</u>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.20	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of retirement villages in Standard at 4.2.5.10 as they consider that the requirement for a minimum outdoor living space for each unit that may be grouped cumulatively is not appropriate for retirement villages.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.2.5.10(b) as follows (or wording to similar effect): The above standards do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u> , managed care facilities or rest homes. Refer to Rule 4.2.6.5 and Rule 4.2.6.8
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.21	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the zoning of the Wilson Carlile Village site (as shown in Figure 1 on Page 9 of the attached submission document) as HDRZ because they consider that because the site is centrally located and could support more intensive development.	The submitter seeks to retain the proposed HDR zoning of the Wilson Carlile Village site.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.22	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 4.4.2.1 and Policies 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.1a and 4.4.2.1b as they provide for a range of housing typologies to provide for NZ's increasing and ageing population. However, they consider that 6 storey height should be supported rather than required.	The submitter seeks to amend the objectives and policies under 4.4.2.1 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain Objective 4.4.2.1 as notified. Retain Policy 4.4.2.1a as notified. Amend Policy 4.4.2.1b: <u>Support</u> Require the height, bulk, density and appearance of development to contribute to a high density urban character of at least 6 storeys.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.23	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	Metlifecare generally supports Objective 4.4.2.2 and Policies 4.4.2.2a-c which provide for development within the High Density Residential Zone that incorporates best practice urban design principles that contribute to an attractive, liveable, and functional high density environment.	The submitter seeks the following in regard to the provisions in section 4.4.2.2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain Objective 4.4.2.2 as notified. Retain Policy 4.4.2.2a as notified. Amend Policy 4.4.2.2b as follows: Require developments adjoining existing <u>public</u> pedestrian and cycling throughfares ... Retain Policy 4.4.2.2c as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.24	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status for Rule 4.4.3.1l.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.4.3.1l as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.25	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status for Rule 4.4.3.1oo.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.4.3.1oo as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.26	4.4 High Density	4.4.3.1 Activity	Support	The submitter supports supports the activity status for Rule 4.4.3.1pp.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.4.3.1pp as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
		Residential Zone	Status Table			
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.27	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the Standards in 4.4.5 which apply to retirement villages.	The submitter seeks to the Standards in 4.4.5 as notified (except where amendments are requested - addressed in further submission points below).
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.28	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes in party Standard 4.4.5.10 and considers that retirement villages should be excluded due to the requirement for a minimum outdoor living space for each unit, that may be grouped cumulatively. The submitter notes that this is not appropriate for making the maximum use of land (such as in retirement villages) as their communal outdoor spaces and internal recreation spaces are not easily calculated on a per dwelling basis and not directly adjacent to all units.	<p>The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.5.5.10(d) as follows :</p> <p>The above standards do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u>, managed care facilities or rest homes. Refer to Rule 4.2.6.5 and Rule 4.2.6.8 <u>Rule 4.4.6.4 and Rule 4.4.6.5.</u></p> <p>The submitter notes that they understand the reference to Rule 4.2.6.5 and Rule 4.2.6.8 is an error.</p>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.29	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes Standard 4.4.5.11 and beleives that retirement villages should be excluded from these Waste Management and Service areas as the requirement for a service area per unit is not appropriate.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.4.5.11(e) as follows: These standards do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u> , managed care facilities or rest homes (refer to Rule 4.4.6.3 and Rule 4.4.6.4).
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.30	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports Objective 4.3.2.1, particularly the promotion of comprehensive and integrated development 4 or more residential units.	The submitter seeks to retain Objective 4.3.2.1 as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.31	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports Policies 4.3.2.1a-f.	The submitter seeks to retain Policies 4.3.2.1a-f as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.32	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 4.3.2.2 and Policy 4.3.2.2a, specially because they provide for a range of housing types and sizes. However, the submitter considers that the objective should recognise changing needs population due to the affordability of housing and NZ's aging population.	<p>The submitter seeks to amend Objective 4.3.2.2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Medium Density Residential Zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) <u>Changing and diverse housing</u> needs and demand; and (ii) The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including 3 to 5 storey buildings. Retain Policy 4.3.2.2a as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.33	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 4.3.2.2b in part, particularly the recognition that amenity values will change, however they consider that the qualifications are already appropriately addressed by the relevant development standards. However, the submitter opposes Policy 4.3.2.2c, considering that it is overly restrictive and inappropriate for the location.	<p>The submitter seeks the following in regard to Policy 4.3.2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Policy 4.3.2.2b as notified to delete “and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):” and delete (i) and (ii). Delete Policy 4.3.2.2c

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.34	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status for Rule 4.3.3.1k.	The submitter seeks to retain Rule 4.3.3.1k as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.35	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the activity status for Rule 4.3.3.1tt.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.3.1tt is retained as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.36	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports the activity status for Rule 4.3.3.1vv.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.3.1vv is retained as notified.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.37	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.2 Building Coverag e	Oppose	The submitter opposes Standard 4.3.4.2 in part, considering that the maximum building coverage for retirement villages should be 60% to allow for more efficient use of land.	The submitter seeks amendment of Standard 4.3.4.2 as follows: (a) All residential units (except for <u>retirement villages and</u> terrace housing units and apartment units where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear lane then 4.3.4.2(b) applies). (b) Maximum building coverage for <u>retirement villages and</u> any terrace housing units and apartments where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear lane – 60%.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.38	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permea ble Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for 20% landscaping per residential unit at ground floor as this would be onerous for a retirement village development where a variety of private and shared spaces are already provided. The submitter considers that on front, corner sites and through sites, and in yards, landscaping required forward of the front building line should be a minimum of 20% for retirement villages.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.3.4.3 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard 4.3.4.3(b) to state that it does not apply to retirement villages. Amend Standard 4.3.4.3(c) as follows: (c) On front, corner sites and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required <u>in the yard forward of the front building line.</u> <u>(iv) Retirement villages: Minimum 20%.</u>
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.39	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter considers that the minimum outlook space for a principal living room in a retirement village should be 3m by 3m rather than 4m by 4m, given that 4x4 is difficult to achieve for all units in a comprehensive retirement village development.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.3.4.9 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) A principal living room (<u>other than in a retirement village unit</u>) must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 4 metres in depth and 4 metres in width Add: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(ba) a principal living room in a retirement village unit must have an outlook space with a minimum dimension of 3 metres in depth and 3 metres in width.</u> As alternative relief, amend Standard 4.3.4.9 to apply a 3m by 3m outlook space for all residential development.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.40	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes the retirement villages being considered within the Outdoor Living Area Standard at 4.3.4.10. as this requires a minimum outdoor living space for each unit (that may be grouped cumulatively) which is not appropriate for such development as previously raised.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.3.4.10 as follows: The outdoor living area standards in Rule 4.3.4.10 do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u> , managed care facilities or rest homes. See Rule 4.3.5.5 and Rule 4.3.5.8.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.41	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes retirement villages being considered within the Waste Management and Service Areas Standard at 4.3.4.11. The submitter notes that the requirement for a service area for each unit is not appropriate for retirement villages as they often have communal service areas.	The submitter seeks to amend Standard 4.3.4.11(e) as follows: The waste management and service area standards in Rule 4.3.4.11 do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u> , managed care facilities or rest homes. See Rule 4.3.5.5 and Rule 4.3.5.8.
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.42	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks that PC12 adopts an integrated approach to align with PPC 13 (lodged by the Waikato Racing Club Incorporated), including rezoning of a 1.5ha segment of the Te Rapa Racecourse site (at 37 Sir Tristram Avenue) to Medium Density Residential Zone and providing for a Te Rapa Racecourse Medium Density Residential Precinct.	The submitter seeks that the PC12 planning maps are amended to provide for the rezoning of part of Te Rapa Racecourse to Medium Density Residential Zone, as requested in PPC 13. The submitter also seeks that a Medium Density Residential Precinct around this site is introduced in alignment with PPC13.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.43	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Oppose	The submitter considers that retirement villages should be excluded from the Waste Management and Service area standards, as this is not appropriate for retirement villages as they often have communal service areas to ensure waste disposal is easy, efficient and safe for residents.	The submitter seeks that Standard 4.2.5.11(e) is amended as follows (or wording to similar effect): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These standards do not apply to <u>retirement villages</u>, managed care facilities or rest homes. Refer to Rule 4.2.6.5 and Rule 4.2.6.8
Metlifecare Limited - Bianca tree	288.44	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4 Rules – General Standards – Medium Density Residential Zone		The submitter generally supports the standards in 4.4.5 to the extent they apply to retirement villages in the MDR zone.	The submitter seeks the Standards in 4.3.4 are retained except where changes are requested (addressed in other submission points).
Craig William Jefferies	289.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the High Density Zoning of the area bounded by River Road, Casey Ave, Riverview Terrace and the Boundary Road Bridge.	Remove the High Density zoning of the area bounded by River Road, Casey Ave, Riverview Terrace and the Boundary Road Bridge because of the constraints in the area such as the Gully Hazards, Waikato River stability and geotechnical issues making it inappropriate for high density development.
Len Halgryn	290.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers humankind at its ease most, in the exercise of liberty. The submitter considers that rule-making needs to have a light touch, and through the right channels. Any interference with liberty can hold the potential for disaffection, which in turn can foster dysfunction and hostility within a community. The proposed changes and their support documents appear to contain a number of ideologies that ignore these factors and increasingly aim to restrict liberty, and that will necessitate sacrifice. That is a recipe for a city that is difficult to live in – a road that Hamilton has already travelled down quite a distance. This is a disincentive for community participation.	Pause or rein in the reforms to carry out a more thorough and transparent process can be undertaken both in the communities and among the team.
Len Halgryn	290.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the allowance of intensification as of right across the general residential zone. Their concerns include visual privacy, loss of sunlight, storm water capacity, community value loss, respiratory illness, monotonous typologies and a lack of architectural and urban design oversight.	Prioritise the upgrading of underground infrastructure in selected areas within general residential zones to break up the 3x3 ‘carpet’ that would otherwise result; and Council takes responsibility for developing storm water treatment features on public land, not individual sites, which creates public open space; and Council sponsoring or incentivising the expression and utilisation of culturally diverse design, visual symbols, typologies and amenity values, in order to acknowledge, celebrate and promote everyone in a conscious, explicit and inclusive manner.
Len Halgryn	290.3	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Oppose	The submitter has concern for developer covenants in the subdivision consenting process. They consider it increasingly concerning that the options for occupants to choose their own lifestyle are being micromanaged and sanitised through covenants, that they are discriminatory and non-inclusive, and that they also frequently contribute to a state of unaffordability by prescribing aspirational	Target developer covenants to curtail or eliminate them.
Bryan Windeatt Architect Ltd - Bryan Windeatt	291.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter opposes the change to 4.2.5.5 noting a potential 50% more BLDG bulk being permitted constructed closer to the boundar	Oppose the proposed Height in Relation to Boundary rule.
Bryan Windeatt Architect Ltd - Bryan Windeatt	291.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.2.5.6c due to compounding impact on residential character.	Oppose 4.2.5.6c.
Bryan Windeatt Architect	291.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and	Support in part	The submitter considers the urban trees standard contributing to the urban landscape but requires improved provisions.	Improved provisions for 2 urban trees and building density.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Ltd - Bryan Windeatt			Landsca ping			
Kelvin and Julia French	292. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 4.1.2.6c (xi) because in many narrow streets this new rule would be counterproductive/result in unintended adverse outcomes (i.e, reduced road safety). Another issue is that the urban intensification that has already occurred (e.g., cross-lease, subdivision) has resulted in insufficient off-street parking for residents and their family and friends. Parking on the berm on the no-park side of the road and partial blocking of pedestrian-way is a frequent occurrence and accidents involving cyclists have already occurred due to the current parking situation.	Amend as follows: • Rule 4.1.2.6c (xi) will be enabled by reduced off-street parking in new developments. However, in many narrow streets this new rule would be counterproductive/result in unintended adverse outcomes (i.e, reduced road safety). McCracken Avenue (Riverlea), where we reside, is one example of a narrow residential street that has additional issues that make urban intensification envisaged under Plan Change 12 problematic AND That the special features and issues related to individual localities is taken into consideration rather than having a ‘one size fits all’ approach e.g a narrow residential street AND All new development/dwellings in McCracken Avenue must have off-street parking as there is no capacity for further on-street parking. This will mitigate the risk of injury/death which would accompany congested parking practices in a narrow street.
Kelvin and Julia French	292. 2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	The submitter support Policy 4.1.2.6(f) because large native trees in particular that are many decades old substantially enhance the local environment, community wellbeing and provide important roosts and nesting sites for native birds, including the Tui and Ruru/Morepork that has made a resurgence in Riverlea over the last 5-10 years. Preserving mature native trees that have taken many decades to grow and provide multiple good for the community and wildlife should be of paramount importance to Council.	No specific relief sought.
Kelvin and Julia French	292. 3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones	Support	The submitter supports the intent of this proposed Policy 4.1.2.6j .The submitter's property is located on the south side of McCracken Avenue and below those on the north side and any new multi storey dwelling built on the north side, would have visual dominance and look directly into our indoor and outdoor living areas of our property.	No specific relief sought.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Ryman Healthcare Limited (Matthew Brown)	294. 1	General	General		The submitter wishes to emphasise that PC12 will have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Hamilton City’s growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region. [Note: this submission is in support of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA) submission on PC12].	The submitter seeks the decisions sought by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA) in its submission on PC12.
Kim Daysh	295. 1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectiv es and Policies: All Resident ial Zones		The submitter notes the service constraints in the Claudelands area with concerns for the water catchment and health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	I want Hamilton City Council to refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA - specifically to reuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Kim Daysh	295. 2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectiv es and Policies: General Resident ial Zone		The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage homes in the city and the loss of sunlight, privacy and overall community culture. Plan Change 9 excluded Gillies, Avenue, East Street, Young Street and Pearsons Street from its heritage protections. Plan Change 12 will enable even more loss of heritage homes, adversely affecting the health of residents by reducing sunlight and privacy.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter notes in addition to the specific relief sought that the general relief is sought to achieve the following:</p> <p>i. The purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and consistency with the relevant provisions in Sections 6 - 8 RMA;</p> <p>ii. Give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement;</p> <p>iii. Assist the Council to carry out its functions under Section 31 RMA;</p> <p>iv. Meet the requirements of the statutory tests in section 32 RMA; and</p> <p>v. Avoid, remedy or mitigate any relevant and identified environmental effects;</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make any alternative or consequential relief as required to give effect to this submission, including any consequential relief required in any other sections of the proposed plan that are not specifically subject of this submission but where consequential changes are required to ensure a consistent approach is taken throughout the document; and 2. Any other relief required to give effect to the issues raised in this submission.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.2	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter notes that the intensification changes are required under either the NPS:UD or the MDRS with little to no discretion on their applicability, other than for qualifying matters, and are neutral to them subject to ensuring reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established retail fuel activities are appropriately managed.</p> <p>PC12 will alter development potential around these facilities (fuel stations) with corresponding potential to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects including nuisance effects (e.g. noise and lighting) and amenity effects. For instance, an occupier of a terraced apartment or residential occupier of a multi storey mixed use development is more likely to perceive noise and visual effects compared to an occupier of single-storey dwelling and, more than likely, setback from the boundary and screened by a fence and landscaping.</p> <p>The submitter consider this is a potential adverse effect on the ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrade of these facilities, which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act. The submitter anticipates that this will be a wider issue for non-residential activities more generally, which, like fuel industry sites, have demonstrated that they can operate in a range of zones and at zone interfaces.</p>	<p>The submitter acknowledges that there is no appropriate relief regarding the construction of dwellings of up to three dwellings per site in accordance with permitted activity standards in residential zones. However, where consent is required in residential zones, the Fuel Companies consider that residential amenity and existing activities need to be appropriately protected by provisions which respond to the interface with the Central City Zone or Business Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities. This is reflected in the National Medium Density Design Guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which encourages new development to respond to existing or proposed nearby non-residential activities.</p> <p>However, the submitter generally supports the provisions of PC12 but seek amendments to ensure reverse sensitivity is more explicitly recognised in the policy framework of the residential zones to ensure there is appropriate direction to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities and adjoining non-residential zones. This could be achieved by amending the following provisions as set out in the rest of this submission. Alternative relief may achieve the same outcome.</p>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 4.1.2.2d because it requires new buildings and activities to mitigate effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure, which includes reverse sensitivity effects. However as set out in submission point 1 the submitter also considers this policy should be extended to address existing non-residential activities.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.2d by adding the underlined words:</p> <p><i>New buildings and activities shall mitigate effects on and from regionally significant infrastructure <u>and existing non-residential activities.</u></i></p>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 4.1.2.2e but considers it should be amended to manage effects from existing non-residential activities.	<p>Amend Policy 4.1.2.2e by deleting struck out text and inserting underlined text:</p> <p><i>Residential land uses should be managed to avoid potential effects, such as noise, from arterial transport corridors, and state highways <u>and existing non-residential activities.</u></i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 4.1.2.6c but consider the inclusion of design measures to minimise reverse sensitivity effects will further pormite higher amenity outcomes while protecting the ongoing operation of existing non-residential activities.	Amend Policy 4.2.1.6c by adding a new point: <u>xiv. Design measures to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining non-residential activities and zones, including acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation</u>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 4.1.2.6e noting that Section 16 of the Act requires avoidance of unreasonable noise. Rather than duplicate that requirement, the submitters considers that the policy needs to go further to promote sustainable management through a requirement to minimise noise through design techniques.	Amend Policy 4.1.2.6e by deleting the struck through text and adding the underlined text: <i>Ensure development uses design techniques, including building location, orientation and acoustic insulation is designed to minimise avoid unreasonable adverse noise effects occurring between residential units or from non-residential activities on the site or from adjoining sites.</i>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone		The submitter supports in part Policy 4.2.2.2b as it acknowledges that adverse effects from greater density residential development are likely to occur on adjoining residential neighbours, however the submitter considers that the policy should also be extended to adjoining non-residential activities which are likely to experience adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Policy 4.2.2.2b by deleting the struck through text and adding the underlined text: <i>Recognise that development in accordance with the General Residential Zone will have adverse effects, in some instances substantial, on existing <u>adjacent residential and non-residential</u> development and neighbours, and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):</i> <i>i. Subject to (ii) below, ensure that development with adverse effects, greater than those enabled by the General Residential Zone on a <u>residential</u> neighbour, will achieve an equivalent or greater overall standard of on-site amenity for that neighbour compared to development in accordance with what the General Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in.</i> <i>ii. Where a proposal cannot satisfy (i) above, avoid adverse effects <u>on residential neighbours</u> beyond those that could result from development in accordance with what the General Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in except where substantial off-setting positive effects are proposed</i> <u><i>iii. Where a proposal adjoins an existing non-residential activity, ensure any reverse sensitivity effects are minimised.</i></u>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo	296.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion	Support	The submitter acknowledge that relief is not appropriate for the construction of and use of up to three dwellings per site that comply with permitted activity standards in residential zones, and therefore support the requirement for 4 or more dwellings, or an infringement of a standard, to be assessed against the following Matters of Discretion (MD) and Assessment Criteria (AC): B – Design and Layout; and C – Character and Amenity. Specifically, the Fuel Companies support AC C2 which requires consideration of how development (including residential development) has been designed and located so that the potential for reverse sensitivity effects (including noise) are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Retain Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria 4.2.7 (i), (ii) and (iii) as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
bil Oil New Zealand Limited			n and Assessment Criteria			
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.9	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter acknowledge that relief is not appropriate for the construction of and use of up to three dwellings per site that comply with permitted activity standards in residential zones, and therefore support the requirement for 4 or more dwellings, or an infringement of a standard, to be assessed against the following Matters of Discretion (MD) and Assessment Criteria (AC): B – Design and Layout; and C – Character and Amenity. Specifically, the Fuel Companies support AC C2 which requires consideration of how development (including residential development) has been designed and located so that the potential for reverse sensitivity effects (including noise) are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	The submitter supports Assessment Criteria C2
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.10	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 4.3.2.2 but seeks amendments to address reverse sensitivity effects are minimised on existing non-residential activities.	Amend Policy 4.3.2.2 by deleting the struck through text and adding the underlined text: <i>Recognise that development in accordance with the Medium Density Residential Zone will have adverse effects, in some instances substantial, on existing <u>adjacent residential and non-residential</u> development and neighbours, and (except where a neighbour has provided written approval to a proposal):</i> <i>i. Subject to (ii) below, ensure that development with adverse effects, greater than those enabled by the Medium Density Residential Zone on a <u>residential</u> neighbour, will achieve an equivalent or greater overall standard of on-site amenity for that neighbour compared to development in accordance with what the Medium Density Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in.</i> <i>ii. Where a proposal cannot satisfy (i) above, avoid adverse effects <u>on residential neighbours</u> beyond those that could result from development in accordance with what the Medium Density Residential Zone could be reasonably anticipated to result in except where substantial off-setting positive effects are proposed</i> <i><u>iii. Where a proposal adjoins an existing non-residential activity, ensure any reverse sensitivity effects are minimised.</u></i>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.11	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria 4.7.2 i. ii. and iii.	Retain Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria 4.2.7 i. ii. and iii. as notified
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mo bil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.12	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part objective 4.4.2.2 but consider that a new policy is required to ensure residential development employs appropriate design techniques to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent land uses, which will also give effect to Objective 4.4.2.2.	Add a new Policy (d) to Objective 4.4.2.2 <u>Ensure development uses design techniques to minimise reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining non-residential activities and zones, including acoustic insulation and mechanical ventilation.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Jarrod Dixon Z Energy Limited,BP Oil New Zealand Limited,Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	296.13	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		The submitter supports the Assessment Criteria 4.4.7 a.	Retain Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria 4.4.7 a. as notified.
Johnnybro Development Ltd - Alan Tsai	297.1	25.14 Transportation	General		While the submitter recognises that the removal of minimum car parking requirements will enable more houses to be built and reduce gas emissions, he is concerned about the effects of city growth on traffic and on-street parking.	No relief sought
Johnnybro Development Ltd - Alan Tsai	297.2	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		It is unrealistic and unsuitable for a developer to prepare a travel plan.	Hamilton City Council and the house buyer should prepare the travel plan.
Johnnybro Development Ltd - Alan Tsai	297.3	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General		It is a big burden for developers to pay both financial and development contributions.	Developers and buyers to share the cost of financial contributions.
Thomas Gibbons Waikato Community Lands Trust, Bridge Housing Charitable Trust, Waikato Housing Initiative, Habitat for Humanity Central Region Limited, Momentum Waikato	298.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>[Inclusionary Zoning]</p> <p>The submitters seek that PC12 be amended to achieve the implementation of inclusionary zoning as set out in the submission.</p>	<p>[Inclusionary Zoning]</p> <p>Amend PC12 to achieve the implementation of inclusion zoning and such consequential changes to give effect to the points.</p>
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.4 Home-based Businesses	Support	<p>The submitter supports more activity during the day in residential zones, which can be improved by including the presence of small businesses.</p> <p>The submitter supports 4.2.6.4 Home-based businesses having up to ‘three employees that do not normally reside on the property’</p>	No specific relief requested
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter supports more activity during the day in residential zones, which can be improved by including the presence of small businesses. As a permitted activity it is possible to have a dairy on average every 0.5km sq, 500 dwellings per dairy, 1,240 people per dairy (Link to– Hamilton Urban blog: Hamilton – Independent Local Dairy-Grocery as a Permitted Activity)	Amend 4.2.3.1 Activity status table [q] g.) to a be a ‘Permitted Activity’ (P) not a ‘Restricted Discretionary Activity’ (RD)

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.3 Dairies	Support in part	The submitter supports more activity during the day in residential zones, which can be improved by including the presence of small businesses. The submitter seeks removal {{p29} 4.2.6.3 Dairies} of references to dairies being required to be ‘Located on a corner or through site’. The reference to corner dairy is branding: many of the 77+ independent dairies in Hamilton are not on corners.	Remove references to dairies being required to be 'located on a corner or through site' from rule 4.2.3.3 Dairies.
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter recognises there is a need for more housing, but caution is needed in planning and construction. The submitter shares the concern of many people in relation to shading of properties and loss of privacy, and loss of the essential character of older areas of the city.	The submitter seeks that Hamilton City Council to do an annual report of risk to the public and to the mental health of people living next to and in new buildings with recession planes greater than 45°, 3 metres above ground level.
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that the legislation will result in scattergun development and that intensification will increase shading and reduce privacy on one- and two-storey houses.	The submitter requests that housing intensification in Hamilton be much more carefully controlled, and that developers be required to work on a larger scale, so that current property owners are adequately compensated if they need to move, or offered ownership of a unit in the new development if they wish to stay in the same location.
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.6	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that retail is always changing, and limiting the market for properties zoned business ‘5’ Suburban and ‘6’ Neighbourhood Centres limits the number of entry-level business growing out of home business locations. Over-supplying the market and allowing village centres to expand and contract to meet demand is how century-old town centres have survived change, and are still worth visiting today. As a permitted activity, ground-floor apartments would allow village centres to expand and contract to meet market demand, without the need for the extra cost of rezoning. This approach also reduces the risk of monopoly landlords exploiting their tenants.	Amend ground floor apartments (living) {{p19} 6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table yy.} to be a ‘Permitted Activity’ (P) for Suburban (5) and Neighbourhood Centre (6) - Not a ‘Non-complying Activity’ (NC)
Living Streets Kirikiriroa - Peter H Bos	299.7	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	City Living Precinct	Support in part	The submitter considers that the Downtown Precinct have the traditional commercial Primary Active Frontage, but allow the primary and secondary active frontages of the Living Precinct to include ground floor living as a permitted activity in all areas of the City Living Precinct, creating activity 24 hours a day at ground level. A Living Precinct should be about drawing people in to explore the inner streets, not present them with a predictable edge.	Amend ground floor apartments {{p11} 7.3 Rules – Activity Status ff. & gg.} be a ‘Permitted Activity’ (P) not a ‘Non-complying Activity’ (NC).
Thomas Beuker	300.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that Council should strongly object to Governments direction for reasons related to privacy and sunlight; carparking; access for larger vehicles such as fire engines etc; rubbish collections; visual, social and financial impact; and how Council will realistically achieve its objectives.	Seeks Council reject PC12.
Simon John Badger	301.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 4.2.[2].2a with regards to multi-storey units/buildings. The policy allows multi-storied buildings in existing low and medium density residential areas/suburbs which reduce the daylight and visual privacy now enjoyed by residents of adjoining and nearby properties.	<p>Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey.</p> <p>Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.</p>
Simon John Badger	301.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 4.3.2.2a with regards to multi-storey units/buildings. The policy allow multi-storied buildings in existing low and medium density residential areas/suburbs which reduce the daylight and visual privacy now enjoyed by residents of adjoining and nearby properties.	<p>Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey.</p> <p>Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.</p>
Simon John Badger	301.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule 4.2.5.4a because 11m is too high.	<p>Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey.</p> <p>Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.</p>
Simon John Badger	301.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule 4.2.5.5 because 4m is too high. The 60 degree maximum angle of roof elevation will allow for reduced daylighting to adjoining and nearby properties.	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Relation to Boundary			Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
Simon John Badger	301.5	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule 4.3.4.4a because 11m is too high.	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey. Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
Simon John Badger	301.6	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule 4.3.5.4a . The 60° is too steep.	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey. Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
Simon John Badger	301.7	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	Rule 4.3.4.6b is opposed as 1m is too short. The 1m setback from boundaries will allow for reduced daylighting to adjoining properties.	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey. Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
Simon John Badger	301.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	Rules 4.2.5.6c and 4.2.5.6e are opposed as 1m is too short. The 1m setback from boundaries will allow for reduced daylighting to adjoining properties.	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey. Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
Simon John Badger	301.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>Infill housing, particularly multistoried is causing a significant increase in the density of cars parked in surrounding street which:-</p> <p>a- makes ingress/egress of cars to properties more difficult, especially in narrow streets.</p> <p>b- increases congestion and danger for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians in these streets.</p>	Push back/reject the policies/rules of the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2021 which allow for multi-storied buildings in established low and medium density residential areas, where the large majority of existing buildings are single storey. Any replacement and infill housing in these areas needs to be single storey in order to retain the character and appeal of Hamilton established low/medium density residential areas.
AREINZ - Colin Jones	302.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 (PC12) as PC12 will not make housing more affordable or increase supply.</p> <p>There are major issues related to PC12, including the cost of infrastructure and construction. They raise the following concerns in relation to the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of details on the price of construction (e.g., infrastructure or housing) and affordability of housing from an economic position; PC12 still adopts the policy of 'limiting of supply' which is a principal driver of housing costs; Cost of infrastructure from 'up zoning' of predominately Ulster St, Beerescourt, Forest Lake and Enderley for medium and high density residential areas. Wider issue of community wellbeing / stable community was not considered. <p>The submitter also pointed out that the Smart Growth / Managed Growth housing policies adopted elsewhere in NZ has made housing unaffordable. They believe this policy adopted by Hamilton City Council (the Council) in 2008 has limited land supply and given people an economic incentive to move into inner city apartments, which takes no consideration of consumer choice or affordability, and resulted in an increase in housing prices.</p> <p>The submitter gave an example that involved a review on the theoretical capacity of the city based on zoning by Harrison Grierson which was commissioned by the Council in 2008. They believe this report states that infill capacity is limited as all easy and affordable sites have already been</p>	Consideration should be given to fast tracking significantly more Greenfield land for houses.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>acquired and developed, as such, Hamilton can not rely on infill housing to meet demand. The report concludes that Hamilton had the capacity for an additional 108,000 dwellings, but this will subject to infrastructure issues as the current infrastructure is unable to accommodate the intensification required by the legislation.</p> <p>The submitter believes the PC12 that the Council proposed is the same approach that was used in 2008, which is being 'theoretical' possible, but the price of infrastructure is not included.</p>	
Daphne Bell	303.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter does not support Hight Density zoning for the area bounded by River Road, Casey Avenue, Riverview Terrace and the Boundary Road bridge. The submitter considers that up to three stories would suffice, rather than higher density zoning believing that HDRZ should be closer to current hub commercial areas. The submitter considers that to ensure adequate on site amenity, privacy and current height to boundary ratios are maintained, regular residential zoning would be appropriate. The submitter also notes that the area has particular issues re the river flooding and wastewater.	No specific relief sought.
Claire Cameron	304.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the service capacity of the Claudelands and intensification's impact on water catchment and the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Claire Cameron	304.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage in the Claudelands area, particularly around streets like Gillies, East, Young and Pearsons. The submitter is concerned about more loss of heritage homes, adversely affecting the health of the residents by potentially blocking out sunlight if a three storey or taller dwelling is built right beside a one storey home. Combined with the loss of privacy, the submitter is concerned that this will adversely affect the wellbeing of current residents who chose to buy and live in this older heritage suburb because of the types of houses and heritage vibe the suburb has and the overall culture of the community.	Reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Design Network Waikato Ltd - Darrell and Helen Bell	305.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter makes the submission on behalf of the residents of Arcus Street, St Andrews. The submitter understands the reasons for increasing housing density, and submits as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> opposed to 1.0 side yard and 1.5m front yard setbacks; 4.0 and 60 degree HRB; parking reduction or abolishing of requirements. rules will destroy property values and will change urban areas to be generalised and have no respect to the neighbourhood due to high density population support 50% site coverage 	<p>Enable the public to have their voice to their own city or region and not be directed by national government</p> <p>Stand up against nat government blanket policy but drive the city to what is best for Hamilton</p> <p>Ensure the planners and decision makers visit and overview this city from each suburb and listen to the people.</p> <p>Don't allow more than 3 dwellings on general residential sites.</p> <p>Hamilton city has a limited and minimal use for public transport and reducing or abolishing parking in many areas will not work - think about the outcome</p> <p>Agree with protecting our environment and waterways - increasing density in some areas where services and facilities around 3 waters will be pushed to disaster. Upgrading <u>all</u> services in suburbs is a no-brainer.</p> <p>Keep our heritage buildings and consider these location in the plan change</p> <p>In new subdivisions the proposals of plan change will work if can be developed of top level planning around densities, transport, suburban shopping links, access directly to parks and reserves, green areas without needing to drive and reduce distance to these areas by no more than 500m.</p> <p>Don't allow developers to control our city most only want to self service their own wealth.</p>
Ewan Opie	306.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Plan Change 12 (PC12) as the new measures proposed will regulate housing intensification within the Hamilton city. They support the application of specific controls and measures in relation to height and infrastructure improvement to support extra homes within the city centre and suburban centres.	<p>The submitter seeks further controls to be implemented in the GRZ, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers are required to consider the existing neighbours (e.g., their safety and security), public and open spaces, infrastructure (e.g., for vehicles and pedestrians) and the neighbourhood character when propose development; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					The submitter is concerned than intensification within the general residential zone will be detrimental to the family friendly areas which make up a significant part of the Hamilton City.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers are required to undertaken consultation with local residents to understand and address impacts on the specific neighbourhood character in order to maintain them.
Nancy Jean Burroughs	307.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objectives and Policies 4.1.2.1 in the Plan Change 12 (PC12) which relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The submitter considers that the provisions for the Claudelands area were based on 15 homes per hectare instead of 55. They believe that housing intensification in Claudelands area will dramatically increase water catchment, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	The submitter seeks that the Council refuses to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA, specifically to allow the housing intensification proposed in PC12.
Nancy Jean Burroughs	307.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Objectives and Policies 4.2.2.2 in the PC12 as they consider that it will enable more loss of heritage homes and adversely affect the health of residents by potentially blocking sunlight if multi-storey dwellings are to built beside a single storey house. The submitter believes high density development will result in the loss of natural light and privacy of current residents who chose to buy and live in the existing heritage, inner city suburb.</p> <p>The submitter opposes three or more storey development in Claudelands as they consider that this change will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton and adversely affect the environment into the future.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council rejects any proposal which would allow the unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Bernard Leslie Peterson	308.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objectives and Policies 4.1.2.1 in the Plan Change 12 (PC12) which relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The submitter considers that the provisions for the Claudelands area were based on 15 homes per hectare instead of 55. They believe that housing intensification in Claudelands area will dramatically increase water catchment, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	The submitter seeks that the Council refuses to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA, specifically to allow the housing intensification proposed in PC12.
Bernard Leslie Peterson	308.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Objectives and Policies 4.2.2.2 in the PC12 as they consider that it will enable more loss of heritage homes and adversely affect the health of residents by potentially blocking sunlight if multi-storey dwellings are to built beside a single storey house. The submitter believes high density development will result in the loss of natural light and privacy of current residents who chose to buy and live in the existing heritage, inner city suburb.</p> <p>The submitter opposes three or more storey development in Claudelands as they consider that this change will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton and adversely affect the environment into the future.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council rejects any proposal which would allow the unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Brigitte Watson	309.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 12 (PC12) for housing intensification, following the Central Government direction. The submitter opposes the provisions to allow more than two storey dwellings per section in the suburbs, as they consider that this doesn't change the city and suburbs for the better.</p> <p>The submitter believes that housing intensification will generate several issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure and parking availability (e.g., traffic congestion and poorly maintained road, parks and trees); Amenities; Insufficient green spaces; Pollution (e.g., visual, air, noise) <p>They believe that it is required to protect the natural environment and established residential suburbs, as such, the Council needs to have forward-thinking as to how to grow the city in the correct way and provides sufficient infrastructure for the growth.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council says NO to the Central Government direction to housing intensification.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and	310.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter, Classic Group supports Plan Change 12 to the District Plan, but with appropriate amendments/deletions and further wording changes to address matters raised in our submission. These amendments/deletions and further changes are considered necessary to ensure that the plan change is sufficiently enabling so as to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban	That amendments to address Classic Group's submission are made; and Such further other relief or other consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out in the attached table.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Peter Cooney					Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The submitter seeks sound planning policy which will increase housing capacity, whilst also avoiding unnecessary and inefficient process and uncertainty. Suggested amendments and changes to provisions are required to better provide for housing needs, to avoid uncertainty, unnecessary processes, costs, and delays. The submitter considers some proposed provisions in PC 12 which are more restrictive than those in the current District Plan and contrary to the intent of the national policy direction and intent of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2021. It is their view that these should be removed.	
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping		The submitter opposes the stadnard 4.2.5.3.c Permeability and Landscaping considering that the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping.	Remove standard 4.2.5.3.c Permeability and Landscaping standard.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes the standard 4.2.5.3.d Permeability and Landscaping, considering that the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping. The believe requiring trees to be planted will have maintenance implications and may result in adverse outcomes long term such as roots interfering with foundations.	Remove standard 4.2.5.3.d Permeability and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes that standard 4.2.5.3.e Permeability and Landscaping, considering the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping. They also consider that requiring trees to be planted will have also ongoing maintenance implications and may result in adverse outcomes long term.	Remove standard 4.2.5.3.e Permeability and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.2.5.6.b Building setbacks, considering that the MDRS provisions contain setback requirements and these are acceptable and that separate setback requirements are inconsistent with the NPS-UD and is unnecessarily restrictive.	Remove standard 4.2.5.6.b Building setbacks.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.2.5.8a Public interface, considering restriction on the glazing type by way of needing to be clear, or ground level only, is not considered to be aligned with the national policy direction which guided the MDRS provisions.	Amend the standard 4.2.5.8a Public interface as follows: <i>Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</i> <i>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.2.5.b Public interface, noting that the MDRS provisions do not restrict the glazing type by way of needing to be clear, or ground level only. They believe the need for further restrictions is not considered to be aligned with the national policy direction which guided the MDRS provisions.	Amend standard 4.2.5.b Public interface as follows: <i>Public Interface for four or more residential units on a site</i> <i>b. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</i> <i>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i> <i>ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear-glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building.</i> <i>iii. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door).</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.2.5.11 Waste Management, considering 5m2 too large an area. 1.5m2 is considered sufficient. The submitter considers that the NPS-UD seeks to maximise efficient use of residential zoned land and therefore onsite requirements such as this should be the minimum.	Amend standard 4.2.5.11 Waste Management as follows: <i>All residential units</i> <i>i. 5m² 1.5m2 per residential unit.</i> <i>ii. Minimum dimension 1.5m</i>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking, considering that the National policy direction is clear that enabling residential development and removing impediments and unnecessary restrictions to such is a priority. They consider the the MDRS glazing provision suitable to achieve passive surveillance and that the proposed standards are too restrictive, unnecessary and onerous restrictions to residential development.	Remove standard 4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.2.5.15 Universal Access, considering the standard would add significant cost to development and would not guarantee the accessible units are built in the areas that they are best suited.	Remove standard 4.2.5.15 Universal Access.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.2.5.3.c Permeability and Landscaping, considering that the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping. They consider requiring trees to be planted will also have ongoing maintenance implications and may result in adverse outcomes long term.	Remove standard 4.2.5.3.c Permeability and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.2.5.3.d Permeability and Landscaping, considering that the “NPS on Urban Development” and “Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matter Amendment Act” are trying to give Council’s the tools to remove overly restrictive and often obstructive barriers that have become commonplace within the realm of resource consent planning.	Remove standard 4.2.5.3.d Permeability and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.13	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes 4.2.5.3.e Permeability and Landscaping, considering that the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping, and requiring trees to be planted will also have ongoing maintenance implications and may result in adverse outcomes long term.	Remove 4.2.5.3.e Permeability and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface		The submitter opposes in-part 4.3.4.8 Public Interface, considering that the MDRS provisions do not restrict the glazing type by way of needing to be clear, or ground level only, and that the standard does not align with the national policy direction which guided the MDRS provisions.	Amend 4.3.4.8 Public Interface as follows: <i>a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</i> <i>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i> .
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and	310.15	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.3.4.8 Public Interface considering that the MDRS provisions do not restrict the glazing type by way of needing to be clear, or ground level only. The need for further restrictions is not supported by MDRS provisions.	Amend 4.3.4.8 Public Interface as follows: <i>Public Interface for four or more residential units on a site</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Peter Cooney						<p><i>b. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</i></p> <p><i>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i></p> <p><i>ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear-glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building.</i></p> <p><i>iii. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door).</i></p>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area, considering 5m2 too large an area for waste management. 1.5m2 is considered sufficient. The submitter notes that the NPS-UD seeks to maximise efficient use of residential zoned land and therefore onsite requirements such as this should be the minimum.	<p>Amend standard 4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area as follows:</p> <p><i>All residential units</i></p> <p><i>i. 5m² 1.5m2 per residential unit.</i></p> <p><i>Minimum dimension 1.5m</i></p>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.17	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking, considering the National policy direction is clear that enabling residential development and removing impediments and unnecessary restrictions to such is a priority. The submitter considers that the provisions are restrictive and in opposition to the MDRS and national policy direction and that the MDRS glazing provisions are suitable for passive surveillance.	Remove 4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.18	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.3.5.15 Universal Access, considering the requirements would add significant cost to development and would not guarantee the accessible units are built in the areas that they are best suited.	Remove 4.3.5.15 Universal Access.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.19	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.4.5.3.c Permeability Surface and Landscaping, considering the MDRS landscaping rule would ensure an adequate and acceptable level of landscaping. Requiring trees to be planted will have also ongoing maintenance implications and may result in adverse outcomes long term.	Remove 4.4.5.3.c Permeability Surface and Landscaping.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.20	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.3.4.8 Public Interface, considering the MDRS provisions do not restrict the glazing type by way of needing to be clear, or ground level only. The need for further restrictions is not supported by MDRS provisions.	<p>Amend standard 4.3.4.8 Public Interface as follows:</p> <p><i>a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</i></p> <p><i>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</i></p> <p><i>ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear-glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door).</i></p>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and	310.21	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management		The submitter opposes in-part standard 4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Area considering 5m2 is too large for a waste management area, and 1.5m2 more appropriate. The submitter notes that the NPS-UD seeks to maximise efficient use of residential zoned land and therefore onsite requirements such as this should be the minimum.	<p>To amend 4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Area as follows:</p> <p><i>All residential units</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Peter Cooney			and Service Areas			<p>i. 5m² 1.5m² per residential unit.</p> <p>ii. Minimum dimension 1.5m</p> <p>iv. Spaces can be provided for each individual unit or cumulatively on a communal basis</p>
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.22	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking, considering that the National policy direction is clear that enabling residential development and removing impediments and unnecessary restrictions to such is a priority. It is considered that these provisions are restrictive and in opposition to the MDRS and national policy direction, and that the MDRS provides suitable glazing provisions.	Remove standard 4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.23	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 4.4.5.15 Universal Access, considering that it would add significant cost to development and would not guarantee the accessible units are built in the areas that they are best suited to.	Remove standard 4.4.5.15 Universal Access.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.24	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Oppose	The submitter opposes standard 23.7.1 Allotment size and shape. The submitter requests Council to remove the minimum lot size requirement and reliance be placed on the land use rules to ensure suitable development outcomes.	Remove standard 23.7.1 Allotment size and shape.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.25	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	The submitter opposes 24.4.2.a.i. Residential Development, considering it unfair and potentially economically unviable to put the full cost on to those developing the sites, when others have also contributed to the state of the network.	<p>Remove part of 24.4.2.a.i. Residential Development as follows:</p> <p><i>B. These costs will include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where an existing supply is available, the cost of connection with the existing system; Where an existing supply is available, but the age and state of the network makes it unsuitable to meet the additional generated demand, the cost of connection and renewal of the existing system.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.26	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	The submitter opposes 24.4.2.a.ii Residential Development, considering it unfair and potential economically unviable to put the full cost on to those developing the sites, when others in the community will benefit from the development.	To remove part B of 24.4.2.a.ii Residential Development, as provided.
Classic Group - Libby Gosling and Peter Cooney	310.27	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes 25.14.4.2b Electric Charging Vehicles, considering that such a feature should be encouraged but not mandatory. The submitter does not consider the definition of a electric vehicle charging point clear, with concern that if it is a wall charger, it could cause unnecessary installation in homes that will never have an electric vehicle and a shortage of units for those who need to install them. In addition to noting an increased cost of dwellings, the submitter asks if power infrastructure capacity has been considered.	Remove 25.14.4.2b Electric Charging Vehicles.
Alan and Lorraine Issac	311.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>Plan Change 12 is opposed, particularly as it affects the Pembroke Street/Hamilton Lake area, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A carte blanche approach to all areas within 800m of the CBD is inappropriate. Amongst the most desirable residential properties are those with water views, especially the lake. The mainly detached residences which create an amphitheatre around the lake 	No specific relief requested.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>are valued for their unique location, providing space, tranquillity, convenience and lifestyle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With respect to unfettered high rise development within the 'green zone' east (Pembroke Street) and south (Lake Domain Drive to Queens Ave) of Lake Rotoroa, such development as proposed would have a deleterious effect, because of loss of private space, overload of service amenities, sun shadowing, further pollution of the endangered lake, disrespect for the Maori Gateway position of the lake entrance, and increased traffic congestion. 	
John C Aubrey	312.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers the plan difficult for lay persons to comment on. The submitter is concerned proposed standards might impact stop existing residents from minor subdivisions or rebuilding on their properties. The submitter notes the Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) in comparison to Council’s General Residential planning document at 4.2.2.2c which expands on multi-unit housing locations described by the RIS to include parks, open spaces and other areas of high social amenity. The submitter considers this to be an expansion of the definition that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about developers working around covenant restrictions and the impact of 3x3 housing on privacy and sunlight for neighbouring properties. The submitter considers it reasonable to assume a similar scenario to Auckland in terms of existing housing capacity.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about a loss in value of their property from potential 3x3 developments in the Hamilton Lake area.</p> <p>The submitter considers it would be appropriate to have heritage areas across the city.</p> <p>Emphasis should be on grouping 3x3 walk-ups close to employment centres, public transport and in high demand areas for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Reduce the area zoned General Residential Zone across the city; and</p> <p>The zone should be limited to those parts of the city where there is employment, public transport and high demand for housing; and</p> <p>3x3 developments should be tightly restricted to defined areas of the city; and</p> <p>Amend the High Density zoning of land between Lake Road and Lake Domain Drive; and</p> <p>Remove the phrase “parks, open spaces and other areas of high social amenity” from 4.2.2.2c - and any other references - of the proposed plan; and</p> <p>A special “low density zone” be established for the area surrounding Hamilton Lake and other areas.</p>
Robert Edward John and Kathleen Hutchinson	313.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that their area has no high concentration and bulk of buildings.</p> <p>The submitter considers that most people do not walk ‘to the edge of the CBD’. They generally go to a more central area, which is much further than has been estimated.</p> <p>4.4.1.3 ‘Visitor Facilities Precinct’ is considered to bear no relationship or similarity to the area on the East side of the river which is currently totally residential.</p> <p>The submitter is relived resource consent is required but unsure how adequate on-site amenity and privacy, and consistency with the expected urban built character of the Zone will be provided for.</p> <p>The submitter considers 4.4.1.5 a word salad that does not advance its purpose.</p> <p>Geotechnical issues beside the river are noted concerning flooding, gully hazards and stability which would compromise any large development. They also note a watermain under some of these properties and the hilly nature of the area.</p>	The submitter seeks this area be zoned General Residential.
Robyn Macnamara	314.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Chapter 4 and Appendix 3 of the Plan Change 12 (PC12) in relation to the provisions on development of 1-3 residential units of up to 3 stories in residential areas, especially on Tramsway Road, Enderley where they live. The submitter is particularly concerned that the future development of three-storey units, indicated by a property developer, adjacent to their 1920s family cottage will block sunlight and result in adverse privacy effects on their property and surrounding family homes. They believe that Tramway Road are mostly occupied by families and older residents, as such, multi-storey apartments should not be allowed in this area.</p> <p>The submitter also highlights environmental effects on their neighbourhood that have been generated from current residential development and future multi-storey development, including</p>	The submitter seeks a decision from the Council that multi-storey apartments are not allowed in their area (Tramway Road, Enderley)

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					infrastructure issues on stormwater and sewage systems. They believe that further housing development would only exacerbate existing problems in this area.	
Robyn Macnamara	314.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter notes that their cottage is one of the original and earliest residential dwellings on Tramway Road, that could potentially be impacted by future three-storey development in the area.	The submitter does not offer any relief to be sought.
Robyn Macnamara	314.3	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 25.13 of the PC12 in relation to Three Waters, in particular Objectives and Policies 25.13.2.1. They consider that the provisions for the net site are of less than 200 ² per residential unit in the General Residential Zone will potentially allow at least four units on a property and result in considerable impact on the stormwater system, which are already inadequate in their area.	The submitter seeks a decision from the Council that multi-storey apartments are not allowed in their area (Tramway Road, Enderley).
Alice Sayers	315.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the provision for High Density development in the River Road, Riverview Terrace, Tamihana Avenue, Whitiara Bridge and up to Boundary Rd area, and the west side of the Waikato River directly opposite this pocket. The submitter does not consider this area to lend itself to high density development due to specific factors such as topography, steep streets, and other functional barriers.</p> <p>The submitter notes access to the CBD via Whitiara Bridge is along a narrow footpath next to traffic in excess of 50km/h. The submitter considers that this area, therefore, does not meet its own criteria for safe and easy access to and from the CBD. The submitter has concern for people's safety if this is not resolved before intensification occurs.</p> <p>The submitter notes the hilly topography of Riverview and Tamihana and the impact 6+ storey developments will have on neighbours natural light.</p> <p>Other issues such as geotechnic, flooding, erosion and stability, shading of Riverpath, and the Waikato River affecting its health and wellbeing are noted by the submitter. The submitter considers that there must be heritage value in not destroying this area.</p> <p>The submitter considers that Climate Change will result in more storms, droughts, stronger winds which will further create challenges for housing in this neighbourhood.</p> <p>Storm water is noted as a issue for the area as well as the wastewater pipe running under housing along the river bank.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about street congestion from parking and traffic from intensification.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the proposed pocket for HDRZ fails to improve the quality, wellbeing and safety for the neighbourhood. The plan does not provide an acceptable approach to mitigating the multitude of adverse impacts as indicated in this submission. It does not meet all the needs of current let alone future residents with respect to access to the CBD for the foreseeable future.</p>	Rezone the subject area to General Residential.
Alice Sayers	315.2	General	General		The submitter considers the communication to citizens of this plan change inadequate and could have been personalised further in lettered communications. Digital information has not been easy to navigate, nor information from Council. The submitter considers that no site visits across the city have taken place with arbitrary process being used instead.	That Council communicate more clearly the opportunities as well as challenges as the City grows.
Jill Thelma Ferguson	316.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposed to the building of high-rise homes in long term family neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The submitters reasons for opposition are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peoples expectations 2. Loss of quality of life 3. costly upgrade of services 4. rise and plummet of values of homes 	<p>The submitter is seeking the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preferably to have lower-level houses evenly throughout Hamilton, but if high-rises are required, keep "like for like" not mixed together. Location of high rise homes should be in new purpose-built areas (land designated for new housing eg Rototuna, Peacocke and possibly Temple View). If these area do not fully meet the needs for high-rise development then areas to be considered should be those that already have high-rise development such as the city centre, university and hospital (Waikato) suburbs. 2. Develop plan to enforce the protection of existing trees from developers, and ensure they also plant new trees (severe consequences for non-compliance

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					The submitter has attached a sheet to their submission setting out their explanations for the above, as well as alternative suggestions.	3. Please keep New York out of our existing back yards
Melanie Odey	317.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones		The submitter is concerned about the infrastructure capacity of the Claudelands area, particularly the water catchment and effects on the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	Refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Melanie Odey	317.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage buildings in the Claudelands area, particularly in streets like like Gillies, East, Young and Pearsons. The submitter has concern about the loss of heritage homes adversely affecting the health and privacy of the residents by potentially blocking out sunlight if a three storey or taller dwelling is built right beside a one storey home. The submitter has concern for the residents who chose to buy and live in this older heritage, inner city suburb because of the types of houses and heritage vibe the suburb has and the overall culture of the community.	Absolutely reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
John and Christine Versluys	318.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose provisions of Plan Change 12 (PC12) for enabling housing supply and further intensification in general. In particular, they oppose the purpose provided in Section 4.4.1 under Chapter 4.4. High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) for the enabling of at least 6 storey building in the area bounded by Beale Street, Grey Street and Dawson Street. This change will result in significant detrimental impacts on the quality of life, character and amenity value, heritage value and financial value of existing residents in this area. Provisions of HDRZ in their neighbourhood are inconsistent with the zoning of other areas that are located in close-proximity to the central city such as Myrtle Street, O'Neill Street, Te Aroha Street and River Road, which are zoned as General Residential Zone (GRZ).</p> <p>There are Councils around the country who will not implement these measures and HCC should take a similar stance.</p>	<p>The submitters seek that the area bounded by Beale Street, Grey Street and Dawson Street to be zoned as GRZ instead of being HDRZ. Alternatively, the submitters seek an amendment to PC12 provisions to ensure that only single storey buildings are allowed to develop in adjacent to 'heritage built' sites if the HDRZ is retained for this area.</p> <p>The submitters also seek that the Hamilton City Council takes a similar stance to other Councils around the country who do not implement provisions for housing intensification.</p>
John and Christine Versluys	318.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the enabling of unrestrained construction of buildings of at least 6 storey in the area bounded by Beale Street, Grey Street and Dawson Street. They believe that this area contains a number of properties with important historic heritage value. However, they consider that heritage value is as much derived from the context and surroundings of those properties as from the properties themselves, as such, the category of 'heritage built' on the individual property is not adequate.	The outcome we seek is that the area in question is not designated as High Density but as General Density. Alternatively, if the High Density designation is retained, that only single storey buildings be allowed adjacent to sites designated as 'heritage built'.
John and Christine Versluys	318.3	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitters oppose the area bounded by Beale Street, Grey Street and Dawson Street being zoned as HDRZ under the PC12. They consider that this change is not consistent with the zoning of areas in close proximity to the central city, including the areas around Myrtle St, O'Neill St, Te Aroha St and River Rd, which are zoned as GRZ.	The submitters seek that the area bounded by Beale Street, Grey Street and Dawson Street being zoned as GRZ. Alternatively, if the HDRZ is retained, the submitters seek an amendment to PC12 provisions to ensure that only single-storey buildings be allowed to develop in adjacent to historic heritage buildings.
Margaret McLeod	319.1	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	<p>Increase in housing density needs to be well thought through with relevant stakeholders working together to ensure to successful urban communities. The submitter believes PC12 does not include aspects that will result in successful urban communities and has there following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring sufficient space for outdoor living • potential loss of light, sun and privacy for neighbours • maintaining tree canopy and sufficient green space • ensuring the capacity of three waters infrastructure is sufficient to service the increased number of households • the need for measures to ensure that roads and footpaths are suitable and safe for use by pedestrians, cyclists, mobility vehicles, cars, vans, trucks, buses etc. • ensuring that public transport meets the needs of the community in terms of frequency, shelter, affordability, safety. 	No specific relief sought

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Margaret McLeod	319.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		The submitter suggests that Council considers the potential changes on the community by amending the requirements for permitted activities to ensure quality liveable environments. Access to services, infrastructure, and public transport is crucial when considering high density housing. Outdoor living space is crucial to the wellbeing of residents, there is concern about privacy and sunlight when considering multistorey buildings. The submitter is against removal of parking requirements stemming from NPS-UD and suggests Council oppose this decision as parking is needed for vehicles, scooter, ebikes, prams, etc and will avoid sctreet and verge parking.	No specific relief sought. The submitter mentions wanting Council to consider the changes as part of the effects on the community as a whole and amend the requirements for permitted activities to ensure that the living environment for residents is enhanced rather than worsened to shabby, less desirable environments with diminished tree canopy and green spaces, footpaths blocked by vehicles, and inadequate infrastructure capacity.
Margaret McLeod	319.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter raises the questions around developers' commitment to PC 12 green policies as trees have numerous benefits to the environment especially giving balance to built areas.	The submitter seeks: 'We want the Council to include rules that protect existing trees so that developers are not removing them just for the sake of convenience or unsubstantiated concerns about them falling over'.
Margaret McLeod	319.4	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter mentions PC12 has no requirements for developers to include work on infrastructure to account for the increased load unless the proposed development is non-complying. This is extremely concerning as it potentially results in a significantly increased burden on existing infrastructure, which is likely to be already insufficient to cope with demand.	The submitter seeks: 'We want the Council to commit to investment in three waters infrastructure to ensure that capacity is sufficient for both existing suburbs and new developments, given that this is not provided for in PC12'.
Margot Louise Rawlings	320.1	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed high density residential zone around Tamihana Avenue mentioning there will be no improvement by replacing existing 'high-quality' homes with apartments that have 'less value'. The submitter opposes the 800m walkable catchment suggesting the river is a major factor when considering movements between the Central city and Tamihana Ave and mentions there will be no demand for 'Visitor Facilities Precinct'. The design and layout of sites and buildings within the High-Density Residential Zone are important but there is uncertainty around issues such as adequate on-site amenity relating to privacy, sunlight, height relation to boundary ratios being maintained and consistent with the expected urban built character of the Zone. The submitter mentions the wording regarding the HDRZ purpose (5th paragraph) does not make sense.	The submitter seeks: 'Urgently, designate the area discussed in this submission as a General Residential zone' and 'Generally, take more time to explore appropriate ways to intensify housing in Hamilton that are workable, generally improve the housing stock in the city and lessen the impact on individual homeowners'.
Margot Louise Rawlings	320.2	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter highlights concern regarding effects of development on 3 waters infrastructure mentioning the already constrained network. Development constraints include Flood hazards, Gully areas, underground pipes, geotech, topography, earthworks leading to slips, land banking leading to unkept properties.	The submitter seeks: 'a) Urgently, designate the area discussed in this submission as a General Residential Zone'. b) 'Generally, take more time to explore appropriate ways to intensify housing in Hamilton that are workable, generally improve the housing stock in the city and lessen the impact on individual homeowners'.
Margot Louise Rawlings	320.3	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	Intensification will increase car ownership which will contribute to issues such as street parking which will hamper traffic flow, disrupt rubbish collection and cause congestion. The public transport bus routes are currently inconvenient.	The submitter seeks: a) 'Urgently, designate the area discussed in this submission as a General Residential Zone'. b) 'Generally, take more time to explore appropriate ways to intensify housing in Hamilton that are workable, generally improve the housing stock in the city and lessen the impact on individual homeowners'
Margot Louise Rawlings	320.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Natural Environment	Oppose	The submitter mentions that Intensification will remove vegetation, break the corridors between the gullies, and see bird life disappear from the area. Their area in which the submitter lives has its own heritage and has been linked to notable individuals/companies that are thriving in the New Zealand business sector.	The submitter seeks: a) 'Urgently, designate the area discussed in this submission as a General Residential Zone'. b) 'Generally, take more time to explore appropriate ways to intensify housing in Hamilton that are workable, generally improve the housing stock in the city and lessen the impact on individual homeowners'.
Richard William Ferguson	321.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.1 which allows the development of five-storey buildings within 400 m of shopping centre.</p> <p>In general, the submitter also opposes the following matters that could potentially result from PC12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massive on-street parking; • Only developers are attracted to housing redevelopment; • Shopping centre potentially be surrounded by slums; • Increased rates due to zone changes; and • Infrastructure problem (e.g., stormwater and wastewater) 	The submitter seeks that the Government mandates on housing intensification to be spread out across the whole community.
Margaret Louise Sale	322.1	4.4 High Density	General	Oppose	The submitter notes their established life in the East Frankton area. The submitter considers that there was poor consultation by the Council regarding the Plan Change with concerns regarding the	To delay Plan Change 12 and any other plans by the Council; and

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
		Residential Zone			neighbourhood becoming a slum area with car fumes, parking issues, rubbish & storage issues, and shadows by introducing High Rise buildings. The submitter is also concerned about loss of trees and associated bird life. The submitter comments on Developers picking off land owners one by one, leaving the remaining land owners surrounding by construction noise, dust and traffic.	<p>Work with the community on planning Hamilton; and</p> <p>Encourage developers to purchase larger pieces of land outside existing residential areas to develop high rise buildings; and</p> <p>Create more rules for housing accessibly;</p> <p>Oppose residential high zone in their area; and</p> <p>Seek better solutions that includes the local community.</p>
Karen Whitakerr	323.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the service capacity of the Claudelands area, considering intensification to increase water catchments and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.	I want the Hamilton City Council to refuse to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA – specifically to refuse to allow the housing intensification proposed in Plan Change 12.
Karen Whitakerr	323.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the loss of heritage buildings in the Claudelands area, particularly excludes streets like Gillies, East, Young and Pearsons. The submitter considers that Plan Change 12 will enable even more loss of heritage homes, adversely affecting the health of the residents by potentially blocking out sunlight if a three storey or taller dwelling is built right beside a one storey home. The submitter has additional concern with the loss of privacy, adversely affecting the wellbeing of current residents who chose to buy and live in this older suburb because of the types of houses and heritage vibe the suburb has and the overall culture of the community. We currently are okay about living with two storey developments but three storey and above in Claudelands will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton, and which will adversely affect the environment into the future.	Absolutely reject any proposal which would allow unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Waikato River Authority - Bob Penter	324.1	General	General	Support	<p>The WRA sought explicit recognition of Te Ture Whaimana and that Tier 1 authorities demonstrate that it has been provided for.</p> <p>After reviewing the proposed plan changes, the Waikato River Authority (WRA) is encouraged by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the proposed plan change has elevated the visibility and prominence of Te Ture Whaimana and Waikato River Settlement to Chapter 2 of the proposed plan, previously located at Chapter 6; References to Te Ture Whaimana are populated throughout the proposed plan and not limited to one or two sections. This demonstrates that Te Ture Whaimana has been considered together with many matters in the proposed plan; There is a policy that encourages contributions to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River; and Te Ture Whaimana has been considered as a qualifying matter to ensure that the growth of the city is managed in a way that provides for housing in a way that protects the health and wellbeing of the river as the city grows. 	The WRA supports proposed plan change 12; and encourages Hamilton City Council to include submission points, from other submitters, that further the objectives of Te Ture Whaimana.
Robert Dol Golden Ridge Park Limited, Golden Ridge Farm Limited, Golden Valley Farm	325.1	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that the way financial contributions have been constructed suggests that HCC does not consider growth resulting from intensification in brownfields areas as growth. HCC's methodology to mitigate the effects of intensification therefore seeks to share the costs of intensification in brownfields areas with the greenfields areas of Hamilton, despite greenfields areas receiving little or no benefit from these works. The proposed Citywide approach provides no recognition of the substantial costs that greenfield developments are now required to incur to satisfy resource consent conditions to mitigate adverse environmental effects relative to	<p>Financial contributions should not be charged on greenfield development and instead should be fully recovered in brownfields areas.</p> <p>There needs to be flexibility in the timing of Financial Contribution payments. HCC should allow FC payment post construction during the 223/224c stage.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Limited, Dart Holdings Limited and Glass Investments Limited (Selwyn Mexted)					<p>comparable historical and/or brownfield development. This is achieved either directly through the provision of infrastructure or indirectly through the payment of DCs.</p> <p>The result of the proposed FCs in Plan Change 12 is a subsidisation by greenfields development of intensification in brownfields areas of Hamilton. We are concerned that there is a real risk of HCC unreasonably penalising developers with risk of double dipping and in some cases council also introducing value capture discussions in greenfield area.</p>	
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Oppose	<p>The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) defines a well-functioning urban environment as one that as a minimum:</p> <p>“... (c) [has] good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport; and</p> <p>(d) support[s], and limit[s] as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets; and</p> <p>(e) support[s] reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; ...”</p> <p>We consider that having a more compact urban form is important for achieving these requirements.</p>	Amend objective 2.2.3 to “Hamilton is characterised by an increasingly sustainable <u>compact</u> urban form”.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support	We support the provision for residential development to enable a variety of household choices and meet diverse cultural and social needs.	Retain 2.2.9a
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>We support the purpose of the residential zones to assist in creating a compact city and to use land efficiently. This is consistent with the direction set in the Future Proof Strategy and the WRPS. We support the reference to Te Ture Whaimana and the requirement for development within residential zones to achieve betterment.</p> <p>Under the section titled Residential Precincts there is a paragraph that discusses amenity. This should be amended to reflect NPS-UD Policy 6(b) in that significant changes may result from planning documents prepared to give effect to the NPS-UD and this may result in changes to amenity values, and these changes are not an adverse effect.</p>	Retain and amend to clarify that amenity changes over time and that changing amenity is not, of itself, an adverse effect.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	We support the requirement to ensure development is coordinated with infrastructure. This gives effect to Policy 6.3 of the WRPS.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	We support the objective 4.1.2.1 and associated policies requiring that development gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach		<p>WRC have stated they are Neutral on 2.2.5 and its associated policies</p> <p>Reducing transport emissions is highly dependent on urban form. A more compact form that avoids the need to use private cars for most daily needs can help to resolve both housing affordability and transport issues, especially those relating to emissions and climate change.</p>	Add wording within this section on the climate change and emissions reduction benefits of compact urban form or create a new section on climate change and emissions reduction.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Oppose	It is important that transport corridors are used and developed efficiently, including potential reassignment from use by cars, to more active travel modes to reduce transport emissions. This would align with proposed policy 25.14.2.1eiiA.	Amend to “Efficient use and development of natural and physical resources, especially land, buildings and infrastructure including transport corridors.”

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Support	Policy 2.2.12C - We support objectives and policies that assist with meeting national and regional climate change and emissions aspirations and targets.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	We support the objective of incorporating sustainable features and technology to minimise the effects on climate change.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.10	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	We support the policy that vegetation and trees should be retained wherever possible during development. As the city intensifies it is important that urban tree cover is provided for.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support	Activity Standard 4.2.5.3d - We support the rules requiring the provision of urban trees. Trees mitigate the urban heat island effect resulting from climate change, and provide a range of other benefits for amenity, urban biodiversity and air quality. These rules will have a positive effect as the city intensifies.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support	We support the rules requiring the provision of urban trees. Trees mitigate the urban heat island effect resulting from climate change, and provide a range of other benefits for amenity, urban biodiversity and air quality. These rules will have a positive effect as the city intensifies. Activity Standard 4.3.4.3d is mentioned	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.13	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support	We support the rules requiring the provision of urban trees. Trees mitigate the urban heat island effect resulting from climate change, and provide a range of other benefits for amenity, urban biodiversity and air quality. These rules will have a positive effect as the city intensifies. Activity Standard 4.4.5.3c has been mentioned in the submission	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.14	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	WRC refer to Policy 25.14.2.1b and state - We would like to see stronger policies that require climate change action, not just promote, or encourage.	Amend as follows “ Promote the establishment and maintenance of to <u>Establish and maintain</u> a continuous tree canopy ...”
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.15	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC refer to 25.14.2.1c and state - We support these provisions.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council -	326.16	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies:	Support	WRC refer to Policy 25.1.2.1d and state - We support these provisions	Retain both Policies

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Katrina Andrews			Transportation			
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.17	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design		WRC's submission point 25 refers to Objective 25.15.24.4 where they 'OPPOSE IN PART' - We need to ensure out of sequence developments can link to public transport immediately, and not rely on “back-fill” of subdivisions yet to occur. For example, North Rotokauri is out of sequence and while it may provide bus stops and shelters, there may not be enough patronage to justify public transport until the other parts of Rotokauri are developed. This embeds travel behaviour that is car-reliant and does not provide mode alternatives that will reduce carbon emissions from the start.	Add an explicit policy under 25.15.2.4 and 25.15.2.5 to address carbon emissions.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.18	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design		WRC has stated they 'Oppose in Part' Objective 25.15.2.5 - We need to ensure out of sequence developments can link to public transport immediately, and not rely on “back-fill” of subdivisions yet to occur. For example, North Rotokauri is out of sequence and while it may provide bus stops and shelters, there may not be enough patronage to justify public transport until the other parts of Rotokauri are developed. This embeds travel behaviour that is car-reliant and does not provide mode alternatives that will reduce carbon emissions from the start.	Add an explicit policy under 25.15.2.4 and 25.15.2.5 to address carbon emissions.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.19	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support in part	WRC's submission point refers to Chapter 23 - Subdivision. Generally, we support subdivision provisions that promote a well laid out urban environment that supports links to existing transport networks and maximises use of the road corridor for active and public transport. However, we recommend adding new provisions to ensure that subdivision does not occur in locations where the risk of climate change cannot be mitigated, or the resulting land use activity (such as the transport network) cannot adapt or be resilient to the effects of climate change.	Add new objectives, policies, and rules to ensure that subdivision does not occur in locations where the risk of climate change cannot be mitigated, or the resulting land use activity cannot adapt or be resilient to the effects of climate change.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.20	General	General		WRC states their position is NEUTRAL regarding the following - Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of (i) existing and planned rapid transit stops. High density development should be especially prioritised along rapid transit routes. The draft Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) should be consulted to determine where those routes are to ensure alignment and consistency between the District Plan and the RPTP.	Ensure alignment and consistency between the District Plan and the draft RPTP when planning for high density development near rapid transport routes.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.21	4.1 All Residential Zones	General		WRC have stated their position is NEUTRAL regarding - Intensification across the Residential Zones will result in many more people living in most areas of Hamilton. It is essential to allow mixed use areas, and expansion of existing commercial zones so that continued reliance on a car as the main mode of travel is avoided. Intensification may solve housing issues but will create transport issues if easy access to day to day needs by active or public transport is not provided for.	Add objectives, policies and rules that will enable more, or expansion of existing commercial and mixed uses in neighbourhoods where intensification will be occurring.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.22	General	General		WRC have stated they are NEUTRAL regarding - We suggest introducing a system of progressive removal of on-street parking as new developments occur on identified streets, especially in the CBD, to encourage use of active and public transport modes.	Introduce a system of progressive removal of on-street parking as new developments occur on identified streets.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.23	General	General	Support	We support the inclusion of CPTED principles. These principles, when implemented provide actual and perceived safety outcomes, and therefore encourage walking and cycling.	Retain reference to CPTED principles in various provisions.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.24	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	Management plans and strategies prepared under other legislation are matters to be considered under s74(b)(i) of the RMA. The Future Proof Strategy has been prepared under the Local Government Act 2002 and is a collaborative effort to integrate land use and transport planning. It incorporates the Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan and is supported by the Transport Programme Business Case. This establishes transport interventions to promote the compact urban form aspirations set in the Hamilton-Waikato Metro Spatial Plan. These interventions promote responsive land use scenarios supported by the transport interventions to achieve equitable access, tackle climate challenges and embrace kaitiakitanga across the sub-region. Further reference to the transport matters identified in the Strategy could be made in the district plan.	Add text about the role of Future Proof in transport planning e.g. “supports planning for an integrated rapid public transport network linking major employment and residential hubs, as well as ensuring that neighbourhoods are designed to integrate public transport use, walking and cycling” or words to similar effect.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.25	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	WRC have stated they are supportive of Objective 2.2.3bii and associated explanation. We support priority being given to walking, cycling and public transport as it will enable national and regional safety and climate change aspirations to be achieved. We support the clarity provided by the amended wording in the explanation that land for housing be used more efficiently.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.26	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Oppose	WRC have stated that they oppose Policy 2.2.4c - We seek to encourage every opportunity to increase mode shift into walking, cycling and public transport to mitigate the effects of climate change.	Amend to “...unless appropriate infrastructure <u>and public transport</u> is available ...”
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.27	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Towards a Sustainable City	Support	WRC have stated that they support the explanation associated with Objective 2.2.4 - We support the amendment to the second paragraph of the explanation to “...provide information on land use and infrastructure, transport links, public transport, mitigation of climate change through emissions reduction, management of amenity...”.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.28	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Support	WRC have stated they support Policy 2.2.13f - We support provision for developments to prioritise strong connections to, and use of public transport and walking, cycling and micro-mobility.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.29	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	WRC have stated that they support Policies 2.2.14e & 2.2.14g - We support these provisions and the objectives and policies relating to urban intensification.	Retain both policies
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.30	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	WRC have stated they support provision 4.1.2.5av.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.31	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	We support Objective 25.14.2.1, but we consider that the words “where practicable” should be deleted from point vi. Safety should not be conditional on being practicable.	Amend 25.14.2.1.vi. to “Integrated with land use to minimise the need to travel and the total distance travelled, and avoid wherever practicable conflicts between transport modes.”
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.32	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state they support Policy 25.14.2.1eii - We support this provision. It is preferable to minimise the building of new, or widening of existing, transport corridors to accommodate growth by making best use of existing road corridors first before widening.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.33	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC have stated they support Policy 25.14.2.1eiii - We support the strong policy direction provided by this provision.	Retain

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.34	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC's supports policies 25.14.2.1f and 25.14.2.1g	Retain both Policies
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.35	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	WRC Support In Part, Policy 25.14.2.1h - We need to ensure new developments or intensification of areas that offer no off-street parking (e.g., compact housing areas in greenfield subdivisions) include a parking management plan, and we strongly encourage electric vehicle (EV) charging stations for communal use.	Suggest HCC prepares and implements a parking management plan as encouraged through Policy 11 of the NPS-UD and includes reference to this in the District Plan. Ensure new developments that offer no off-street parking include EV charging stations for communal use.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.36	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state that they support Policy 25.14.2.1i	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.37	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state that they support Policy 25.14.2.1j and they support this provision as the terminology aligns with the RPTP.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.38	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state they support Policy 25.14.2.1K	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.39	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state that they Support Policy 25.14.2.1L - We support this provision, especially consistency with the Transport Mode Hierarchy and other matters that contribute to reducing transport emissions.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.40	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC state they support Policies 25.14.2.1m and 25.14.2.1n - We support these provisions and the requirements around the need to provide Integrated Transport Assessments (ITAs) and Travel Plans for new development.	Retain both Policies
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.41	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support in part	WRC Support in Part Policy 25.14.2.1oi - We generally support provisions that promote a well laid out urban environment that supports links to existing transport networks and that maximises use of the road corridor for active and public transport. We recommend including new policy and rules to ensure that access is provided for cycling infrastructure in the transport corridor hierarchy.	Add a new E: “An existing or planned cycleway” and associated rule(s) to ensure that access is provided for cycling infrastructure in the transport corridor hierarchy.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.42	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	WRC Oppose Policy 25.14.2.1ovii - We want to avoid in the first instance any new vehicle accesses within the Central City Zone and Business Zones so that priority is given to safe pedestrian movement. We need to ensure that continued reliance on a car as the main mode of travel is avoided.	Amend to “ Discourage <u>Avoid</u> new vehicle access...” and amend the associated rule to support the new policy.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.43	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Support	WRC Support Policy 25.14.2.1oviii - We support the provision that allows public access to and along the Waikato River	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.44	General	General	Support in part	WRC SUPPORT IN PART Appendix 1.3 Criteria G3 - We support the requirement under G3 that a proposal must amongst other things, consider in an ITA how the development responds to “regional and national transport and growth strategies”. However, we recommend that the RLTP is explicitly referenced here. It is noted that the RLTP is already explicitly recognised in a similar vein in Appendix 15 Transportation (Section 15.2) which requires compliance with other policy and other frameworks. We support the new additions to G3 of the need to consider “national emissions reduction and climate change strategies or plans”, plus the need to consider any Travel Plans.	Retain but add a specific reference to the Regional Land Transport Plan within G3.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.45	Appendix 15 Transportation	General		WRC state they are NEUTRAL regarding Appendix 15 Transportation - We have made no comment on technical specifications for road corridors and the transport network in general, but support these where they meet best practice standards for walking and cycling infrastructure. The tables in Appendix 15 are very difficult to read and we assume these will be formatted appropriately in due course.	Format tables in Appendix 15 appropriately.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.46	Appendix 15 Transportation	General		WRC state they are NEUTRAL regarding Appendix 15 - The removal of parking minimums is required under the NPS-UD, but developers may provide parking areas subject to the standards and specifications in the district plan. We strongly recommend a maximum number of parking spaces be permitted in the Central City Zone. This is so that an increase in active and public transport modes is easier to achieve, discourages car use in the central city area and contributes to reducing transport emissions.	Add a maximum number of car parking spaces permitted in the Central City Zone.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.47	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Support	WRC state they SUPPORT Appendix 15 Table 15-2a Simple ITA checklist and Table 15-2b Broad ITA checklist - We support both tables. We support the requirement for an assessment of how walking, cycling, micro-mobility and public transport will be prioritised in any ITA. We also support the requirement to provide an assessment of the effects of a development on embodied and operational greenhouse gas emissions, and the use of the Avoid, Shift, Improve (ASI) framework. The ASI model is consistent with our regional policy. These requirements embed the changes to the transport system that are required to effect transport emissions reduction and will assist in meeting national and regional climate and emission aspirations.	Retain both tables
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.48	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-3A Transport Mode Hierarchy	Support	We support the Transport Mode Hierarchy in Section 15-3A as it up-ends traditional thinking and defines prioritisation of the most at-risk road users.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.49	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Support	We support HCC using its powers under the RMA to collect financial contributions for activities including riparian enhancement, wetland creation, protection, restoration and enhancement and other betterment activities for the Waikato River.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.50	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with	Support	We support this provision and the coordinated approach it sets up to managing three waters to ensure that HCC is complying with its regional resource consents.	Retain

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Other Plans			
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.51	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.1 Purpose	Support	WRC state they support Policy 25.13.1d - We support the explicit recognition of the potential adverse effects that can result from intensification and an increase in impermeable surfaces, including erosion and bank instability, flooding and effects on aquatic ecosystems and stream health.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.52	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	WRC SUPPORT Policy 25.13.2.2 and associated policies, explanations and rules - We support the provisions to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River with development and redevelopment, including the use of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay to ensure the development can be adequately serviced to avoid adverse effects on the river. We also support the explicit recognition of the benefits of on-site water sensitive techniques.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.53	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support	WRC support Policy 25.13.2.5 and associated policies, explanations and rules - We support the provisions to protect and improve the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River with development and redevelopment, including the use of the Infrastructure Capacity Overlay to ensure the development can be adequately serviced to avoid adverse effects on the river. We also support the explicit recognition of the benefits of on-site water sensitive techniques.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.54	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	WRTC Support in Part Objective 25.13.24.4 and associated Policies - We support including ‘resilient’ in the objective. This is consistent with the definition of well-functioning urban environment under the NPS-UD. However, this should flow through to the policy direction. We suggest an amendment to the supporting policy to ensure that infrastructure is designed to be resilient to likely current and future impacts to climate change.	Retain and amend 25.13.2.4c to add that infrastructure is to be designed and constructed to be resilient to the likely current and future impacts of climate change.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.55	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	WRC Support in Part General Rules 25.13.4.2 and 25.13.4.2A - We strongly support the inclusion of low-impact stormwater management design technologies and green infrastructure within these rules. These will help mitigate adverse stormwater effects associated with intensification and increased impermeable surfaces. The Waikato stormwater management guideline 2020 ¹ could be referenced in the advice notes to these rules.	Retain but add reference to the Waikato stormwater management guideline 2020 in the advice notes to the rules.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.56	General	General	Support	WRC support Various provisions relating to inclusion of minimum permeable surface standards throughout the plan to reduce adverse effects of additional stormwater run-off associated with intensification.	Retain
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.57	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.5 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		WRC are Neutral regarding Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria 25.13.5a.v - The term “impervious” is used here. This does not match the rest of the plan which uses “impermeable”. We consider the terminology should be consistent.	Amend to use the term “impermeable” instead of “impervious”.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.58	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.7 Historic Heritage Areas -		WRC are Neutral regarding Rule 19.4.7e - WRC state the rules for other zones require buildings to be set back a minimum of 6m from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area. However, Rule 19.4.7e for Historic Heritage Areas requires a lesser setback (3m for Temple View and 1.5m for other heritage areas). It is unclear what the reasoning for this is.	Amend 19.4.7e to be consistent with the 6m setback required from the Waikato Riverbank and Gully Hazard Area in other zones or clarify why lesser setbacks are appropriate in Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Building Setbacks			
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.59	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	WRC state the Support in Part Statutory Context 1.1.2.2a - The reference to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management uses the date 2011. This should be updated to 2020 to reflect the most recent amendment.	Amend the date for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management from 2011 to 2020.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.60	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.11 Local Authority Cross-boundary Issues	Support in part	WRC Support in Part Purpose 1.1.11b where an update for all reference to the Vision and Strategy for consistency	Add “Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato” before Vision and Strategy.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.61	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	WRC state they Support in Part Purpose 1.1.2.2e - The references to the Regional Policy Statement are out of date. This section needs to be updated to reflect the current Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Operative 2016). We also suggest referencing the current RPS plan change being undertaken by WRC - Waikato Regional Policy Statement Proposed Change 1 – National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Future Proof Strategy Update.	Amend to update the status of the Regional Policy Statement (Operative 2016). Add reference to the “Waikato Regional Policy Statement Proposed Change 1 – National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and Future Proof Strategy Update” being undertaken by WRC.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.62	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans		WRC Support in Part Purpose 1.1.2.2g - The list of regional strategies and plans includes the “Waikato Regional Pest Management Strategy”. This needs to be updated to “Waikato Regional Pest Management Plan”.	Amend “Waikato Regional Pest Management Strategy ” to “Waikato Regional Pest Management <u>Plan</u> ”.
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.63	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	WRC Support in Part Purpose 1.1.2.2n - This section is titled “Hamilton City Infrastructure Technical Specifications”. Use of “Hamilton City Infrastructure Technical Specifications” versus “Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications” is inconsistent throughout the plan.	Update to make consistent.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.64	Chapter 1 Plan Overview	1.1.2 Statutory Context of the District Plan and Relationships with Other Plans	Support in part	WRC Support in Part Purpose 1.1.2.2p - There is a typo in the last line of the second paragraph of this section.	In the last line of the second paragraph, remove the 's' from "considerations".
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.65	General	General	Support in part	WRC Support in Part Various provisions - Use of the terms "public transport" versus "passenger transport" is inconsistent through the plan. We prefer the term public transport as it is a statutory term included in the Land Transport Management Act.	Amend "passenger transport" to "public transport".
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.66	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Te Awa O Waikato	Support	We support the increased recognition of Te Ture Whaimana and generally support the approach to applying Te Ture Whaimana as a qualifying matter. As acknowledged in both the WRC and Hamilton City Council (HCC) submissions on the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021, it is critical Te Ture Whaimana is expressly recognised as a qualifying matter. Increased urban densities will exceed the capacity of existing wastewater and stormwater systems which discharge into the sensitive environment of the awa. These systems are already at capacity and cannot function in a manner which gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana without substantial ongoing investment.	None Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.67	General	General		We acknowledge Waikato Tainui and other river iwi as having mana whakahaere over the river and acknowledge that they are best placed to determine the extent to which the plan change gives effect to Te Ture Whaimana.	None Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.68	General	General	Support	The proposed plan change recognises that land use and transport must be integrated to achieve well-functioning urban areas and we recognise that implementation of the plan will result in positive change to reflect this. Overall, we support the city-wide objectives, policies, and rules in Chapter 25.14 Transportation.	None Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Katrina Andrews	326.69	General	General		There is scope to further strengthen the policy wording around emissions reduction to align with the Regional Land Transport Plan 2021-2051 (RLTP). The RLTP climate change and environmental sustainability objective is "an environmentally sustainable, energy efficient and low-carbon transport system that delivers emissions reductions and enhances communities' long-term resilience to the effects of climate change". This is supported by Policy P32 "Develop good urban form that supports low carbon and low emission transport options".	None Sought
Carla Parry	327.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter believes the plan change gives little consideration to the character and established communities in existing neighbourhoods and disagrees with high rise typology in residential suburbs. Increase in density and people bring upon an increased social and traffic issues. The submitter believes the removal of parking requirements will have an impact as people are car dependant as the public transport system is unreliable. They do not believe the plan change will positively contribute to Hamilton's liveability.	No specific relief sought
Margaret Fish	328.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the government direction of allowing 3 dwellings can be built 3 stories.	Seeks that Council negotiate to allow HCC planners to continue with present planning so residential homes remain without neighbours building 3 story dwellings in Kingsford Mews and other similar streets.
Fraser Blair Muller	329.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan change mentioning various concerns relating to proposed typology, height, privacy, sunlight, rules, location, etc. Increase in density will cause traffic and parking issues that may hinder emergency service vehicles performing their duties. There is currently enough greenfield housing supply therefore infill may not be needed.	The submitter seeks: 'HCC needs to pullback on the policy/rules of the Resource Management Amendment bill 2021 allowing for multistorey buildings which will ruin suburbs with low and medium height density already established. Any infill housing needs to be single storey to maintain privacy and limited. The infrastructure cannot cope including sanitary, sewerage, rain, privacy and access'. Hamilton planners need to allow no height restrictions in the CBD and allow for the suburbs to be left alone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					Policies: 4.2.2a, 4.3.2.2a - I oppose multi story units/buildings Rules 4.2.5.4a, 4.2.5.5, 4.3.4.4a, 4.3.4.5a - I oppose 11m/4m is too high. Rules 4.2.5.5a, 4.3.4.5a, 4.3.4.6b - I oppose 60° is too steep. Rules 4.2.5.6c, 4.2.5.6e, 4.3.4.6b - I oppose 1m is too short.	
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of ‘Explanation’ sections throughout PC12. It considers the planning direction should be clearly set out in the operative provisions because the explanation text has no clear role and increases interpretation uncertainties where it creates inconsistencies with operative provisions.	Delete all Explanation material and incorporate as relevant into the operative provisions while ensuring there is no inconsistency.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.2	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support	The submitter considers that a ‘retirement unit’ definition is required in the District Plan to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Add the following ‘Retirement unit’ definition to the District Plan: <u>Retirement Unit</u> <u>means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.3	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Oppose	The submitter supports the inclusion of a definition for ‘Retirement Village’ in the District Plan, however the definition does not align with the National Planning Standard.	Amend the existing definition to comply with the National Planning Standards as follows: <u>Retirement village</u> <u>means a managed comprehensive residential complex or facilities used to provide residential accommodation for people who are retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities (inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.4	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks to ensure that the provisions in the District Plan that relate to rest homes do not complicate or duplicate the provisions that apply to retirement villages.	Amend as follows: <u>Rest Homes</u> Means land or buildings for the accommodation of the elderly and/or infirm where nursing/medical care is provided. They exclude hospitals, managed care facilities, <u>retirement villages</u> and residential centres.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	330.5	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks to ensure that the provisions of the District Plan that relate to Integrated Residential Developments do not complicate or duplicate the provisions that apply to retirement villages.	Amend as follows: <u>Integrated Residential Development:</u> Means a development containing a mixture of residential units, and specifically more than one of the following types: single dwellings, duplex dwellings and/or apartment buildings on a site which is designed in a comprehensive way. The development may include shared facilities such as open space, access, parking and manoeuvring, and may have other communal activities (e.g. recreational facilities, office administration) for the exclusive use of the residents of the development and their visitors. The development may include where relevant management structures which govern its day to day operation (such as for retirement villages or rest homes). An integrated residential development does not include a development that consists solely of one of the following

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d (John Collins)						activities: One type of residential unit Hospitals Managed Care Facilities <u>Retirement village</u> Residential Centres.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	2.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports the intent to incorporate Objective 1 of the MDRS into the Purpose for the Strategic Framework chapter, however it considers amendments should be made to ensure (e) includes Objective 1 verbatim as drafted in the MDRS and to better align with the s77G RMA direction.	Amend 2.1(e) as follows: Schedule 3A of the RMA requires the District Plan to incorporate all residential areas <u>give effect to the MDRS standards in all residential areas</u> , to achieve well-functioning urban environments which enable all current and future people and communities to provide for their wellbeing, health and safety. In some circumstances qualifying matters may modify the MDRS and these qualifying matters are identified in the Plan.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Oppose	The submitter acknowledges that Objective 2.2.5 incorporates aspects of the MDRS and Policy 6 of the NPSUD, but considers amendments are required to better reflect Objective 1 and 2 of the MDRS.	Amend Objective 2.2.5 as follows: Promote <u>well-functioning safe, compact, sustainable, good quality</u> urban environments that respond positively to their local context <u>the housing needs and demand and the neighbourhood's planned urban built character</u> , recognising that further <u>significant change is anticipated</u> may occur through intensification, <u>and that change is not in of itself an adverse effect</u> .
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.8	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.5a as it seeks to manage the form and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS. It considers the reference to 'best practice urban design and sustainable development principles' is vague and will create interpretation issues as neither are defined in the Plan.	Delete Policy 2.2.5a.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.9	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.5b as it seeks to manage the form and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS. CPTED matters are relevant but covered by Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Delete Policy 2.2.5b.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages	330.10	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.5c as it seeks to manage development in a manner that is inconsistent with the MDRS. The requirement to 'enhance' a broad range of matters is vague and contrary to the intention of the Enabling Housing Act. Development should only be required to mitigate its adverse effects, not remedy the effects of past development.	Delete Policy 2.2.5c.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.11	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Urban Design Approach	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.5d as it is unnecessary as it simply cross-refers to another part of the Plan (Chapter 25.15 - Urban Design).	Delete Policy 2.2.5d.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.12	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Oppose	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones under the NPSUD. Accordingly, the submitter considers residential activities should be recognised in Objective 2.2.6.	Amend Objective 2.2.6 as follows: Establish and maintain a hierarchy of viable and vibrant business centres that provide a focus for retail, commercial, <u>residential</u> and entertainment activities and serve the social, cultural, environmental and economic needs of the community.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.13	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Central City, Business and Industry	Oppose	The submitter opposes overly restrictive limitations on ground level residential activities in commercial zones. The submitter supports 2.2.6d insofar as it reflects Policy 3 and 4 of the MDRS but suggests amendments should be made to ensure the policies are included verbatim as drafted in the MDRS.	Amend Policy 2.2.6d as follows: Residential activity above ground floor <u>and where appropriate at ground level</u> commercial uses is encouraged it can be shown <u>to</u> support the business centres and meet the day-to-day needs of residents, achieve attractive and safe streets and public open spaces, including by providing for passive surveillance.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.14	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.9 to the extent it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS but seeks an amendment to this objective to align more accurately with Objective 2 of the MDRS.	Amend Objective 2.2.9 as follows: A range of housing types and densities is available to meet the housing needs and demands <u>and which responds to</u> a neighbourhood's planned urban built character.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New	330.15	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.9a as it aligns with the MDRS and the direction in the NPSUD regarding housing choice. The reference to ‘social needs’ is expected to support the provision of retirement villages and enable a response to the current retirement housing and care crisis.	Retain Policy 2.2.9a as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.16	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Oppose	The submitter considers the references to being ‘within’ the walkable catchment and ‘adjacent’ to identified commercial centres in Policy 2.2.9(b) will be unnecessarily limiting and conflicts with the direction in the NPSUD under Policy 3 to enable higher density residential developments in other areas, and should be amended for consistency. The submitter also considers higher density development can be located on larger sites, as per its relief sought below.	Amend Policy 2.2.9b for consistency with Policy 3 NPSUD.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.17	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton’s Identity, Character and Heritage	Oppose	The submitter opposes the aspects of these provisions in relation to “Hamilton’s unique identity” which is unclear and likely to lead to interpretation issues. While historic heritage will be identified in the District Plan providing certainty, the vague concept of “identity” is not described.	Delete references to “identity”.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.18	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part Objective 4.1.2.2 as it is not clear what “infrastructure services” means and whether it expands beyond infrastructure necessary to service the development.	Amend 4.1.2.2 as follows: Development maximises the use of land by providing a range of housing typologies that are consistent with the neighbourhood's planned urban built character while ensuring the provision of infrastructure <u>necessary to service the services as part of any</u> development.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.19	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Support	The submitter supports the objective as it relates to the efficient use and development of land.	Retain.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	330.20	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.12b requiring buildings to be designed so they can be adapted in the future for a range of uses. Retirement villages are designed to meet the specific needs of residents. The submitter opposes Policy 2.2.12c requiring development to reduce embodied and operational carbon to minimise greenhouse gas emissions because it is not clear how this policy direction will be implemented and it has the potential to have significant implications for new development given it inevitably enables greenhouse gas emissions during construction and operation.	Delete Policy 2.2.12b

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.21	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Integrate Land Use, Transport and Infrastructure	Oppose	The submitter has also made submissions on infrastructure and amendments to this objective and policies will be necessary to align with changes made to Chapter 25.	Amend as needed to align with Chapter 25.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.22	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	The submitter supports Objective 2.2.14(i) as it aligns with Objective 1 of the MDRS and does not oppose (ii) given its high level nature.	Retain as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.23	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.14a as it aligns with Policy 3 of the NPSUD and provides for heights that will enable more people to live in the City's urban environment.	Retain Policy 2.2.14a as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.24	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.14b to the extent it aligns with Policy 3 of the NPSUD but considers amendments should be made to clarify the building heights expected in high-density areas.	Amend Policy 2.2.14b as follows: Provide for high-density residential developments <u>of at least six storeys</u> within a nominal 800m walking distance of the Central City Zone.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.25	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.14c as it aligns with Policy 3(d) of the NPSUD.	Retain Policy 2.2.14c as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.26	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 2.2.14d to the extent it aligns with Policy 3 of the NPSUD but considers amendments should be made to clarify the building heights expected in high-density areas.	Amend Policy 2.2.14d as follows: Enable higher density residential development <u>of at least 6 storeys</u> within a nominal 200m walking distance of Nawton Suburban Centre.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.27	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes this policy requirement, as it does not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. Retirement village residents have reduced activity levels due to their age and frailty, and therefore have less need for multi-modal transport opportunities.	Amend Policy 2.2.14f as follows: Improve the permeability of neighbourhoods for, and give access priority to, pedestrians, cyclists, and micro-mobility users, <u>as appropriate to the particular needs of the activity</u> .
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.28	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports the recognition of the need to accommodate more people within the city and to develop the land more efficiently to provide for higher-density living. However, the submitter seeks amendments to the ‘Residential Precincts’ part of this statement to better align with Policy 5 of the MDRS and recognise that amenity values are anticipated to change over time, to align with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend the purpose as follows: Design and layout of residential units and buildings are critically important. <u>Encourage</u> all residential development must to address potential adverse environmental effects and ensure <u>encourage a quality well-functioning</u> urban environment is achieved through high quality development <u>urban design</u> . <u>Reasonable</u> good standards of amenity create a pleasant and attractive living environment, and in doing so contribute to wider neighbourhood amenity. Residential amenity means the many qualities and attributes that allow people to enjoy living where they do — such as visual attributes, sunlight, good access, low noise levels and safe environment including the provision of usable, practical and function living space both internally and externally. The planned urban form for each residential zone is anticipated to change, and this may detract from current amenity values experienced by some people. These changes are not, of themselves, an adverse effect.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.29	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part Policy 4.1.2.2a(i) as it is not clear what “services” means and Policy 4.1.2.2a(ii) as it suggests infrastructure capacity may be ‘held’ for later in time development, which will not allow immediate housing needs to be met.	Delete “and services” from Policy 4.1.2.2a(i). Delete Policy 4.1.2.2a(ii).
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.30	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes this objective to the extent it modifies the wording of Objective 1 of the MDRS because it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of ‘well-functioning urban environment’ consists of a list of positive/beneficial matters.	Amend Objective 4.1.2.3 as follows: The Residential Zones and development within these zones positively contribute to achieving a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.31	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports Policies 4.1.2.3a – 4.1.2.3d as they align with Policies 2 - 5 of the MDRS.	Retain as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.32	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter supports this objective and policies to the extent retirement villages are specifically identified as residential activities.	Retain as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.33	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter recognises the importance of sustainable development. However, it is not clear how this policy direction will be implemented and it has the potential to have significant implications for new development (eg by requiring solar energy). Policy 4.1.2.5b is broad and the RVA is concerned that this policy guidance could be translated into onerous consent requirements to minimise effects on climate change. It is important to ensure RMA plans do not result in a ‘double up’ of regulation given climate change is predominately regulated under the Climate Change Response Act 2002.	Amend to focus on the effects of new development regulated by the RMA.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.34	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objective 4.1.2.6 and the corresponding policies to the extent that they seek to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner which is inconsistent with the MDRS (for example, Policy 4.1.2.6j requiring development to “minimise” building bulk effects does not recognise that a certain level of effect is anticipated under the MDRS). The submitter considers that many of the policy requirements are not suitable for retirement villages, which have substantially different functional and operational needs to standard residential development (eg requiring a public ‘front’ and private ‘back’, requiring private outdoor living, requiring storage/service areas for individual units, etc).	Delete Objective 4.1.2.6 and Policies 4.1.2.6a-j.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.35	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	In addition to the current general objectives for all residential zones, the submitter considers that an ageing population specific objective should be included in the Plan that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	The RVA seeks that a new objective is inserted in the General Objectives and Policies for All Residential Zones chapter that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>4.1.2.X Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.36	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the ‘All Residential Zone’ section. The submitter considers this policy should be included to respond to the NPSUD direction and recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, which result in building formats that tend to be higher intensity than surrounding residential neighbourhoods.	<p>The submitter seeks that the following new policies are inserted in the General Objectives and Policies for All Residential Zones that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</p> <p><u>4.1.2.Xx Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in residential zones, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs for retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>4.1.2.Xx Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs for communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>4.1.2.Xx Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>4.1.2.Xx Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.37	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter considers that the Purpose for the General Residential Zone should recognise that the planned urban built form in the zone may involve significant changes to the area, in line with the MDRS and NPSUD, and this may detract from the amenity values of existing residents in a way which is not in itself an adverse effect. It does not consider the reference to “balancing” amenity values of existing residents with new residents reflects the position under the MDRS and NPSUD. It is not clear what National Environmental Standard the purpose is referring to.	<p>Amend General Residential Zone Purpose as follows:</p> <p>The General Residential Zone is the most common residential zone in Hamilton. Its purpose is to provide for housing supply and choice in a manner that balances the amenity values of existing residents with the needs of new members of the community, <u>recognising that the planned urban built form for the zone may involve significant changes that detract from existing amenity values.</u> These provisions are primarily derived from the Government’s requirements including through its National Policy Statement <u>for Urban Developments</u> and National Environmental Standard.</p> <p>The zone applies to both existing residential areas and greenfield areas, and it anticipates a wide range of housing types and densities will occur. The zone also provides for residentially compatible business activity including...</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.38	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Objective 4.2.2.1 as it provides for higher density housing types and sizes that provide for identified housing needs and demands. However, the submitter considers a retirement village specific policy (a form of 4 or more residential unit development) is required as set out above.	<p>Retain Objective 4.2.2.1 as notified.</p> <p>Add new policy as sought above - <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.39	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policies 4.2.2.1a-d as these policies do not align with the MDRS. These policies place limitations and restrictions on residential developments which do not achieve the intent of the Enabling Housing Act, nor are these policies set out in the MDRS.	Delete Policies 4.2.2.1a – 4.2.2.1d.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.40	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies:	Oppose	The submitter supports Objective 4.2.2.2 to the extent it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS. However, it considers that the Objective should be amended to reflect that 3 storey buildings are a permitted standard under the MDRS, not a maximum building height.	<p>Amend Objective 4.2.2.2 as follows:</p> <p>The General Residential Zone and development within it provide for a variety of housing types and sizes that</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)			General Residential Zone			<p>respond to</p> <p>i. Housing needs and demand; and</p> <p>ii. The neighbourhood’s planned urban built character, including 1-to 3 storey buildings.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.41	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter supports Policy 4.2.2.2a to the extent that it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS, however, it considers that the policy should be amended to recognise that 3 storey buildings are a permitted standard under the MDRS, not a maximum building height.</p> <p>The submitter opposes Policy 4.2.2.2b as this policy does not align with the MDRS and will place additional restrictions on residential development which does not achieve the intent of the Enabling Housing Act. It supports the recognition that development will have adverse effects, but opposes the direction to avoid adverse effects beyond those permitted in the Zone. It is important that a case-by-case assessment of effects is enabled.</p> <p>The submitter considers Policy 4.2.2.2c should also recognise that higher-density development can be located on larger sites.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks to amend Policy 4.2.2.2a as follows:</p> <p>Policy 4.2.2.2a</p> <p>Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 1, 2 and 3-storey attached and detached residential units and <u>low rise apartments</u>.</p> <p>The RVA seeks that Policy 4.2.2.2b is deleted.</p> <p>The RVA seeks to amend Policy 4.2.2.2c as follows:</p> <p>Higher-density residential development is located close to neighbourhood centres, parks, open spaces, and <u>or</u> other areas of high social amenity <u>or on larger sites</u>.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.42	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Oppose	<p>The submitter supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however it opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefits, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks to amend 4.2.3.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (4.2.7 below).</p> <p>4.2.3.1 Activity status table</p> <p>g. Retirement Village, excluding the construction of buildings – RD P</p> <p>...</p> <p>All Activities and Structures</p> <p><u>ga. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village – RD</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.43	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Oppose	<p>The submitter supports Rule 4.2.4 to the extent it prevents proposals for certain residential activities from being processed as publicly notified and limited notified. However, the Rule limits the notification rules to certain percentage exceedances of the density standards, which is not consistent with the MDRS.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the following amendment to Rule 4.2.4:</p> <p>4.2.4 Rules – notification</p> <p>Except as set out below, all proposals for consent will be subject to the normal notification tests of the RMA 1991 as set out in Chapter 1.1.9:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>v. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village shall be processed without public notification.</u></p> <p><u>vi. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 4.2.5.2, 4.2.5.4, 4.2.5.5 and 4.2.5.6 and shall be processed without public or limited notification.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.44	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.1 Density	Support	<p>The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.1 Density because it does not impose a density standard for retirement villages.</p>	<p>Retain Rule 4.2.5.1 as notified.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages	330.45	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the inclusion of the building coverage in Rule 4.2.5.2(a) as it is consistent with Clause 14 of the MDRS. However, the submitter seeks this rule is amended to reflect the new definition for “retirement units” sought above.</p> <p>The submitter does not oppose Rules 4.2.5.2(b) as it is more enabling of development consistent with s77H RMA.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.2 as follows:</p> <p>4.2.5.2 Building Coverage</p> <p>a. Activity: All residential units <u>and retirement units</u> (except for terrace housing units and apartment units where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear land then 4.2.5.2.b applies).</p> <p>Maximum building coverage: 50%.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)					The submitter also seeks the removal of Rule 4.2.5.2(c) as it does not align with Clause 14 of the MDRS as does not relate to a qualifying matter.	b. Activity: Maximum building coverage for any terrace housing units and apartments where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear lane. Maximum building coverage: 60%. c. Activity: All other activities. Maximum building coverage: 40%.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.46	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.2.5.3 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS.</p> <p>The submitter supports 4.2.5.3(b) as it aligns with Clause 18 of the MDRS.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.3 as follows:</p> <p>4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping Landscaped area</p> <p>a. Permeable Surface Standard: Minimum 30% of a site b. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have a landscape area of a minimum of 20% of the total site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of a tree regardless of the ground treatment below them. c. On front, corner sites and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required forward of the front building line. i. Single residential units and duplex residential units and apartment buildings — Standard: Minimum 50% ii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage with 7.5m or greater — Standard: Minimum 40% iii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width of less than 7.5m — Standard: Minimum 30% d. Urban trees: Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site, clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, at the rate set out below:</p> <p>i. Detached residential unit: Two per residential unit ii. Duplex residential unit: Two per residential unit iii. Terrace housing unit: One per residential unit iv. Apartment buildings: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m2 of site area v. All other activities: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m2 of site area. e. Specimen trees shall be planted as per 4.2.5.3d at a planted size of at least 80L. <u>f. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.47	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.4 Building Height as it aligns with Clause 11 of the MDRS.	Retain Rule 4.2.5.4 as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.48	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.5 and the height in relation to boundary provisions in principle as it reflects the provisions of the MDRS. However, the submitter considers that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate.	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.5 as follows to include additional exclusions from this standard:</p> <p>4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary</p> <p>...</p> <p>This standard does not apply to</p> <p>i. a boundary with a road</p> <p>ii. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site</p> <p>iii. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sties or where a common wall is proposed</p> <p><u>iv. boundaries adjoining Business Zones, Central City Zone, Special Character Zones, Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone, Open Space Zones, and Major Facilities Zone.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.49	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	<p>The submitter supports Rules 4.2.5.6(a), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) as they are consistent with Clause 13 of the MDRS or are more enabling, but suggests the insertion of a new (da) for consistency with Clause 13 in relation to common walls.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the deletion of the remaining standards in Rule 4.2.5.6, which do not align with the MDRS and will restrict housing development.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.6 as follows to align with Regulation 13 of the MDRS:</p> <p>4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks</p> <p>Building setback from:</p> <p>a. Transport corridor boundary Minimum distance: 1.5m</p> <p>b. Where a garage is provided and the garage door or carport facing towards a transport corridor shall be set back from the transport corridor boundary. Minimum distance: 5m</p> <p>c. Side yards</p> <p>Minimum distance: 1m</p> <p>d. One side yard per site where:</p> <p>i. Legal provision is made for access and maintenance; and</p> <p>ii. Neighbours consent is obtained; and</p> <p>iii. The opposite side yard is a minimum of 2m. OR, It is a common/party wall. Minimum distance: 0m.</p> <p>da. <u>this standard does not apply to site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</u></p> <p>e. Rear yard Minimum distance: 1m</p> <p>f. Rear yard where it adjoins a rear lane Minimum distance: 0m</p> <p>g. Side and rear yard where it adjoins a rear lane</p> <p>i. The written consent of the owners adjoining the relevant setback or setbacks is obtained; or</p> <p>ii. It is proposed to site a building within the 1m setback and:</p> <p>i. The building is less than 10m in area; and</p> <p>ii. The building is less than 2m in height; and</p> <p>iii. The building will not be connected to electricity supply; and</p> <p>iv. There is no discharge of stormwater onto neighbouring land from the building; and</p> <p>v. No more than one building is established on a site in accordance with this rule; except where notional boundaries are shown for an approved subdivision, one accessory building can exist for each notional lot.</p> <p>h. Internal vehicle access serving up to three residential units on a site (excluding access to an ancillary residential unit). Minimum distance: No part of a building (including eaves) shall extend over or encroach into an internal vehicle access.</p> <p>i. Internal vehicle access serving more than three residential units on a site Minimum distance: Setback of Residential Units = 1m</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.50	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 4.2.5.7 as the MDRS do not address fences and walls.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 4.2.5.7.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association	330.51	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 4.2.5.8 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS. In addition, the submitter consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to Rule 4.2.5.8 to provide for public interface/windows facing the street requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.8 as follows to align with the MDRS and to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages:</p> <p>4.2.5.8 Public Interface</p> <p>Public interface for one to three residential units on a site:</p> <p>a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</p> <p>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						<p>windows or doors.</p> <p>Public interface for four or more residential units on a site:</p> <p>b. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</p> <p>i. A minimum 20% of the street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</p> <p>ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear-glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building.</p> <p>iii. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door).</p> <p>c. All residential developments comprising 4 or more residential units must have pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door of each residential unit, or to the single front door and lobby of an apartment building. This pedestrian access must:</p> <p>i. Be step-free and separate from and clear of any obstructions, carriageway, vehicle parking space (including any parked vehicle overhang or nose in space), cycle parking space, service area, loading space, or vehicle manoeuvring area, except:</p> <p>A. As provided for in d ii, or</p> <p>B. Where the pedestrian access must cross a carriageway.</p> <p>ii. Have lighting to meet the requirements set out in Chapter 25.6.</p> <p>d. A pedestrian access serving between 4 and 15 residential units must be at least 1.5m wide, except:</p> <p>i. Where the pedestrian access is adjacent to any building wall or fence, it must be at least:</p> <p>A. 1.8m wide, or</p> <p>B. 1.65m wide with a 0.75m wide landscape strip provided on one side of the path between it and either the building wall or the fence, or</p> <p>ii. Where the residential development comprises only 4 or 5 residential units, the pedestrian access may be shared in a carriageway that serves those 4 or 5 residential units only, is at least 3.5m wide, and within a legal width of at least 4m.</p> <p>e. A pedestrian access serving more than 15 residential units must be at least 1.8m wide, except where the pedestrian access is adjacent to any building wall or fence, a 0.75m wide landscape strip must be provided on one side of the path between it and either the building wall or the fence.</p> <p>f. For retirement units, clauses a – b apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.52	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.9 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however, the submitter considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant.	<p>Amend Rule 4.2.5.9 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages:</p> <p>4.2.5.9 Outlook space</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p><u>k. For retirement units, clauses a – i apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.53	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	<p>The submitter acknowledges that Rule 4.2.5.10 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule 4.2.5.10 that enable the communal areas to count towards the outdoor living space requirement.</p> <p>In addition, the submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.5.10 is amended to align with Clause 15 of the MDRS.</p>	<p>Amend as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the outdoor living space requirement:</p> <p>4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Areas per residential unit or retirement unit</p> <p>a. Outdoor living areas shall have minimum areas and dimensions as follows:</p> <p>i. ...</p> <p>iv. For four or more residential units, is readily accessible from the principal living room; and</p> <p><u>c. For retirement units, clause (a) applies with the following modifications:</u></p> <p><u>i. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible location(s) in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.54	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Oppose	The MDRS density standards do not address waste management and service areas. Retirement villages should also be excluded from the Rule as they are comprehensively designed to provide adequate waste management areas.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.5.11 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas a. ... <u>f. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in Rule 4.4.5.11.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.55	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	The MDRS density standards do not address storage areas. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.5.12 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.2.5.12 Storage Areas a. ... <u>d. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in Rule 4.2.5.12.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.56	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The MDRS do not address landscaping requirements for vehicle parking. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.5.13 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking a. ... <u>g. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in Rule 4.2.5.13(f).</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.57	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.2.5.14 as it does not align with the MDRS.	Delete Rule 4.2.5.14.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.58	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.2.5.15 to exclude the requirements for universal access for retirement villages. These requirements do not align with the MDRS and retirement village operators best understand the access requirements of their residents.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.5.15 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.2.5.15 Universal Access a. ... <u>b. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.2.5.15.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.59	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from assessment matters that apply to residential development, including those set out in Rule 4.2.7 i – iii. Instead, the submitter considers that a specific retirement village set of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of a retirement village, which takes into account the functional and operational needs of a retirement village.	The submitter seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from matters of discretion Rule 4.2.7 i – iii, so only the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.60	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.7 is amended to reflect the changes sought in relation to Rule 4.2.3.1. This includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity in Rule 4.2.3.1 and the inclusion of a new rule that identifies the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.2.7(xiv) is deleted and replaced with the following assessment matters which are focused on relevant matters for the construction of retirement villages:</p> <p>4.2.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</p> <p>For the construction of retirement villages under Rule 4.2.3.1 the Council restricts the exercise of its discretion to:</p> <p><u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the standards: 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.5.4 – 4.2.5.6, and where relevant, 4.2.5.3 and 4.2.5.8 – 4.2.5.10:</u></p> <p><u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u></p> <p><u>d. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u></p> <p><u>e. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider:</u></p> <p><u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u></p> <p><u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village</u></p> <p><u>f. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to the construction of a retirement village.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.61	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes paragraph 5 of the Purpose, to the extent it is inconsistent with Objective 2 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. The reference effects on neighbouring sites should be linked to the density standards.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the Medium Density Residential Zone Purpose should also recognise that the character of the Zone is anticipated to change substantially over time, as required by the NPSUD, and to reflect the same recognition made in the High Density Residential Zone purpose.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 5 as follows:</p> <p>Where resource consent is required for 4 or more dwellings, the plan places particular emphasis on achieving <u>responding to</u> the anticipated urban built character of the Medium Density Residential Zone while achieving <u>and encouraging</u> attractive and safe street and public open spaces. As well as managing the effects of development on adjoining neighbouring sites, including visual amenity, privacy and access to daylight <u>through density standards</u>, and ensuring <u>encouraging</u> a high quality <u>development on-site living environments</u>. <u>The character of the Zone is anticipated to change substantially over time, with effects on the existing amenity of neighbouring sites anticipated.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.62	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Objective 4.3.2.1 as it promotes 4 or more residential units. However, the submitter considers a retirement village specific policy (a form of 4 or more residential unit development) is required as set out above.	<p>Retain Objective 4.3.2.1 as notified.</p> <p>Add new policy as sought above - <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.63	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policies 4.3.2.1a – 4.3.2.1f as these policies do not align with the MDRS. These policies place limitations and restrictions on residential developments which may unnecessarily restrict development of a comprehensive retirement village, and these policies are not set out in the MDRS. In particular, the submitter opposes Policy 4.3.2.1b requiring universal access principles to be incorporated as the submitter’s members best understand the needs of their residents and this matter does not require Council oversight.	Delete Policies 4.3.2.1 a – 4.3.2.1 f.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.64	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 4.3.2.2 as far as it aligns with Objective 2 of the MDRS and is more enabling in relation to 4-5 storey buildings.	Retain as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.65	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectives and Policies: Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter supports Policy 4.3.2.2a as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS and is more enabling in relation to 4-5 storey buildings. The submitter opposes Policy 4.3.2.2b as this policy does not align with the MDRS and will place additional restrictions on residential development which does not achieve the intent of the Enabling Housing Act. It supports the recognition that development will have adverse effects, but opposes the direction to avoid adverse effects beyond those permitted in the Zone. It is important that a case-by-case assessment of effects is enabled. The submitter considers Policy 4.2.2.2c should also recognise that higher-density development can be located on larger sites.	Retain Policy 4.3.2.2a as notified AND Delete Policy 4.3.2.2b AND Amend Policy 4.3.2.2c as follows: Medium <u>Higher</u> density residential development should be located within and close to suburban centres, tertiary education facilities and hospital, and in areas serviced by passenger transport <u>or on larger sites</u> .
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.66	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however it opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone. The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages are residential activities that are appropriate in residential zones and provide substantial benefit, including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend 4.3.3.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (4.3.7 below). 4.3.3.1 Activity status table k. Retirement Village, <u>excluding the construction of buildings – RD P</u> ... All Activities and Structures ka. <u>Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village – RD</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.67	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.3.3.2 to the extent it prevents proposals for certain residential activities from being processed as publicly notified and limited notified. However, the Rule limits the notification rules to certain percentage exceedances of the density standards, which is not consistent with the MDRS. Further, the notification rules are limited to dwellings and are silent on retirement villages. In alignment with the MDRS, the submitter considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Enabling Housing Act, it considers that a retirement village that is compliant with standards 4.3.4.2 (Building Coverage), 4.3.4.4 (Building Height), 4.3.4.5 (Height in relation to Boundary) and 4.3.4.6 (Building Setbacks) should also be precluded from limited notification.	The submitter seeks the following amendment to Rule 4.3.3.2: 4.3.3.2 Rules – notification Except as set out below, all proposals for consent will be subject to the normal notification tests of the RMA 1991 as set out in Chapter 1.1.9: ... <u>v. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village shall be processed without public notification.</u> <u>vi. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village that complies with standards 4.3.4.2, 4.3.4.4, 4.3.4.5 and 4.3.4.6 and shall be processed without public or limited notification.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.68	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.1 Density	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.1 Density because it does not impose a density standard for retirement villages. The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. No density standard is therefore required to trigger restricted discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule 4.3.4.1 as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.69	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.2 Building Coverag e	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of the building coverage in Rule 4.3.4.2(a) as it is consistent with Clause 14 of the MDRS. However, the submitter seeks this rule is amended to reflect a new definition for “retirement units”. The submitter does not oppose Rules 4.3.5.2(b) as it is more enabling of development consistent with s77H RMA.	Amend Rule 4.3.4.2 as follows: 4.3.4.2 Building Coverage a. Activity: All residential units (except for terrace housing units and apartment units where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear land then 4.2.5.2.b. applies). Maximum building coverage: 50%. b. Maximum building coverage for any terrace housing units and apartments where onsite parking is provided and accessed by a rear land. Maximum building coverage: 60%.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.70	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permea ble Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.3.4.3 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS. The permeable surfaces and additional landscaping requirements place limitations and restrictions on residential developments which does not achieve the intent of the Enabling Housing Act. The submitter supports 4.3.4.3(b) as it aligns with Clause 18 of the MDRS. The submitter also considers that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.	Amend Rule 4.3.4.3 as follows: 4.3.4.3 Permeability and Landscaping a. Permeable Surface Standard: 30% b. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have a landscape area of a minimum of 20% of the total site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of a tree regardless of the ground treatment below them. c. On front, corner sites and through sites, landscaping planted in grass, shrubs and trees required forward of the front building line. i. Single residential units and duplex residential units and apartment buildings— Standard: Minimum 50% ii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage with 7.5m or greater— Standard: Minimum 40% iii. Terrace housing with a residential unit frontage width of less than 7.5m— Standard: Minimum 30% d. Urban trees: Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site, clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, at the rate set out below: i. Detached residential unit: Two per residential unit ii. Duplex residential unit: Two per residential unit iii. Terrace housing unit: One per residential unit iv. Apartment buildings: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 150m2 of site area v. All other activities: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m2 of site area. e. Specimen trees shall be planted as per 4.3.4.3d at a planted size of at least 80L. c. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated <u>with each residential unit or retirement unit.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.71	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.3.4.4 as it is more enabling than the MDRS consistent with s77H RMA.	Retain Rule 4.3.4.4 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.72	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.3.4.5(a) and the height in relation to boundary provisions in principle as it reflects the MDRS. However, the submitter considers that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate.	<p>Amend Rule 4.3.4.5 as follows to include additional exclusions from this standard and align with the MDRS:</p> <p>4.3.4.5 Height in Relation to Boundary</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p>This standard does not apply to</p> <p>i. A boundary with a road;</p> <p>ii. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; or</p> <p>iii. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sties or where a common wall is proposed; or</p> <p>iv. Boundaries adjoining Business Zones, Central City Zone, Special Character Zones, Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone, Open Space Zones, and Major Facilities Zone or</p> <p>b. For three or more attached residential units on a site that adjoins a transport corridor, another site in the Medium Density Zone or High Density Zone or the following zones, any Business Zone, any Open Space Zones;</p> <p>i. Within the first 20 meters of the site measured from the transport corridor boundary 4.3.4.5 a. will not apply along the side boundaries.</p> <p>ii. Within the first 20 meters of the site measured from the transport corridor boundary the following shall apply:</p> <p>a. All parts of a building less than 11m in height (or up to 3 storeys) shall be setback from the side yard boundary a minimum of 1 meter as required by Rule 4.3.4.6 b;</p> <p>b. All parts of a building greater than 11m in height (or greater than 3 storeys) shall be setback from the side boundary a minimum of 4 meters.</p> <p>iii. Site that adjoin any other zone then 4.3.4.5 a. will apply.</p> <p>a.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.73	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports Rule 4.3.4.6(a) - (f) as they are consistent with the MDRS or are more enabling, but suggests the insertion of a new (ca) for consistency with Clause 13 in relation to common walls.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the removal of the remaining standards in Rule 4.3.4.6, as these do not align with the MDRS and will restrict housing development.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.3.4.6 as follows to align with the MDRS:</p> <p>4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks</p> <p>Building setback from:</p> <p>a. Transport corridor boundary</p> <p>i. A single storey unenclosed verandah / patio / porch space attached to a residential unit</p> <p>Maximum distance: 1m</p> <p>ii. Other than provided for above</p> <p>iii. Minimum distance: 1.5m,</p> <p>b. Side yards</p> <p>Minimum distance: 1m</p> <p>c. One side yard per site where:</p> <p>i. Legal provision is made for access and maintenance; and</p> <p>ii. Neighbours consent is obtained; and</p> <p>iii. The opposite side yard is a minimum of 2m or</p> <p>iv. It is a common/party wall.</p> <p>Minimum distance: 0m.</p> <p><u>ca. this standard does not apply to site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed.</u></p> <p>d. Rear yard (except where it adjoins a rare lane)</p> <p>Minimum distance: 1m</p> <p>e. Rear yard where it adjoins a rear lane</p> <p>Minimum distance: 0m</p> <p>f. Side and rear yard where it adjoins a rear lane</p> <p>i. The written consent of the owners adjoining the relevant setback or setbacks is obtained; or</p> <p>ii. It is proposed to site a building within the 1m setback and:</p> <p>iii. The building is less than 10m² in area; and</p> <p>i. The building is less than 2m in height; and</p> <p>ii. The building will not be connected to electricity supply; and</p> <p>iii. There is no discharge of stormwater onto neighbouring land from the building; and</p> <p>iv. No more than one building is established on a site in accordance with this rule; except where notional boundaries are shown for an approved subdivision, one accessory building can exist for each notional lot.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.74	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.4.7 as the MDRS does not address fences and walls.	Delete Rule 4.3.4.7.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.75	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.4.8 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS. In addition, the submitter considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple open communal spaces available for residents which provide outlook opportunities), the standard is not directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to Rule 4.3.4.8 to provide for outlook space/windows to street requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	<p>Amend Rule 4.3.4.8 as follows to align with Clause 17 of the MDRS and to provide for the windows to street requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages:</p> <p>4.3.4.8 Public Interface</p> <p>Public interface for one to three residential units on a site:</p> <p>a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</p> <p>i. A minimum 20% of the <u>public</u> street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</p> <p>Public interface for four or more residential units on a site:</p> <p>b. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have:</p> <p>c. A minimum 20% of the <u>public</u> street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors.</p> <p>i. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access to the front door is provided.</p> <p>d. All residential developments comprising 4 or more residential units must have pedestrian access from a transport corridor to the front door of each residential unit, or to the single front door and lobby of an apartment building. This pedestrian access must:</p> <p>i. Be step free and separate from and clear of any obstructions, carriageway, vehicle parking space (including any parked vehicle overhang or nose in space), cycle parking space, service area, loading space, or vehicle manoeuvring area, except:</p> <p>A. As provided for in d ii, or</p> <p>B. Where the pedestrian access must cross a carriageway.</p> <p>ii. Have lighting to meet the requirements set out in Chapter 25.6.</p> <p>e. A pedestrian access serving between 4 and 15 residential units must be at least 1.5m wide, except:</p> <p>i. Where the pedestrian access is adjacent to any building wall or fence, it must be at least:</p> <p>A. 1.8m wide, or</p> <p>B. 1.65m wide with a 0.75m wide landscape strip provided on one side of the path between it and either the building wall or the fence, or</p> <p>ii. Where the residential development comprises only 4 or 5 residential units, the pedestrian access may be shared in a carriageway that serves those 4 or 5 residential units only, is at least 3.5m wide, and within a legal width of at least 4m.</p> <p>f. A pedestrian access serving more than 15 residential units must be at least 1.8m wide, except where the pedestrian access is adjacent to any building wall or fence, a 0.75m wide landscape strip must be provided on one side of the path between it and either the building wall or the fence.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	330.76	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.9 Other Resource Consent Information	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.3.4.9 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however, the submitter considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to Rule 4.3.4.9 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	<p>Amend Rule 4.3.4.9 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages:</p> <p>4.3.4.9 Outlook space</p> <p>a. ...</p> <p><u>I. For retirement units, clauses a – k apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.77	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	<p>The submitter acknowledges that Rule 4.3.4.10 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule 4.3.4.10 that enable the communal areas to count towards the outdoor living space requirement.</p> <p>In addition, the submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.4.10 is amended to align with Clause 15 of the MDRS.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 4.3.4.10 as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the outdoor living space requirement:</p> <p>4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Areas per residential unit or retirement unit Outdoor living areas shall have minimum areas and dimensions as follows:</p> <p>a. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20m2. This may comprise a combination of ground floor,</p> <p>balcony, verandah, porch, patio or roof terrace space that:</p> <p>i. ... v. For four or more residential units, is readily accessible from the principal living room; and vi. c. For retirement units, clause (a) applies with the following modifications: i. <u>the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in one or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> ii. <u>a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible location(s) in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.78	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Area	Oppose	<p>The MDRS density standards do not address waste management and service areas. Retirement villages should also be excluded from the Rule as they are comprehensively designed to provide adequate waste management areas.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.4.11 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages:</p> <p>4.3.4.11 Waste Management and Service Areas a. ...</p> <p><u>f. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in Rule 4.3.4.11.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.79	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	<p>The MDRS density standards do not address storage areas. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.4.12 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages:</p> <p>4.3.4.12 Storage Areas a. ... <u>d. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.3.4.12.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.80	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	<p>The MDRS do not address landscaping requirements for vehicle parking. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.4.13 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages:</p> <p>4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking Accessory buildings, vehicle access and vehicle parking for four or more residential units on a site: a. ... <u>g. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.3.4.13(f).</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey	330.81	4.3 Medium Density	4.3.4.14 Built Form	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 4.3.4.14 as it does not align with the MDRS.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 4.3.4.14.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)		Residential Zone				
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.82	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.3.4.15 to exclude these requirements for universal access for retirement villages. These requirements do not align with the MDRS and retirement village operators best understand the access requirements of their residents.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.4.15 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.3.4.15 Universal Access a. ... <u>b. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.3.4.15.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.83	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from assessment matters that apply to residential development, including those set out in Rule 4.3.7 i – iii. Instead, the submitter considers that a specific retirement village set of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of a retirement village, which takes into account the functional and operational needs of a retirement village. These retirement village specific matters of discretion are those provided in response to Rule 4.3.7(xi) below.	The submitter seeks to amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from matters of discretion Rule 4.3.7 i – iii, so only the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.84	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages which should be regulated in line with the MDRS. The submitter particularly opposes the matter of discretion relating to character and amenity. The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages. This will require the deletion of Rule 4.3.7(xi) and its replacement with a specific set of assessment matters.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that Rule 4.3.7(xi) is deleted and replaced with the following assessment matters which are focused on relevant matters for the construction of retirement villages: 4.3.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</p> <p><u>For the construction of retirement villages under Rule 4.2.3.1 the Council restricts the exercise of its discretion to:</u> <u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the standards: 4.3.4.2 and 4.3.4.4 – 4.3.4.6, and where relevant, 4.3.4.3 and 4.3.4.8 – 4.3.4.10;</u> <u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>d. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>e. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider:</u> <u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>f. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to for the construction of a retirement village.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages	330.85	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter supports paragraph 1 of the Purpose which aligns with the MDRS. The submitter opposes in part paragraph 4 of the Purpose. ‘Visually attractive’ buildings is a vague and subjective requirement that is not related to adverse effects. The submitter supports reference to “adequate” on-site amenity being linked to the expected urban built character.	Delete paragraph 5.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.86	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports this Objective 4.4.2.1 as it is enabling of high density development and buildings of at least 6 storeys consistent with Policy 3 NPSUD.	Retain Objective 4.4.2.1 and supporting policies.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.87	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes Objective 4.4.2.2 as it does not align with the MDRS. This Objective places limitations and restrictions on residential developments by requiring development to incorporate “best practice urban design principles”, which are not defined in the Plan The requirement to contribute to an attractive, liveable and functional high density environment is ambiguous and open to interpretation. It is not clear what this objective adds in addition to the policy direction to achieve a ‘well-functioning urban environment, which applies in all residential zones.	Delete Objective 4.4.2.2 or replace with an objective relating to high quality development in line with the MDRS.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.88	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.2 Objectives and Policies: High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	Policies 4.4.2.2a-c appear to be seeking to define high quality development. It is important however that RMA regulation remains focused on managing effects. The policies also do not reflect the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Amend Policies 4.4.2.2a-c as follows: 4.4.2.2a Enable developments that contribute to a <u>high quality well-designed</u> high density environment, including through the use of height, design and scale, visually interesting roof profiles, recesses and projections, fenestration and façade treatments. 4.4.2.2b Require <u>Encourage</u> developments adjoining existing pedestrian and cycling thoroughfares (such as walkways) to connect to and interface with these in a manner that is useable, practical and safe. 4.4.2.2c Require developments to provide for functional and useable on-site amenities, including accessible storage space that meet household requirements.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.89	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, however it opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of retirement villages in the High Density Residential Zone. The submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under a separate rule, recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend Rule 4.4.3.1 to provide for retirement villages as a permitted activity and integrate a new rule that provides for the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity, with a specific set of retirement village matters of discretion (Rule 4.3.7 below). 4.4.3.1 Activity status table Activity I. Retirement Village, <u>excluding the construction of buildings</u> – RD <u>P</u> ... All Activities and Structures <u>Ia. Construction of buildings for a Retirement Village – RD</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association	330.90	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.4 Rules - Notification	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.4 as it prevents retirement village proposals from being processed as publicly notified and limited notified applications where they comply with all relevant standards. The submitter considers that proposals for the construction of retirement villages should also be precluded from being publicly notified in all cases.	The submitter seeks the following amendment to Rule 4.4.4: 4.4.4 Rules – notification Except as set out below, all proposals for consent will be subject to the normal notification tests of the RMA 1991 as set out in Chapter 1.1.9: ... <u>d. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village shall be processed without public notification.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						<u>e. A proposal for the construction of a retirement village that complies with all relevant standards shall be processed without public or limited notification.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.91	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.1 Density because it does not impose a density standard for retirement villages. As set out above, the submitter seeks that retirement villages are provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. No density standard is therefore required to trigger restricted discretionary activity status.	Retain Rule 4.3.4.1 as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.92	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.2 Building Coverage	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.5.2 as it is more lenient than the MDRS consistent with s77H RMA.	Retain Rule 4.4.5.2 as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.93	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.4.5.3 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS. The permeable surfaces and additional landscaping requirements place limitations and restrictions on residential developments which are inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act. The submitter supports Rule 4.4.5.3(b) as it aligns with, but is more enabling than, Clause 18 of the MDRS. The submitter also considers that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.3 as follows: 4.4.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping Landscaped area a. Permeable Surface Standard: Minimum 20% of a site b. A residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> at ground floor level must have a landscape area of a minimum of 10% of the total site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of a tree regardless of the ground treatment below them. c. Urban trees: Each development shall provide trees in an unobstructed area within the site, clear of any required vehicle access and manoeuvring, regardless of the ground treatment below the canopy of the tree, at the rate set out below: i. Terraces and/or Apartments: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 150m2 of site area ii. Other activities: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 200m2 of site area. d. Specimen trees shall be planted as per 4.3.4.3d at a planted size of at least 80L.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.94	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports in part Rule 4.4.5.4 as it aligns with, but is more enabling than, the MDRS and consistent with enabling six storey development as a baseline.	Retain Rule 4.4.5.4 as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement	330.95	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.5.5 and the height in relation to boundary provisions in principle as it reflects the MDRS. However, the submitter consider that additional exclusions should be integrated with this standard to enable larger scale developments to occur where adjacent to less sensitive zones, where the effects of larger buildings will be appropriate.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.5 as follows to include additional exclusions from this standard and align with Regulation 12 of the MDRS: 4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary a. Any buildings must not project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)			to Boundary			ground level along the boundaries adjoining any other zone. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way. This standard does not apply to: i. A boundary with a transport corridor ii. A boundary with Public Open Space Zone iii. A boundary with the Central City Zone iv. A boundary with any Business zones v. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent site or where a common wall is proposed, or <u>vi. A boundary with any Special Character Zones, Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone and Major Facilities Zone</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.96	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Oppose	The submitter supports Rules 4.4.5.6(a) - (d) as they are consistent with the MDRS. The submitter opposes the remaining standards in Rule 4.4.5.6 and seeks their deletion from the Plan, as these do not align with the MDRS and will restrict housing development.	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.4.5.6 as follows to align with Regulation 13 of the MDRS: 4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks Building setback from: a. Transport corridor boundary Minimum distance: 1m, b. Side yard Minimum distance: 1m c. Rear yard Minimum distance: 1m d. Rear yard where it adjoins a rear lane Minimum distance: 0m e. Internal vehicle access serving up to 3 residential units on a site – No part of a building (including eaves) shall extend over or encroach into an internal vehicle access f. Internal vehicle access serving more than 3 residential units on a site Setback of residential units: 1m
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.97	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter oppose Rule 4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls as the MDRS does not address fences and walls.	Delete Rule 4.4.5.7.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.98	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.5.8 to the extent it does not align with the MDRS. In addition, the submitter consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to Rule 4.4.5.8 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.8 as follows to align with the MDRS and to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: 4.4.5.8 Public Interface Residential units facing the street: a. Where a residential unit is facing the street it must have: i. A minimum 20% of the <u>public</u> street-facing façade at ground level in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows or doors. ii. At least one habitable room of the residential unit shall have a clear glazed window facing the transport corridor from which vision toward the transport corridor is not blocked by any accessory building. For corner and through sites this shall be required only on the frontage from which pedestrian access is provided (front door). The submitter seeks that clauses b, c and d of Rule 4.4.5.8 are deleted.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey	330.99	4.4 High Density	4.4.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 4.4.5.9 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the MDRS, however, the submitter considers that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.4.5.9 as follows to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: 4.4.5.9 Outlook space

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)		Residential Zone			directly relevant. The submitter considers amendments should be made to Rule 4.4.5.9 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	a. ... <u>k. For retirement units, clauses a – j apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.100	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Oppose	The submitter acknowledges that Rule 4.4.5.10 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the MDRS. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to Rule 4.4.5.10 that enable the communal areas to count towards the outdoor living space requirement. In addition, the submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.10 is amended to align with Clause 15 of the MDRS.	Amend Rule 4.4.5.10 as follows to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the outdoor living space requirement: 4.4.5.10 Outdoor Living Area per residential unit a. A residential unit at ground floor must have an outdoor living space that is at least 8m2. This may comprise a combination of ground floor, balcony, patio or roof terrace space that: i. ... <u>e. For retirement units, clauses a to c apply with the following modifications:</u> <u>i. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in one or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> <u>ii. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible location(s) in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.101	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Oppose	The MDRS density standards do not address waste management and service areas. Retirement villages should also be excluded from the Rule as they are comprehensively designed to provide adequate waste management areas.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.11 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas a. ... <u>f. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.4.5.11.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.102	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	The MDRS density standards do not address storage areas. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.12 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.4.5.12 Storage Areas a. ... <u>d. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.4.5.12.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.103	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The MDRS do not address landscaping requirements for vehicle parking. These requirements are also not relevant to retirement villages, which have different functional and operational needs.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.13 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking Accessory buildings, vehicle access and vehicle parking for four or more residential units on a site: a. ... <u>g. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.4.5.13(f).</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.104	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.4.5.14 to exclude these requirements for built form for retirement villages. These requirements do not align with the MDRS.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.14 is deleted in its entirety.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.105	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.15 Universal Access	Oppose	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 4.4.5.15 to exclude these requirements for universal access for retirement villages. These requirements do not align with the MDRS and retirement village operators best understand the access requirements of their residents.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.5.15 is deleted in its entirety, or is amended as follows to exclude retirement villages: 4.4.5.15 Universal Access a. ... <u>b. Retirement villages are excluded from the requirements in 4.4.5.15.</u>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.106	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	In accordance with the relief sought below in relation to Rule 4.4.7(f) below, the submitter seeks to exclude retirement villages from assessment matters that apply to residential development, including those set out in Rule 4.4.7 a. Instead, the submitter considers that a specific retirement village set of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of a retirement village, which takes into account the functional and operational needs of a retirement village.	Amend this rule to exclude retirement villages from matters of discretion Rule 4.4.7 a, so only the retirement village specific matters of discretion apply to the construction of a retirement village building.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.107	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.7 is amended which includes the removal of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity and the inclusion of the ‘construction of retirement villages’ as a restricted discretionary activity. The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). The submitter opposes the current matters of discretion as they are broad and not sufficiently focused on the effects of retirement villages which should be regulated in line with the MDRS.	The submitter seeks that Rule 4.4.7(f) is deleted and replaced with the following assessment matters which are focused on relevant matters for the construction of retirement villages: 4.4.7 Restricted Discretionary Activities - Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria <u>For the construction of retirement villages under Rule 4.4.3.1 the Council restricts the exercise of its discretion to:</u> <u>a. The effects arising from exceeding any of the standards: 4.4.5.2 and 4.4.5.4 – 4.4.5.6, and where relevant, 4.4.5.3 and 4.4.5.8 – 4.4.5.10;</u> <u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>d. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>e. When assessing the matters in a – d, consider:</u> <u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>f. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to for the construction of a retirement village.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.108	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Oppose	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones. Accordingly, the submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Business 1 to 7 Zones is required (as also set out in the submission above). In particular, the submitter considers that retirement villages should be enabled in the Sub-regional Centres (Business Zone 3) (6.2.1), Suburban Centre (Business Zone 5) (6.2.2), Neighbourhood Centre (Business Zone 6) (6.2.3) and Commercial Fringe (Business Zone 1) (6.2.7) zones.	<p>The submitter seeks the following objective and policies and included into the provisions that apply to the Sub-regional Centre, Suburban Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Commercial Fringe zones, and that necessary amendments are made to the notified provisions of these zones for consistency:</p> <p>Objective: <u>Ageing population</u> Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</p> <p>Policies: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the Business Zones, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</p> <p><u>Larger sites</u> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Business Zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites. <u>Density standards</u> Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.109	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Support in part	The submitter supports the provision for residential activities in the Sub-regional Centres Zone, noting that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones. The submitter opposes the limitations on residential activity at ground floor level.	Amend Objective 6.2.1 to enable residential activities at ground floor where appropriate.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.110	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Sub-regional Centres	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Sub-regional Centres Zone, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise that retirement villages provide communal spaces. The submitter also opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	<p>Amend Policy 6.2.1f as follows:</p> <p>6.2.1f Upper floor residential development Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit is provided with adequate space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.111	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Support in part	The submitter supports the provision for residential activities in the Suburban Centre Zone, noting that the Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones. The submitter also considers that the limitations on residential activity at ground floor level should only apply to specifically identified locations, such as adjacent to identified pedestrian frontages.	Amend Objective 6.2.2 to enable residential activities at ground floor where appropriate.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.112	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Neighbourhood Centres	Oppose	The submitter opposes the lack of reference to residential activities in the objective.	Amend the objective as follows:

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						A distribution of locally based centres that provide services and health-care services capable of meeting the day-to-day needs of their immediate neighbourhoods <u>and provide for residential activities</u> .
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.113	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Neighbourhood Centres	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Neighbourhood Centres to be encouraged, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise that retirement villages provide communal spaces. The submitter also opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Amend Policy 6.2.3c as follows: 6.2.3c Upper floor - Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit is provided with adequate space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.114	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Suburban Centres	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Suburban Centre Zone, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise that retirement villages provide communal spaces. The submitter also opposes limitations on ground level residential activities.	Amend Policy 6.2.2h as follows: 6.2.2h Upper floor - Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit is provided with adequate space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.115	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Support	The submitter supports the provision for residential activities in the Commercial Fringe Zone.	Retain as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.116	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Oppose	The submitter oppose the deletion of Policy 6.2.7b as residential activity should continue to be encouraged in this zone consistent with Objective 6.2.7.	Retain Policy 6.2.7b.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association	330.117	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial	Support	The submitter supports the provision for a range of activities to be established adjacent to the Hamilton East Suburban Centre.	Retain objective 6.2.8

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)			Fringe Zone			
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.118	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	Out-of-Centre Development – Commercial Fringe Zone	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Commercial Fringe Zone to be encouraged, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise that retirement villages provide communal spaces. The submitter also opposes limitations on ground level residential activities, except where it applies to a specifically identified location, such as an identified pedestrian footpath.	Amend Policy 6.2.8b as follows: 6.2.8b Upper floor – Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit is provided with adequate space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.119	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the exclusion of a retirement village-specific rule within the Sub-regional Centres (Business Zone 3), Suburban Centre (Business Zone 5), Neighbourhood Centre (Business Zone 6) and Commercial Fringe (Business Zone 1) zones. The submitter supports the restricted discretionary activity status that applies to new buildings. The submitter considers that the Business 1, 3, 5 and 6 Zones should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide a substantial benefit including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	The submitter seeks that Rule 6.3 (and the associated Table) is amended to provide for Retirement Villages as a permitted activity in the Business 1, 3, 5, and 6 Zones and construction of Retirement Villages as a restricted discretionary activity in these zones.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.120	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.4.7 Residential Development	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restriction of residential activity on ground floors and considers that a more nuanced method should be applied that only restricts residential at ground floor when adjacent to identified pedestrian street frontages.	Amend rule 6.4.7(b) or amend to only apply this requirement to specifically identified locations.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.121	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p> <p>The submitter considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages that complies with the relevant density standards, should be precluded from being limited notified.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that the following matters of discretion are integrated into the matters of discretion for residential activities in the Business 1, 3, 5 and 6 Zones:</p> <p>6.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Buildings</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>iv. The construction of retirement villages</u></p> <p><u>The matters of discretion for the construction of buildings for a Retirement Village are limited to:</u></p> <p><u>a. The effects arising from any exceedances of the standards in 6.4 and where relevant 6.5.</u></p> <p><u>b. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>c. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u></p> <p><u>d. When assessing the matters in (a) - (c), consider:</u></p> <p><u>i. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites;</u></p> <p><u>ii. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>e. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to construction of a retirement village.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
						<p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 6.3X [the construction of a retirement village] is precluded from being publicly notified.</u></p> <p><u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 6.3X [the construction of a retirement village] that complies with Rule 6.4.1 - 6.4.4 is precluded from being limited notified.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.122	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support	The Enabling Housing Act is not limited to residential zones and councils are required to ensure district plans provide for intensification of urban non-residential zones. Accordingly, the submitter considers policy support for retirement villages in the Central City Zone is required (as also set out in the submission above).	<p>The submitter seeks the following policies, and that other Central City Zone objectives and policies are deleted or amended for consistency:</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <p><u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in the Central City Zone, such as retirement villages.</u></p> <p><u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p><u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p><u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p>Larger sites</p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the Central City Zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p> <p>Density standards</p> <p><u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.123	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports the provision for “Opportunities ... to live... for people of varying ages... and all levels of mobility”.	Retain Policy 7.2.1a
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.124	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports the provision for as much development capacity as possible (to maximise the benefits of intensification) as this aligns with the expectations under the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Act.	Retain Policy 7.2.1g as notified.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.125	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitter supports the provision for diversity in building form and height in the Downtown Precinct to be encouraged. However it opposes reference to “enhancing” public amenity values as new development should not be required to remedy effects of previous development. Further it opposes the reference to “minimising” adverse effects on adjoining sites as this does not recognise that change is anticipated.	<p>Amend Policy 7.2.6g as follows:</p> <p>Diversity in building form and height is encouraged, subject to enhancing and protecting public amenity values and <u>managing</u> minimising adverse effects on adjoining sites and the public realm.</p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement	330.126	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Downtown Precinct to be encouraged, however it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	<p>Amend Policy 7.2.6h as follows:</p> <p>7.2.6h Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential units <u>are</u> is provided with adequate storage space, usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.127	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	City Living Precinct	Support	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the City Living Precinct, however, seeks to amend this policy to provide for “retirement units” to align with the definition sought above, and to delete the requirement to provide storage space to align with the residential standards of the MDRS.	Amend Policy 7.2.7e as follows: 7.2.7e Residential development <u>including retirement village development</u> which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential unit <u>or retirement unit</u> is provided with adequate storage space , usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.128	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Ferrybank Precinct	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for residential development to be close to open spaces, passenger transport, supermarkets and sporting facilities, as it considers locations in the City Centre should be presumed to be located close to amenities.	Delete policy 7.2.8c
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.129	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Ferrybank Precinct	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the City Living Precinct to be encouraged, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 7.2.7e as follows: Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential units <u>are</u> is provided with adequate storage space , usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.130	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Ferrybank Precinct	Oppose	The submitter supports the provision for residential development in the Ferrybank Precinct to be encouraged, however, it opposes the reference to storage space and each unit having outdoor living space as these do not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Amend Policy 7.2.8e as follows: 7.2.8e Residential development which contributes to safe streets is encouraged where each residential units are-is provided with adequate storage space , usable outdoor living areas and access to daylight.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association	330.131	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status	Oppose	The submitter opposes the exclusion of a retirement village-specific rule within the Central City Zone. The submitter supports the restricted discretionary activity status that applies to new buildings. The submitter considers that the City Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit including enabling older	The submitter seeks that Rule 7.3 (and the associated Table) is amended to provide for Retirement Villages as a permitted activity in the Central City Zone and Construction of Retirement Villages as a restricted discretionary activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)					people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.132	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Oppose	The submitter opposes the density requirements (7.5.3(b)) and storage requirements (7.5.3(e)) as they do not recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Exclude retirement villages from 7.5.3(b) and (e).
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.133	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the construction of retirement villages should have focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The submitter considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p> <p>The submitter considers that for resource consent applications for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages should be precluded from being publicly notified; and that for a resource consent application for the construction of or additions / alterations to retirement villages that complies with the relevant density standards, should be precluded from being limited notified.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks that the following matters of discretion are integrated into the matters of discretion for residential activities in the Central City Zone:</p> <p>7.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities – Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Buildings ...</p> <p><u>v. The construction of retirement villages</u> <u>The matters of discretion for the construction of buildings for a Retirement Village are limited to:</u> <u>f. The effects arising from exceeding the standards in 7.4 and where relevant 7.5.</u> <u>g. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>h. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces.</u> <u>i. When assessing the matters in (a) - (c), consider:</u> <u>iii. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites;</u> <u>iv. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>j. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the Retirement Village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to construction of a retirement village.</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 7.3(f) is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 7.3(f) that complies with Rule 7.4.4 and Rule 7.4.6 is precluded from being limited notified</u></p>
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.134	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	24.4.2 Residential Development	Oppose	<p>The submitter is concerned that the Financial Contributions chapter as proposed will result in ‘double dipping’ under dual financial and development contribution regimes. The general purpose set out in 24.2.1 indicates that both regimes cover three water and transport infrastructure and reserves/public open space.</p> <p>The submitter is also concerned that the Financial Contributions chapter does not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or works carried out as part of development which may result in inequitable contributions being derived from retirement village developments.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks amendments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping; - Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and - Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	330.135	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the requirement for all subdivision and development to provide onsite stormwater management measures that retain increased stormwater volumes. The submitter considers this requirement should not apply where there is capacity in the stormwater network.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes the requirement to “improve” water quality of receiving environments. New development should not be required to remedy the effects of historic development.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks an amendment to the objective to delete “development or”.</p> <p>The submitter seeks an amendment to Policy 25.13.2.2a to acknowledge that in some situations, the retention of stormwater on site to manage discharge rates will not be required and to delete “and improve”.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.136	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policies 25.13.2.4a-d as it considers the requirements for existing three waters infrastructure capacity to be available prior to any development occurring is not consistent with the objectives of the Enabling Housing Act. These provisions should encourage the development of infrastructure to enable the development of housing that meet the needs of the community, rather than the lack of infrastructure capacity inhibiting residential development. The submitter does not oppose the requirement to prepare a Water Impact Assessment in relation to a retirement village proposal, but considers an Integrated Catchment Management Plan is not appropriate to require.	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 25.13.2.4 as follows: 25.13.2.4a All subdivision and development <u>is connected to</u> or provides integrated Three Waters infrastructure and services to a level that is appropriate to their location and intended use. 25.13.2.4b Subdivision and development shall not occur unless the required infrastructure is <u>or is planned to be</u> available to service it including necessary local, trunk and strategic networks, <u>prior to the occupation of the site(s)</u> . 25.13.2.4c Three Waters infrastructure is to be designed and constructed in accordance with any existing Structure Plan and relevant Integrated Catchment Management Plan <u>or any documents that replace these plans in whole or in part</u> . 25.13.2.4d Large scale subdivision and development proposals are to prepare an Integrated Catchment Management Plan (where one does not already exist), <u>Large scale development proposals are to prepare</u> or a Water Impact Assessment.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.137	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirements to stage developments over the medium to long term as this will hinder the residential intensification required under the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. These provisions should encourage the development of infrastructure to enable the development of housing that meet the needs of the community, rather than the lack of infrastructure capacity inhibiting residential development.	The RVA seeks to amend Objective 25.13.2.5 as follows: 25.13.2.5 The health and wellbeing of the Waikato River is restored and protected, with urban development and redevelopment: - Being supported by adequate three waters infrastructure that ensures that adverse effects on the River from development and redevelopment of urban areas are avoided; - Contributing toward improving the health and well-being of the Waikato River.; and Where necessary staged over the medium and long terms, taking into account the future planned environment and the City's ability to upgrade and replace relevant infrastructure where there is inadequate infrastructure.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.138	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	The submitter considers that this Plan Change should include enabling provisions that encourage the development of infrastructure to support the housing that is required by the community, rather than imposing barriers to development. In particular, the submitter opposes Policy 25.13.2.5e as the requirement to avoid further intensification will constrain development and is not consistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Delete Policy 25.13.2.5 a-g or amend to encourage the development of the infrastructure necessary to support the housing development required by the community.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.139	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the requirements for financial contributions may result in double dipping, do not recognise the bespoke demand characteristics of retirement villages or works carried out as part of development and may result in inequitable contributions being derived from retirement village developments. This policy also does not recognise the potential for developers to undertake upgrade works.	The submitter seeks amendments to Chapter 24 to: - Ensure the dual financial and development contributions regimes will not result in double dipping; - Ensure the calculation methodology takes into account cost of works undertaken as part of development; and - Provide a retirement village-specific regime for retirement villages that takes into account their substantially lower demand profile compared to standard residential developments.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New	330.140	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter does not oppose the restricted discretionary activity status for activities a – d listed in the Activity Status Table in Rule 25.13.3 as this activity status will align with that for the construction of retirement villages.	Retain rules.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.141	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirements for an Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) to be prepared for developments creating more than 40 residential units (where a ICMP does not exist) as it is not clear how one development can prepare a ICMP. The Infrastructure Capacity Assessment and Water Impact Assessment required under 25.13.4.6 should be sufficient.	Delete Rule 25.13.4.1(b).
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.142	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 25.13.4.2(b) as this requires stormwater neutrality to be achieved in all cases, even where stormwater network capacity is available.	Amend Rule 25.13.4.2(b) to address scenarios where there is capacity in the stormwater network.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.143	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policy 25.14.2.1h because it may result in car parking being required for developments as is therefore inconsistent with the intent of the removal of minimum car parking requirements directed by the NPSUD. The submitter also opposes Policies 25.14.2.1m and n requiring Integrated Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. The submitter considers any requirements applying to retirement villages should reflect their lower transport demand compared to other residential development.	The submitter seeks to amend Policies 25.14.2.1h, m and n to align with the NPSUD removal of car parking minimums and to reflect the transport demand created by retirement villages.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.144	25.14 Transportation	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restricted discretionary activity status of any activity required to prepare a simple or broad Integrated Transport Assessment as most retirement village developments will likely be required to complete an Integrated Transport Assessment by Rule 25.14.4.3 and this will therefore create further restrictions of retirement village developments which does not achieve the purpose of the Enabling Housing Act. The requirement for an Integrate Transport Assessment should be a performance standard that applies to certain identified activities, rather than an ‘activity’.	Delete Rule 25.14.3a or amend to be a performance standard.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	330.145	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and Policies: Transportation	Oppose	The submitter opposes the parking quantity requirements as they are inconsistent with the removal of minimum car parking requirements directed by the NPSUD. The submitter also opposes cycle parking requirements for retirement villages as they do not reflect the reduced activity levels of residents in retirement villages.	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 25.14.4.2 to remove car parking minimums and reflect the functional and operational needs of retirement villages.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d (John Collins)						
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.146	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	The submitter considers the requirement for retirement villages to prepare an integrated transport assessment should be based on peak hour traffic movements, not daily traffic movements, as that is the determinant for transport infrastructure capacity.	Amend Rule 25.14.4.3a to amend the daily traffic movement standard to a peak hour traffic movement standard.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.147	25.14 Transportati on	25.14.4 Rules – General Standar ds	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirements to prepare a Travel Plan for any retirement village over 50 beds/units as this does not recognise the reduced transport demand created by retirement villages compared to other residential activities.	Delete 25.14.4.3a(xxiii).
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.148	25.15 Urban Design	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Chapter 25.15 as a whole as it is inconsistent with the MDRS and does not recognise the specific functional and operational needs of retirement villages.	Delete chapter or exclude retirement villages from its application.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.149	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Urban Design	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers the objectives of the Urban Design chapter do not align with the residential zone chapters or with the provisions set out in the MDRS. These objectives create further limitations and restrictions on development.</p> <p>The requirement to ‘enhance’ amenity values (Objective 25.15.2.1) is contrary to the intention of the NPSUD and Enabling Housing Act. Development should only be required to mitigate its adverse effects, not remedy the effects of past development.</p> <p>Objective 25.15.2.2 seeks that urban environmental promote a positive sense of place that are reflective of the characteristics of the surrounding local environment. The submitter considers that this objective is inconsistent with the NPSUD which requires provisions in District Plan that recognise that the planned urban built form in the zone may involve significant changes to the area, in line with the MDRS, and this may detract from the amenity values of existing residents in a way which is not in itself an adverse effect.</p> <p>The requirement for “well connected” and “legible” development (Objective 25.15.2.4) is unclear.</p>	Delete objectives.
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement	330.150	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectiv es and Policies:	Oppose	The submitter considers the Policies 25.15.2.1a, b and c do not align with the rules within the residential zone chapters nor with the provisions set out in the NPSUD or the MDRS. These policies create further limitations and restrictions on development.	Delete Objectives 25.15.2.1, 25.15.2.2 and 25.15.2.4

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)			Urban Design			
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.151	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Policy 25.15.2.2b as it does not recognise that urban environments will change over time, and therefore encouraging development to respond positively to existing buildings and spaces could be limiting of the intensification of urban areas required by the National Policy Statement for Urban Development and the MDRS.</p> <p>The submitter opposes Policy 25.15.2.2d as it is uncertain and subjective.</p> <p>The submitter opposed Policy 25.15.2e, which requires that the distinctive architectural styles within identified character areas are retained, as this policy will limit development in these areas. If certain buildings require protection, they should be specifically identified, rather than applying a blanket protection over an area.</p>	Delete Policies 25.15.2.1 a - c
Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (John Collins)	330.152	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers these policies conflict with the MDRS provisions in the residential zones. For example, the requirement to “respond positively to any existing local amenity” does not reflect the change that is anticipated in residential zones. Further the requirement to “contribute towards the creation of continuous building frontages” introduces a requirement additional to the MDRS.</p>	Delete Policies 25.15.2.2 a -e
Sharon Edgecombe -North	331.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Objectives and Policies 4.1.2.1 in the Plan Change 12 (PC12) which relates to the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The submitter considers that the provisions for the Claudelands area were based on 15 homes per hectare instead of 55. They believe that housing intensification in Claudelands area will dramatically increase water catchment, regardless of how it is stored in the interim, inevitably will reach into and adversely affect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council refuses to implement Clause 6 of the first schedule of the RMA, specifically to allow the housing intensification proposed in PC12.
Sharon Edgecombe -North	331.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Objectives and Policies 4.2.2.2 in the PC12 as they consider that it will enable more loss of heritage homes and adversely affect the health of residents by potentially blocking sunlight if multi-storey dwellings are to built beside a single storey house. The submitter believes high density development will result in the loss of natural light and privacy of current residents who chose to buy and live in the existing heritage, inner city suburb.</p> <p>The submitter opposes three or more storey development in Claudelands as they consider that this change will have a cost which goes beyond the health and wellbeing of the residents of this suburb and Hamilton and adversely affect the environment into the future.</p>	The submitter seeks that the Council absolutely rejects any proposal which would allow the unconsented three storey and above developments within the city precinct.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>Fonterra considers that further refinement is required in order to ensure that urban development and intensification occurs in a manner that minimises land use conflicts as far as practicable, including avoiding or minimising the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. Reverse sensitivity effects are a key issue for Fonterra across its manufacturing and distribution sites and, in its experience, they can occur regardless of compliance with resource consent conditions or with performance standards in a District or Regional Plan. Fonterra notes that reverse sensitivity effects occur with urban environments, for example when residential and industrial activities are located in close proximity to one another, as is the case with the Te Rapa Dairy Factory, and the Crawford Road Freight Village. The more sensitive activities are allowed to establish in close proximity to existing Fonterra manufacturing and distribution sites, the greater likelihood that these reverse sensitivity effects will arise.</p>	That the provisions of PC12 be amended as per the specific submission points raised by the submitter; and Any alternative relief which achieves the same or similar outcome as set out by the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.2	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support in part	Fonterra supports Objective 4,3,2,4 and its associated policies, however, seeks a reverse sensitivity mitigation policy be included for lawfully established activities.	Add a Policy 4.3.2.4f as follows: "The development ensures reverse sensitivity mitigation measures avoid or minimise effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on lawfully established industrial sites and activities, including dairy manufacturing and associated sites"
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.3	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Te Awa Lakes Residential Precinct	Support	Fonterra supports Objective 4.3.2.4 and the text that seeks development in Te Awa lakes to not result in reverse sensitivity effects on existing and future industrial activities.	Retain the explanation in the section in Objective 4.3.2.4 and its associated policies as notified.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.4	3.8 Te Awa Lakes	3.8.2 Structure Plan Components	Support	The submitter supports acoustic insulation for all visitor accommodation buildings in Section 3.8.2.2 and avoiding or minimising reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain 3.8.2.2 as notified.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.5	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter supports the reference to reverse sensitivity mitigation measures in Policy 23.2.1a(v), however, seeks a broadened scope to include reverse sensitivity concerning lawfully established industrial sites, as provided.	Amend Policy 23.2.1a(v) to include reference to dairy manufacturing and associated sites.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.6	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 23.2.3b, but seeks the inclusion of an additional policy that considers the potential for reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial sites.	Include an additional standard in 23.2.3b that refers to the reduction of potential reverse sensitivity effects on industrial zoned land, as provided.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.7	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports the retention of reference to the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site within Table 23.2b.	Delete the question mark in the in the Column Heading after 'Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site' of Table 23.3b.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.8	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.8 Controlled Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 23.8 Controlled Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria, but seeks reference to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Assessment Criteria G - Subdivision in Volume 2 Appx 1.3 to include reference to reverse sensitivity effects, as provided.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.9	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and	Support	The submitter supports the references to Assessment Criteria C – Character and Amenity within Rule 23.9 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria and reference to reverse sensitivity.	Retain the Assessment Criteria C – Character and Amenity – Reverse Sensitivity in Volume 2 Appx 1.3 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Assessment Criteria			
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.10	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	Fonterra is opposed to the Council's proposed approach to financial contribution. Fonterra is concerned that the provisions as drafted are not limited to residential zoned properties and would require payment of financial contributions for permitted activities in all zones. The submitter considers that it is not clear why the requirement to pay financial contributions has been extended to apply to properties that are not zoned Residential or utilised for residential activities. The submitter believes that the rationale is unclear for using financial contributions to meet the costs of the Te Ture Whaimana actions, when it appears that those actions are a response to all activity in the city, rather than just new activity. The submitter considers it unclear how "Three Waters/transport infrastructure" network costs will differ from growth-related capital expenditure in the Development Contribution policy.	Amend Chapter 24 so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the financial contributions only apply to residential development in residential zoned areas; and the financial contribution regime more appropriately relates to growth related costs
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.11	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports the addition of new Assessment Criteria for ‘Context’ under Section B – Design and Layout in the Assessment Criteria in Section 1.3 and seeks the specific requirement to assess potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend the Assessment Criteria for ‘Context’ in Section B – Design and Layout to include the following additional matter as Item (j): <p>“Context</p> <p>B2 Whether the proposal:</p> <p><u>(j) Has been designed in a manner that considers reverse sensitivity effects on lawfully established industrial sites and activities, including dairy manufacturing and associated sites including the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing site.</u></p>
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.12	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports the retention of the assessment criteria relating to ‘Reverse Sensitivity’ under Section C – Character and Amenity: General in the Assessment Criteria in Section 1.3.	Retain the Assessment Criteria for ‘Reverse Sensitivity in Section C – Character and Amenity as notified.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.13	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports the retention of specific assessment criteria for Te Awa Lakes within Section 1.3.	Retain Assessment Criteria (i) for ‘Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes’ in Section N1 Development Activities as notified.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.14	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary,	Support	The submitter supports the retention of specific assessment criteria for Te Awa Lakes within Section 1.3.	Retain Assessment Criteria (r) for ‘Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes’ in Section N1 Development Activities as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria			
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.15	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the identification of the proposed zones; ‘Open Space Zone – Natural Open Space Zone and Te Rapa North Industrial Zone – Heavy Industry’ for the dairy manufacturing site located at 1344 Te Rapa Road, as well as the identified qualifying matters as applicable to the site.	Retain the zoning for the Dairy Manufacturing Site located at 1344 Te Rapa Road as notified on the online maps for Plan Change 12; and Retain the existing noise contour boundary (and associated rules) for Te Rapa Dairy Factory.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Abbie Fowler	332.16	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the identification of the following ‘Industrial Zone’ and qualifying matters applicable to the site for the freight and distribution facilities located at 110 Crawford Road, as identified on the online planning maps for Plan Change 12.	Retain the zoning for the Fonterra freight and distribution facilities at 110 Crawford Road as notified on the online maps for Plan Change 12.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Oppose	The submitter considers that for all intents and purposes permeability and landscaping area are seeking to manage and control the same effects and Plan Change 12 does not provide a definition of what Landscaped Area is to be taken to be. The notes to Rule 4.2.5.3 advise that “the management of stormwater generated from impermeable surfaces is controlled by Rule 25.13.4.2A”. On this basis permeable surface standards in the Residential Zone do not appear to be for the purpose of stormwater management. The extent and quality of stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces on a site will be managed and controlled by on-site stormwater management requirements in other sections of the district plan. The plan change does not provide reasons as to why qualifying matters are provided to justify the departure from the 20% density standard for landscaped area. Rule 4.2.5.3 goes beyond the density standards required by the Amendment Act and needs to be amended to reflect what the legislation is dictating should occur.	Delete rules 4.2.5.3c, d and e Amend rule 4.2.5.3a as follows: "Minimum 30% <u>20%</u> of a site" That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter considers that the amended rules of 4.3.2.1 and 4.2.5.7d and notes are contradictory and do not relate to the stated purpose of Plan Change 12. The assessed costs of the rules have failed to take into account the need for people to provide for their own safety, security and privacy within their land and the need to contain dogs in a secure area. Boundary treatments should be a private choice with controls only exercised where there is potential to adversely affect neighbouring landowners / occupiers. The current rules do this well and there is no need to change them.	Delete rules 4.2.5.7(a), (b) and (d) Amend rule 4.2.5.7c to delete the word “other” That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Oppose	Rule 4.2.5.9 provides standards for outlook space which are generally consistent with the requirements of the Amendment Act with the exception of Rule 4.2.5.9(j)(c) which seeks to clarify that an outlook space can be “over driveways or footpaths within the site, as long as it is not obstructed by structures such as fences” The corresponding provision in the Amendment Act is “outlook spaces may be over driveways and footpaths within the site or over a public street or other public open space” provided that it is “clear and unobstructed by buildings”. Rule 4.2.5.9(j)(c) either needs to be deleted or amended to reflect the text of the Amendment Act.	Delete rule 4.2.5.9(j) OR amended to read: "To clarify an outlook space can be: (a) above or below another outlook space (in a vertical configuration); (b) Under buildings, such as balconies; and (c) Over driveways or footpaths within the site, <u>or over a public street or other public open space</u> , as long as it is not obstructed by buildings-structures such as fences ." That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	Rule 4.2.5.11d(ii) does not relate to the stated purpose of Plan Change 12. The effect of the rule is to impose unreasonable screening requirements and unnecessary resource consent triggers for permitted development and to introduce a rule into the district plan which contradicts another established rule (25.5.3.1) that is not proposed to be altered. A residential unit will typically have two wheelie bins, a recycling bin and a clothes line. These are small scale items which every unit has and which are expected in a residential setting. They are not offensive and do not generate adverse visual effects which require mitigation.	Amend rule 4.2.5.11d(ii) to read: "Service areas shall be screened so they are not visible from a legal road, ground floor of adjoining residential sites , open space zones and public walkways by vegetation or fencing in accordance with Section 25.5." That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle		Rule 4.2.5.13 seems overly complicated and is confusing. It appears to have been written with one development typology or outcome in mind. In this respect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear what the term “frontage width” is to be taken to mean. Is this the width of the unit itself or its exclusive road frontage? No definition of frontage width is provided by the District Plan or Plan Change 12. 	Rule 4.2.5.13 be re-written to be clearer in the outcomes it is seeking to achieve and to be clear that it only relates to residential units with front building lines that adjoin a road; and be clear that communal on-site parking areas are able to be provided adjacent to a road subject to appropriate landscaping being established.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Access and Vehicle Parking		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What effects are sought to be controlled beyond the development outcomes / effects which are permitted to occur for developments of 1 – 3 units, that are not subject to the same rule set but which could result in similar streetscape outcomes? Is the rule seeking to control effects in relation to the front yard setback, the area forward of the front building line or the exclusive use area of a residential unit as a whole? Is the rule enabling the establishment of communal parking areas forward of the front building line for residential units? What controls apply (if any) to Duplex / terrace housing developments of more than 6 units? Are carports / garages permitted in the frontage of units or not? and do the rules apply to rear residential units that do not have a road aspect? <p>The rule in its current state is unworkable and fraught with interpretation challenges.</p>	That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Support in part	Rule 4.2.5.14 relates to wall lengths that exceed 15m in length. It is not clear what a wall is to be taken to refer to. It is assumed that it is intended to relate to walls of a building (as opposed to retaining walls). If this is correct the rule should be re-written to clarify what it is intended to relate to.	<p>Amend rule 4.2.5.14 to read: "No <u>external walls of a building</u> which is <u>are</u> parallel to or up to an angle of 30 <u>degrees</u> to any external boundary, except the road frontage, shall exceed 15m in length without there being a step in (or out) plan of at least 1.8m depth and 4m in length.</p> <p>That any rules in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone which correspond with the rule addressed in the submission point be similarly addressed.</p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton	333.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that any non-compliance with the development control standards in Chapter 19 represents an additional consent hurdle to be overcome if landowners wish to develop their properties. Section 19 has effectively been amended to read as its own zone. This is despite all properties in the 200 hectares of Historic Heritage Areas across the city have an underlying zoning of General Residential. The provisions contained in the notified version of Plan Change 9, and which currently have legal effect are sufficient to protect the heritage values of the identified areas. Development should be able to occur subject to the consenting regime established under Plan Change 9 (and any subsequent changes resulting from submissions to this Plan Change). If the development controls are to remain then they should be associated with some level of permitted activity within Historic Heritage Areas such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations and additions to an existing dwelling that do not change its front façade on a front, corner or through site within an HHA Ancillary Residential Structures (excluding fences and/or walls provided in (h) and (i) below located forward of the front building line) Alteration and additions to, or demolition of existing detached accessory buildings located behind an existing dwelling on a front, corner or through site within an HHA New buildings on a rear site or located behind an existing dwelling on a front, corner or through site. 	<p>That sub-rules (j) – (s) notified by Plan Change 12 as being introduced into Rule 19.3.2 be deleted.</p> <p>That permitted activities be included into Rule 19.3.2 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alterations and additions to an existing dwelling that do not change its front façade on a front, corner or through site within an HHA Alteration and additions to, or demolition of existing detached accessory buildings located behind an existing dwelling on a front, corner or through site within an HHA New buildings on a rear site or located behind an existing dwelling on a front, corner or through site.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	334.1	General	General		<p>The submitter notes that:</p> <p>Chp 1: No where in plan 12 do we learn HCC and Government is taking climate change seriously - intensified buildings and removal of trees - congested housing cars.</p> <p>Chp 2: HCC protection of our environment is myopic.</p> <p>Chp 3: Biased decimation of established leafy suburbs.</p> <p>Chp 4: Developer handouts. We have many houses for sale. Those in emergency housing don't have money for town houses. They need state housing. Cheap rent.</p> <p>Chp 5: I have been a public transport user all my life. It has never been so bad. No drivers. No timetables.</p> <p>Chp 6: HCC has not got the message on climate change/global warming. Planting saplings on gullies does not suffice while urban trees are removed whole sale. Every tree is important. My</p>	The submitter seeks an outcome that is most important for a healthy future of Hamilton and its people. Not a ghetto of surplus prefab and a concrete maze. Global warming and its consequent disasters are real - nature needs respect not destroying. Every tree needs protecting - more natural resources - less cars and suffocation.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<p>submission is that HCC priorities, what moving forward is redeemable by - a green healthy land.</p> <p>RECYCLING, RE-USING, is an onus that falls equally on HCC and Government.</p> <p>Good reusable building materials from demolition and building sites is wastefully thrown in land fill.</p> <p>EQUALLY uprooted shrubs, small trees and plants from parks and new building sites that have been bowled for development are wastefully discarded when many ratepayers would recycle them in Gardens.</p> <p>While HCC embraces new businesses the struggling sector is being neglected - people who cannot afford going to theatres or restaurants yet they have to come up with their rates also these are HCC constituents that buy everything 2nd hand and salvage what is needed.</p> <p>This is the part of Hamilton community that HCC overrides in its decisions.</p>	
Shubhangi Nitinchandra Parulekar	335.1	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Oppose	Objective 4.2.2.2b is opposed as it adds adverse effects in relation to parking on the road and development without a resource consent or notification of the neighbour will have adverse effects relating to privacy and property value.	HCC should not allow rampant development without notification and resource consent requirement to build up to 3 storey houses/apartments, even if it is a central govt. directive. These policies are rushed and will have severe adverse effects on the city's character, aesthetic values of neighbourhoods in long term, unless HCC and WRC together come up with barriers to such ad-hoc developments to go ahead.
Shubhangi Nitinchandra Parulekar	335.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Oppose	Rule 4.2.3.1c is opposed as emergency housing up to 10 residents can not be developed unless there is a notification to the neighbours.	HCC should not allow rampant development without notification and resource consent requirement to build up to 3 storey houses/apartments, even if it is a central govt. directive. These policies are rushed and will have severe adverse effects on the city's character, aesthetic values of neighbourhoods in long term, unless HCC and WRC together come up with barriers to such ad-hoc developments to go ahead.
Shubhangi Nitinchandra Parulekar	335.3	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Oppose	Rule 4.2.3.1f is opposed - as it adds adverse effects in relation to parking on the road and development without a resource consent or notification of the neighbour will have adverse effects relating to privacy and property value.	HCC should not allow rampant development without notification and resource consent requirement to build up to 3 storey houses/apartments, even if it is a central govt. directive. These policies are rushed and will have severe adverse effects on the city's character, aesthetic values of neighbourhoods in long term, unless HCC and WRC together come up with barriers to such ad-hoc developments to go ahead.
Shubhangi Nitinchandra Parulekar	335.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Oppose	Rule 4.2.4 is opposed as it adds adverse effects in relation to parking on the road and development without a resource consent or notification of the neighbour will have adverse effects relating to privacy and property value.	HCC should not allow rampant development without notification and resource consent requirement to build up to 3 storey houses/apartments, even if it is a central govt. directive. These policies are rushed and will have severe adverse effects on the city's character, aesthetic values of neighbourhoods in long term, unless HCC and WRC together come up with barriers to such ad-hoc developments to go ahead.
Darcy Watson	336.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter objects to what Central Government is wanting Local Government to do. The submitter does not want more than 2-storey dwellings per section in the suburbs. The submitter has concern for infrastructure, water, parking availability and amenities, considering what Central Government wants will add all aspects of pollution such as visual, air and noise. The submitter seeks protection of our natural environment along with the suburbs already established.	Say 'NO' to Central Government.
Anne Barnett-Bell	337.1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that it is not appropriate that their property and those surrounding are located within the High Density Residential Zone as this is inconsistent with the Historic Heritage Area proposed as part of PC9. It would be more appropriate to include the site and surrounds within the General Residential Zone as development provided for on the adjoining sites is more consistent with the outcomes sought for the Historic Heritage Area.	<p>That 3 Anglesea Street and surrounding properties be located within the General Residential Zone or alternative relief to give effect to this submission and points raised in submission to Plan Change 9 [refer to Appendix 2 of the submission).</p> <p>High Density Housing be allocated to the Inner City, Frankton the Industrial Are and The Base only, and not within the residential areas of Hamilton.</p>
Rowena Kaleopa	338.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter understands that central government is expecting local government to implement high density housing without giving enough data on how to do this. Also, infrastructure s not sufficient to just go and build 3-storey or more buildings when infrastructure which probably needs to be replaced, is no where near enough.	Please send back to central goverment what they have given you - limited data on which to operate.
Jan Whaley	339.1	General	General		The submitter is concerned with the number of mini-houses that are being consented on a short narrow road.	<p>Seeks that applications for subdivisions are considered on a case by case basis to ensure mini-homes are spread out among existing homes to not create parking problems.</p> <p>Also seeks that three storey homes should not be able to shade existing properties and applications should be on a case by case basis.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
John Warwick Kellaway	340.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>Opposed to three storey residential dwellings throughout Hamilton with very limited community control or design control including privacy, daylight, sun and building close to boundaries.</p> <p>Although the rules have been made by government, we should not accept poor quality environments.</p> <p>Existing communities are destroyed when there is the scale of development proposed.</p> <p>Concerned about issues of parking on street, increased rubbish and danger entering roads as well as piling, as is already being experienced in Maeroa.</p> <p>Infill housing in heritage areas would completely destroy the visual appearance of the houses and reduce their heritage value.</p> <p>Not all elderly want to live in apartments.</p> <p>The removal of trees is not good for the environment or global warming/climate change.</p> <p>Those affected by the housing shortage will not be able to afford these apartments unless the quality and cost is greatly reduced.</p> <p>Land in/near inner commercial and industrial areas could take higher levels of housing.</p> <p>Displacement of communities has in the past just created more issues.</p> <p>Council will need to provide good quality, landscaped on street parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council to oppose the proposed government three storey developments across our city until there are much stronger controls over privacy, providing healthy environments, allowing sun, and good quality design, as a collective environment. • Oppose the Medium Density Zone over Maeroa and Forest Lake proceeding, which is already underway with existing rules, until a Neighbourhood Urban Community Plan is in place, that has involved community consultation, and stronger rules that include the existing community and keep what makes places like Maeroa have a sense of place and able to be called home. • A Master plan that respects the existing suburbs and is not based on clearance, demolition and poor quality infill buildings that contribute to the neighbour, not just extra buildings. • A Master Plan that includes mixed use [residential and other zone use], and places high density housing in areas that can accept a large scale development, not clear existing communities- as has happened in Hamilton East. • Rules and Regulations for Urban Design which include retaining, maintaining, and enhancing, exisang neighbourhood character and planangs. Much improved design rules that address the residential zones and control over the scale and degree of change by assessing rues for cumulative change • Large scale developments that are well designed on non residential zones that are able to take Residential Block developments. These are not identified in the current proposal except in the commercial central city. • Better rules to protect the living environment of inner business area apartments in terms of sun, privacy, accessible units and sites, and planning. • A higher percentage of accessible homes in all residential zones and new developments. Including Apartments. • Additional support for developers to retain existing trees and plantings that are in turn protected, including placing on Notable Trees schedule, such as the Rimu in Maeroa Road. • Support is given to protecting our waterways and native vegetation. • A delay in the plan change until there has been better consultation with the communities, that are currently under clearance, not under managed community plans.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter notes that PC12 process does not appear to include an analysis of housing availability/supply and capacity allowed by the current planning rules to determine Hamilton’s shortfall in housing capacity. In Hamilton greenfield areas combined with infill housing policies have been designed to meet the growth projections in the WRPS for decades to come.	Council should firstly properly identify the existing housing stock and supply (including vacant properties and greenfield areas open to development) and then prepare a sequential growth plan for infill areas that enable on time servicing. Such infill master plans should be fully costed and then appropriated charged against the anticipated maximum take up of development opportunity.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Support in part	There are a lot of 'additional' standards that will likely trip up developments (which will then need to get a Resource Consent) and/or are difficult and costly to administer. Rules around Public Interface, fencing, accessory buildings, vehicle access, parking, storage areas, waste management areas, service areas, outdoor living areas, and outlook space areas, are all well meaning but not overly well thought out and will often trigger compliance issues and or be impractical requiring a Resource Consent.	No specific relief sought in relation to residential development standards.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	<p>The proposed changes provide a huge challenge regarding the level of infrastructure re provisioning in the infill areas. In the infill area the challenge is to what level replacement infrastructure is required (to cater for how much development?).</p> <p>An 'adequate' level of infrastructure might exist in an infill area for 'some' development - but then subsequently there will be a shortfall. In my view this all points to the need for a infill structure plan or structure plans providing for sequential development in infill areas as and when infrastructure upgrades have taken place (inclusive of Parks/amenity spaces, pedestrian networks as well as the normal 3 waters and roads infrastructure).</p>	Council should firstly properly identify the existing housing stock and supply (including vacant properties and greenfield areas open to development) and then prepare a sequential growth plan for infill areas that enable on time servicing. Such infill master plans should be fully costed and then appropriated charged against the anticipated maximum take up of development opportunity.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.4	General	General	Oppose	Building up is more expensive per m2 than building out.	Council should firstly properly identify the existing housing stock and supply (including vacant properties and greenfield areas open to development) and then prepare a sequential growth plan for infill areas that enable on time servicing. Such infill master plans should be fully costed and then appropriated charged against the anticipated maximum take up of development opportunity.
Planman Consultants	341.5	Chapter 24 Financial	General	Oppose	The submitter questions the cost to the community of the infrastructural upgrades required, and considers that the financial contribution modelling of PC12 (including development contributions	Council should firstly properly identify the existing housing stock and supply (including vacant properties and greenfield areas open to development) and then prepare a sequential growth plan for infill areas that enable on

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Limited - John Manning		Contributions			<p>and levies) is unclear as to how full development capacity will be provided for. The submitter expresses concerns that a shortfall in funding resulting from low uptake by developers may need to be picked up by ratepayers.</p> <p>The submitter opposes Rule 24.4 and the associated Appendix 18, considering that they are overly complicated, and employ meaningless 10 year projections with no merit in relation to asset replacement and maintenance.</p>	time servicing. Such infill master plans should be fully costed and then appropriated charged against the anticipated maximum take up of development opportunity.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter comments on the absence of any master planning for sequential infrastructure provision in residential infill areas, despite the recognition for such staging and sequential growth highlighted in Policy 4.1.2.2b. This will lead to uncohesive 'ad hoc' development across Hamilton.	Council should firstly properly identify the existing housing stock and supply (including vacant properties and greenfield areas open to development) and then prepare a sequential growth plan for infill areas that enable on time servicing. Such infill master plans should be fully costed and then appropriated charged against the anticipated maximum take up of development opportunity.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	341.7	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The Planning Maps do not seem to align with Policy 4.1.2.3a which seeks application of the Medium Density Residential Standards across all relevant residential zones except where particular circumstances apply. The MDRS zone appears to have been applied to land zoned Residential Intensification Density in the ODP.	No specific relief sought on planning maps
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The Submitter supports Objective 2.2.14 and policies 2.2.14a - d, as they promote intensification which will lead to a more sustainable urban environment.	No specific relief, the submitter supports Objective 2.2.14 and policies 2.2.14a - d
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The Submitter supports objective 4.1.2.3 and policies 4.1.2.3a-d as they promote development that meets the needs of the [local] community and acknowledges that diverging from the permitted activity standards is acceptable provided it [results] in good quality development.	No specific relief sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes this objective and policy set to [missing text] extent that it restricts the built form and scale of [missing text] development that could occur within HHAs. We seek t[missing text] changes below to allow more flexibility in new develo[missing text] in HHAs. The change proposed provides sufficient pro[missing text] for HHAs by still requiring new development to maint[missing text] heritage values but whilst also allowing for different f[missing text] and scale in some circumstances.</p> <p><i>4.1.2.8a</i> <i>Non-residential activities shall only be established wit[missing text] identified historic heritage area when the activity mai[missing text] the heritage values of the area through built form[missing text]</i></p>	<p>The Submitter opposes this objective and policy set to [missing text] extent that it restricts the built form and scale of [missing text] development that could occur within HHAs. We seek t[missing text] changes below to allow more flexibility in new develo[missing text] in HHAs. The change proposed provides sufficient pro[missing text] for HHAs by still requiring new development to maint[missing text] heritage values but whilst also allowing for different f[missing text] and scale in some circumstances.</p> <p><i>4.1.2.8a</i> <i>Non-residential activities shall only be established wit[missing text] identified historic heritage area when the activity mai[missing text] the heritage values of the area through built form[missing text]</i></p>
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.4	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The Submitter supports objective 4.2.2.1 and policy 4.2.2.1 a - d.	No specific relief sought. The Submitter supports objective 4.2.2.1 and policy 4.2.2.1 a - d.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.5	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies: General Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports objective 4.2.2.2 and policy 4.2.2.2a - c	No specific relief sought, the submitter supports objective 4.2.2.2 and policy 4.2.2.2a - c
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.6	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports provision for 3 residential units to be established as a Permitted activity.	No specific relief sought, the submitter supports provision for 3 residential units to be established as a Permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.7	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support	The submitter supports provision for 4 or more residential units to be established as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	No specific relief sought, the submitter supports provision for 4 or more residential units to be established as a Restricted Discretionary activity.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.8	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification		The submitter supports the introduction of <i>4.2.4 Rules - Notification</i>	No specific relief sought. The submitter supports the introduction of <i>4.2.4 Rules - Notification</i> .
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.9	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.1 Density	Support	The submitter supports the removal of minimum density provisions.	No specific relief sought.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage		The Submitter supports the increase in maximum building coverage	No specific relief sought.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.4 Building Height	Support	The submitter supports objective <i>4.2.5.4</i>	No specific relief sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.12	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	The submitter supports the changes to the height in relation to boundary standards as they allow for more flexibility with building design and more efficient use of land.	No specific relief sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.13	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks		The submitter supports the changes to the setback [missing text] as they allow for more flexibility in building design and potentially more efficient use of land.	No specific relief sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.14	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support	The Submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.9 as it is not overly restrictive but still requires an outlook space to be provided for all windows.	No specific relief sought.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support	The submitter supports Rule <i>4.2.5.10</i> .	No specific relief sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.16	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	The Submitter supports Rule 4.2.5.11 the service area standards for [missing text] residential units, as the standards acknowledge that [missing text] area is not necessary for most households or apartment buildings. The new rules provide flexibility for development to provide service areas and waste management facilities [missing text] way that suits the proposed development.	No specific relief sought.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.17	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The Submitter opposes standard d to the extent that [missing text] cannot be provided at the street frontage on sites wit[missing text] small frontage. For many smaller sites a rear access fo[missing text] parking is not possible, and developers should be able to provide parking for each unit if they wish. Other rules [missing text] the portion of windows facing the street (i.e., public [missing text] interface) and this should dictate whether a garage is to be provided. We seek point d be removed.	The submitter seeks point <i>d</i> be removed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.18	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The Submitter supports subdivision being a Controlled [missing text] activity where they are accompanied by a land use cor[missing text] or over an existing appropriately designed building. Th[missing text] appropriateness of such subdivision is determined by- appropriateness of the underlying or proposed buildin [missing text] more restrictive activity status is not necessary.	No specific relief sought.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.19	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	The Submitter supports the reduction in minimum lot [missing text] the general residential zone down to 300m2. The Submitter opposes the HHA minimum lot sizes. Th[missing text] General Residential lots sizes should be retained in this instance. The character of the area is considered to be dictated by the dwellings present rather than the size [missing text] In particular, rear lot sizes will have no influence on [missing text] character, as they will not be visible from the street. [missing text] are already sufficient controls in the Heritage Chapter [missinggg text] dictate how buildings look to maintain this character. Seek that (r) be removed.	Seek that (r) be removed.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.20	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	Oppose provision for rainwater tanks to be provide fo[missing text] new residential unit? One for every unit including a [missing text] bathroom or kitchen seems excessive. One per site m[missing text] better or having it dictated by the floor area of dwelling [missing text] site?	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.21	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	Support provision for travel plans but only where ther[missing text] be a decent increase in vehicle or people movements. [missing text] now, the rule is overly restrictive and likely unnecessary [missing text] so many activities like single dwellings being constructed [missing text] vacant land or basic renovations. Should be kept to w[missing text] or more units are created or where vehicle movemen[missing text] increasing by 30+ movements per day.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	342.22	Planning Maps	General	Support	The Submitter supports the removal of the Special Character Zones from the District Plan.	No specific relief sought; the submitter supports the removal of the Special Character Zones from the District Plan.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.1	General	General		The submitter does not consider the mortified plan the Council has not gone far enough in enabling housing supply and intensification, has not identified all the available opportunities for intensification, has created provisions that are too restrictive and in doing so has actually decreased real world opportunities for intensification and the supply of housing compared with the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS. The submitter considers proposed methods that represent a fine grain micro management of design and development, unnecessary to achieve the purpose of the NPS-UD.	Amend the plan as per those additional reasons set out in Table 1 of their submission; and Make any consequential amendments to give full effect to submission points in Table 1.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.2	4.2 General Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that there has been a considerable missed opportunity in rezoning land in proximity to existing and planned employment hubs, along major roading networks (and in proximity to public transport) and that the sites should be rezoned as Medium Density Residential to give effect to the NPS and RMAA. The submitter has interests in the sites are located at the intersection of Ruakura and Peachgrove Roads, which are major public transport routes and arterial roads. In addition, the sites have a public transport existing bus stop directly on the Ruakura Road boundary. The submitter notes community facilities and amenities in proximity to the submitter's site, and that the submitter's landholdings are within an area identified within the Hamilton-Waikato Metro spatial plans a high growth / economic corridor. The submitter considers PC12 has failed to acknowledge the significant investment and planned growth on the eastern frame of the city with the Proposed Ruakura Inland port and the effect this growth will have on shifting the axis of industrial and economic activity within the city.	Rezone all walkable catchments of centres and arterial roads at least Medium Density Residential; and Amend the zoning of the subject sites to at least Medium Density Residential and provide for a height variation overlay which enables 6 storeys.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.3	25.13 Three Waters	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that it is not suitable to delay further residential development capacity and/or restrict existing opportunity for development with a blanket restriction such as the Infrastructure Constraints Overlay where there are known engineering solutions to capacity. The submitter believes that should not be used to prioritise areas which have no desire to develop over those that do and which can contribute towards growth.	Delete the Infrastructure Constraints Overlay.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground	343.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter has significant concerns regarding the explanatory text including a definition of “residential amenity”, and further explanation including ambiguous references to “good access” and “functional living spaces both internally and externally”. The submitter is also concerned at the linkage made between a safe environment and internal and external living spaces, as these are	Delete the explanatory text or otherwise the explanatory text should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter; and Delete all provisions in PC12 which do not give effect to the NPS-UD and Enabling Housing Act because they will restrict rather than enabling housing in appropriate locations.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d Limited - Tristan Jones					considered unrelated matters, and in the inclusion of definitions in the explanatory text. The submitter is concerned that the introduction of these matters is designed to undermine real world intensification opportunities through the guide of residential amenity.	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.5	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter has several concerns in relation to the matters raised in the detail of Objective 4.1.2.2 and Policies 4.1.2.2[a]-f. These include concern that said policies should not foreclose on the ability to provide for interim solutions to infrastructure to enable housing supply, the preference to public infrastructure is inconsistent with other PC12 requirements, structure plan staging should be in general accordance, that it is inappropriate for the policies to determine that compliance with the structure plan would achieve the use of land and infrastructure “efficiently” as they are indicative only, and reference to the achievement of densities should be replaced with “aim to achieve”.	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter above.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.6	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the text as notified subject to consistency with relief sought elsewhere in this submission. Policy 4.2.1.c [4.1.2.3c] is not considered appropriate – it is outside of the RMA to require dwelling to provide “the day to day needs” of people. This policy should be deleted.	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter; Delete Policy 4.2.1.c.[4.1.2.3c]
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.7	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter considers the following; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 4.1.2.4a should be clearer as to what effects of non-residential activities need to be managed (e. noise etc) • Policy 4.1.2.4 c and d, should have the limitation on serving only the “local” community deleted – this phrase “local “ is undefined and will be problematic in implementation. In addition this may be appropriate only for local cafes/diaries etc, but is too limiting for other non-residential activities. • Policy 4.1.2.4e should be deleted as visitor accommodation is needed throughout the city – not just in identified precincts. 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.8	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter supports the encouragement of sustainable features, including provision for electric charging etc, however does not support this being a requirement of development.	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.9	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The submitter seeks consistency with relief sought elsewhere in this submission. Specific concerns include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to access private areas by “invitation” only – this is not relevant and could be utilised to dictate “gated” rear lanes. • references to matters which are outside of the RMA (e.g internal living areas) • as well as habitable rooms fronting the streetscape inclusion of specific reference to “kitchen”. • References to sunlight and daylight are too broad and could be misinterpreted to be applicable to the whole dwelling • Requiring onsite manoeuvring does not align with the other policies regarding minimising effects of parking/garaging and has no related method • Reference to limiting the number of vehicle crossings should be deleted – this is managed by Chapter 25. • Service and storage areas should be deleted • Deletion of references to retention of existing vegetation – Chapter 25 enables general vegetation to be removed as a permitted activity. • While overlooking between properties should be managed – this is done via the outlook rule and should not be further managed by policies seeking to avoid overlooking. 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground	343.10	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectives and Policies:	Oppose	The submitter opposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any reference to development in adhering to a “masterplanning” approach. This is not a statutory RMA tool and should not be required by stealth via policies. • Any reference to universal access- this is not a relevant RMA matter. 	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d Limited - Tristan Jones			General Resident ial Zone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to consistent with Structure Plans, including any staging identified in structure plans, should be “in general accordance”. 	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 11	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.2 Objectiv es and Policies: General Resident ial Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter generally supports the identification of medium density having effects on existing neighbours etc, and planned character.</p> <p>The submitter has concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy expectations that effect of development can be “offset” rather than “mitigated”. A lack of reference to terraces and apartment type buildings (only attached and detached) High density should also be encouraged close to existing and planned employment areas and major transport routes. 	No specific relief sought.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 12	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.1 Purpose	Oppose	As identified previously, the submitters landholdings should be identified as MDRZ and identified within the purpose.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 13	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Medium Density Resident ial Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes any reference to development adhering to a “masterplanning” approach. This is not a statutory RMA tool or required by stealth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to structure plans and staging should be “in general accordance” Infrastructure staging etc should allow for and foreclose on interim solutions Provision for universal access. This is not an RMA matter to be addressed via a district plan. Encouragement of pairing of vehicle crossings – this works for terraces and duplex dwellings only and is problematic for vacant lot designs. Effects of car parking on streetscape undermines the permitted activity criteria which allow for this (whereas the policy requires this to be avoided” 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 14	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.2 Objectiv es and Policies: Medium Density Resident ial Zone	Support in part	<p>The submitter generally supports the identification of medium density having effects on existing neighbours and planned character including terraces and apartments.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the narrow scope of policy 4.3.2.2.c and considers that higher densities should be encouraged close to employment areas and along major transport routes.</p> <p>The submitter also has concerns that the Policy expectations are that effect of development can be “offset” rather than “mitigated”.</p>	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 15	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.3.1 Activity status table	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the activity statuses listed for the GRZ and MDRZ subject to the relief sought on specific activities.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 16	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the activity statuses listed for the GRZ and MDRZ subject to the relief sought on specific activities.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 17	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.1 Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the higher activity status for new visitor accommodation (DA) activities compared to the GBZ [GRZ] which is listed as RDA. The submitter operates an accommodation business/campground on the Hamilton Campground and adjoining sites and the submitter opposes any rule/ provision (or other method) that would have the effect of changing or altering the submitter's ability to continue that business activity in the interim until the site is intensified.	Amend and/or delete the provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.18	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.4 Rules – notification	Support in part	The submitter considers that the provisions on limited and public notification is confusing and may create an expectation that infringement over 25% are likely to be publicly notified. These should be deleted and replaced with those required by the MDRS.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.19	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.3.2 Rules – Notification	Support in part	The submitter considers that the provisions on limited and public notification is confusing and may create an expectation that infringement over 25% are likely to be publicly notified. These should be deleted and replaced with those required by the MDRS.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.20	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.2 Building Coverage	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS 50%. The submitter opposes the 40% applied to all other development – there is no reason to unduly restrict non-residential activities when the permitted baseline is 50%.	Amend rule to allow all site coverage to 50%
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.21	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.2 Building Coverage	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS 50%. The submitter opposes the 40% applied to all other development – there is no reason to unduly restrict non-residential activities when the permitted baseline is 50%.	Amend rule to allow all site coverage to 50%
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.22	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.3 Permeability and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS 20% in grass and trees. The submitter opposes the limit on permeable surfaces to 30%. Only allowing for a total of 60% impervious is considered to result in poor onsite amenity and outcomes. In addition, the standards for onsite parking pads are considered to conflict with the front yard landscape provisions. The submitter is also concerned with the per tree rate and size to be planted per unit particularly given the loss to useable land once the trees have matured amongst other concerns with ongoing maintenance issues.	Amend rule for permeable surfaces to be 20% and/OR amend the definition of permeable to allow driveways/parking pads and narrow footpaths. Delete front yard landscape percentages where parking pads are required. Delete urban tree provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.23	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS 20% in grass and trees. The submitter opposes the limit on permeable surfaces to 30%. Only allowing for a total of 60% impervious is considered to result in poor onsite amenity and outcomes. In addition, the standards for onsite parking pads are considered to conflict with the front yard landscape provisions. The submitter is also concerned with the per tree rate and size to be planted per unit particularly given the loss to useable land once the trees have matured and other concerns with ongoing maintenance issues.	Amend rule for permeable surfaces to be 20% and/OR amend the definition of permeable to allow driveways/parking pads and narrow footpaths. Delete front yard landscape percentages where parking pads are required. Delete urban tree provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.24	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS setbacks, and generally supports the exclusions/allowance for small buildings like garden sheds to infringe the yard setbacks. The submitter opposes any requirement for a 2m side yard where the opposite side has been made 0m. The submitter also opposes the phrasing of “neighbours consent is obtained” – this is not clear that it only relates to the neighbour adjoining the 0m boundary.	Delete requirement for 2m side yard on the opposite side to a 0m yard. Re-phrase the requirement for neighbour consent for the 0m side yard.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited -	343.25	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.6 Building Setbacks	Support in part	The submitter supports the MDRS setbacks, and generally supports the exclusions/allowance for small buildings like garden sheds to infringe the yard setbacks. The submitter opposes any requirement for a 2m side yard where the opposite side has been made 0m.	Delete requirement for 2m side yard on the opposite side to a 0m yard. Re-phrase the requirement for neighbour consent for the 0m side yard.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Tristan Jones					The submitter also opposes the phrasing of “neighbours consent is obtained” – this is not clear that it only relates to the neighbour adjoining the 0m boundary.	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.26	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule. The submitter opposes the deletion of the provision for a fence where a north facing open space is located forward of the building line.	The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule. The submitter opposes the deletion of the provision for a fence where a north facing open space is located forward of the building line.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.27	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.7 Boundary Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule. The submitter opposes the deletion of the provision for a fence where a north facing open space is located forward of the building line.	The submitter generally supports the approach to combined retaining walls fences for front yards in 4.3.4.7(d), however would support simplification of the rule. The submitter opposes the deletion of the provision for a fence where a north facing open space is located forward of the building line.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.28	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.8 Public Interface	Oppose	Clauses c-e are opposed insofar as they should only related to development which adjoins a transport corridor boundary and should not only apply to apartment applications the provisions are not appropriate to apply to integrated land use applications for multiple duplex dwellings, or detached dwelling.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.29	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.8 Public Interface	Oppose	Clauses c-e are opposed insofar as they should only related to development which adjoins a transport corridor boundary and should not only apply to apartment applications the provisions are not appropriate to apply to integrated land use applications for multiple duplex dwellings, or detached dwelling.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.30	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter considered that an exemption should be made for support structures associated with above ground balconies. In addition, in relation to outlook space clauses 4.2.5.9(a)(v) the submitter opposes the requirement for the space to be located accessible to a “principle living room”. Outdoor living should be accessible from any living/dining/kitchen area.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.31	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.10 Outdoor Living Area		The submitter considered that an exemption should be made for support structures associated with above ground balconies etc.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.32	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.9 Outlook Space	Support in part	The submitter considered that an exemption should be made for support structures associated with above ground balconies etc.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground	343.33	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.10 Outdoor Living Area	Support in part	The submitter considered that an exemption should be made for support structures associated with above ground balconies etc. In addition, in relation to outlook space clauses 4.3.4.10(a)(v) the submitter opposes the	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
d Limited - Tristan Jones					requirement for the space to be located accessible to a “principle living room”. Outdoor living shod be accessible from any living/dining/kitchen area.	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 34	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.11 Waste Manage ment and Service Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 35	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 36	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 37	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.15 Universa l Access	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 38	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.12 Storage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 39	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.14 Built Form	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campgroun d Limited - Tristan Jones	343. 40	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.15 Universa l Access	Oppose	The submitter opposes all provisions which are not MDRS density provisions restricting urban development or limiting developable areas due to rubbish collection/storage, clothes drying, storage spaces, limits on building lengths and requirements for universal access. This includes any information requirement/management plan associated with giving effect to these provisions.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton	343. 41	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.13 Accessor y	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictive, perspective and detailed provisions limiting garages and car parking areas, and is concerned at the ability to comply with these detailed provisions with the landscape and permeable standards.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Campground Limited - Tristan Jones			Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking			
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.42	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.13 Accessory Buildings, Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictive, perspective and detailed provisions limiting garages and car parking areas, and is concerned at the ability to comply with these detailed provisions with the landscape and permeable standards.	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.43	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.3 Dairies	Oppose	The requirement for a dairy to be on a corner or through site is considered by the submitter to be “out of date and pertains to encouraging accessibility for cars. In a walkable neighbourhood and where micro mobility uses are enabled, there is no reason to still only require the traditional corner style sites.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.44	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.3 Dairies	Oppose	The requirement for a dairy to be on a corner or through site is considered by the submitter to be “out of date and pertains to encouraging accessibility for cars. In a walkable neighbourhood and where micro mobility uses are enabled, there is no reason to still only require the traditional corner style sites.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.45	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.5.1 Density	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes all restrictions for managed care facilities. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density. There is no such limit on dwelling which may contain multiple bedrooms, and there is no reason to require these activities to have a greater land requirement than a dwelling. • The outdoor living areas for managed care facilities are impractical as they are based on a per resident basis, rather than a per “room” basis • Service area requirements. When compared to the GRZ or MDRZ zones there is no reason for these areas to be as large as the notified version proposes. • Requirements for a waste container management plan. 	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.46	4.2 General Residential Zone	4.2.6.5 Managed Care Facilities	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes all restrictions for managed care facilities. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density provisions. There is no such limit on dwelling which may contain multiple bedrooms, and there is no reason to require these activities to have a greater land requirement than a dwelling. • the outdoor living areas for managed care facilities. They are impractical as they are based on a per resident basis, rather than a per “room” basis, and when compared to the MDRS standards for only a 20m living court, having 12m2 per resident is excessive. • service area requirements. When compared to the GRZ or MDRZ zones there is no reason for these areas to be as large as the notified version proposes. 	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for a waste container management plan. 	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.47	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.4.1 Density	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes all restrictions for managed care facilities. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density provisions. There is no such limit on dwelling which may contain multiple bedrooms, and there is no reason to require these activities to have a greater land requirement than a dwelling. the outdoor living areas for managed care facilities. They are impractical as they are based on a per resident basis, rather than a per “room” basis, and when compared to the MDRS standards for only a 20m living court, having 12m2 per resident is excessive. service area requirements. When compared to the GRZ or MDRZ zones there is no reason for these areas to be as large as the notified version proposes. Requirements for a waste container management plan. 	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.48	4.3 Medium Density Residential Zone	4.3.5.5 Managed Care Facilities (Except in the Ruakura and Rotokauri North Residential Precincts)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes all restrictions for managed care facilities. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed density provisions. There is no such limit on dwelling which may contain multiple bedrooms, and there is no reason to require these activities to have a greater land requirement than a dwelling. the outdoor living areas for managed care facilities. They are impractical as they are based on a per resident basis, rather than a per “room” basis, and when compared to the MDRS standards for only a 20m living court, having 12m2 per resident is excessive. service area requirements. When compared to the GRZ or MDRZ zones there is no reason for these areas to be as large as the notified version proposes. Requirements for a waste container management plan. 	Delete the standards and any associated provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.49	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the permitted activity status of emergency housing in the activity tables – however, as the activity definition overlaps with Managed Care Facilities, the submitter considered that explicit exclusion is needed from any of the standards relating to managed care facilities as these should not be relevant to emergency housing.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.50	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter supports amendments to the business zones to enable and encourage above ground level residential activities. However, the submitter opposes the drafting which implies that they are only encouraged where they contribute to safe streets.	Amend the provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.51	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the changes to enable as a permitted activity above ground apartments.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited -	343.52	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter supports amendments to the City Centre zones to maximise urban development capacity. The submitter supports amendments to the business zones to enable and encourage apartment activities. However, the submitter opposes the drafting which implies that they are only encouraged where they contribute to safe streets.	Amend the provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Tristan Jones						
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.53	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Oppose	<p>7.4.1 Building Coverage and Permeable Surfaces</p> <p>The submitter considers that the council has missed a significant opportunity to give effect to the new policies to maximum urban development capacity by not amending the building coverage and permeable surface provision from the operative text. The site coverage should be increased, particularly in Precinct 2 to 80% or greater.</p>	Amend the provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.54	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	General	Oppose	<p>7.4.2 Building Coverage and Permeable Surfaces</p> <p>The submitter considers that the council has missed a significant opportunity to give effect to the new policies to maximum urban development capacity by not amending the building coverage and permeable surface provision from the operative text. The site coverage should be increased, particularly in Precinct 2 to 80% or greater.</p>	Amend the provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.55	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.4.4 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to enable a greater height in relation to boundary and that this only apply to the GRZ. However, considered that clause b needs to be clarified that it only applies to land in the GRZ to align with clause a).	Retain the provisions as notified.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.56	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.5.3 Residential	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that PC12 has retained this provision. A more enabling provision would be to not have minimum densities.	Delete the provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.57	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	The submitter supports the deletion of reference to maintaining existing amenity values.	Retain the provisions as notified.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.58	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the proposed changes to Activity Table, in particular the new controlled activity status for activities for subdivision in accordance with a land use consent.	Retain the provisions as notified, subject to amendments to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.59	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.6.8 Subdivision in the Medium-Density Residential Zones and Rototuna Town Centre Zone	Support in part	The submitter supports deletion of requirements for a Comprehensive development plan – however all of the clauses in 23.6.8 need to be amended so as to not require a land use consent first.	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			(excluding Rotokauri North Medium Density Residential Zone)			
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.60	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	<p>23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape</p> <p>The submitter supports in general, the provisions in 23.7.2 allowing fee simple and unit title subdivision with no minimum lot size where land use consent is granted first/concurrently, or applications can provide a permitted activity dwelling can be constructed.</p> <p>The submitter supports the 300m2 minimum for vacant lots in the GBZ but opposes the shape factor for the GBZ being retained as a 15m circle (clear of yards).</p> <p>The submitter considers that retention of this standard this will require 17m wide sites at a minimum, which creates square as opposed to rectangle vacant sites and conflicts with expectation of narrower frontages under the Chapter 4 provisions which restrict garaging carparking based on lot frontages.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the minimum lot size for the MDRZ which will “force” integrated solutions. There is no reason that a medium density vacant lot size less than 300m2 could not be provided to enable vacant lots.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.61	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability	Support in part	<p>23.7.2 – Subdivision Suitability</p> <p>The submitter supports in general, the provisions in 23.7.2 allowing fee simple and unit title subdivision with no minimum lot size where land use consent is granted first/concurrently, or applications can provide a permitted activity dwelling can be constructed.</p> <p>The submitter supports the 300m2 minimum for vacant lots in the GBZ but opposes the shape factor for the GBZ being retained as a 15m circle.</p> <p>Retention of this standard this will require 17m wide sites at a minimum, which creates square as opposed to rectangle vacant sites and conflicts with expectation of narrower frontages under the Chapter 4 provisions which restrict garaging carparking based on lot frontages.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the minimum lot size for the MDRZ which will “force” integrated solutions. There is no reason that a medium density vacant lot size less than 300m2 could not be provided to enable vacant lots.</p>	Amend provisions to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.62	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.3 General Residential Zone	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes any increase to the vest road standards.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes any restriction on the length of a rear lane which is different to the listed total block length, as it does not make any sense to have these as different lengths.</p>	No specific relief sought.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.63	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.4 Medium Density Residential Zone (Excluding Peacocke Residential Precinct)		<p>The submitter opposes any increase to the vest road standards – as identified elsewhere in this submission there are considerable land efficiencies that can be gained to contribute towards housing supply but revisiting these standards.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes any restriction on the length of a rear lane which is different to the listed total block length, as it does not make any sense to have these as different lengths.</p>	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.64	Chapter 24 Financial Contributions	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the financial contributions applying broadly across Hamilton, in particular as the submitter considers that the matters being identified for financial contributions are largely due to inadequate upkeep and renewal of existing infrastructure.	Delete identified provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.65	25.12 Solid Waste	25.12.2 Objectives and Policies: Solid Waste	Oppose	Concerning Policies 25.12.1.d, the submitter opposes policy c for the reason reasons as listed under the waste development controls in Chapter 4. Policy d is also considered inappropriate, and conflicts with other objectives regarding optimising existing berms spaces/road corridors and utilisation of rear lanes for collection. Both policies should be deleted.	Delete identified provisions.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.66	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	Objective 23.13.2.2 Policies 23.13.2.2a-b, and explanation [Objective 23.13.2.4] The submitter generally supports changes to reflect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. Submitter concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific reference to onsite solutions – for greenfield development the ICMP and SC-ICMP’s generally identify the communal devices which allow for the appropriate detention to manage effects. Not every lot/development is required to have onsite device in addition, not all solutions are appropriate in the individual catchments. • The policies and explanation reference retention and soakage as opposed to detention, there are different expectations and outcomes for all of these stormwater solutions, and it should be clear which of these solutions HCC is seeking. • As noted under the Chapter 24 items – the submitter opposes the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield growth areas 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.67	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	The submitter generally supports changes to reflect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. Submitter concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While alignment of development with infrastructure is generally supported the policies should not foreclose on the ability to provide for interim solutions to infrastructure to enable housing supply. • As noted under the Chapter 24 items – the submitter opposes the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield growth areas 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.68	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.2 Objectives and Policies: Three Waters	Support in part	23.13.2.5a-h The submitter generally supports changes to reflect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. Submitter concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While alignment of development with infrastructure is generally supported the policies should not foreclose on the ability to provide for interim solutions to infrastructure to enable housing supply. • As noted under the Chapter 24 items – the submitter opposes the requirement for financial contributions for greenfield growth areas 	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.69	25.13 Three Waters	25.13.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	Rules - General Standards 25.13.4 (all) The submitter considers that the number of management plans and associated requirements for compliance applicable to development is too onerous and will significantly increase the cost of providing for housing as well as the ongoing upkeep of houses by future residents in having to maintain individual stormwater devices/rain tanks. The use of retention across Hamilton in its entirety as opposed. In addition, there is no recognition that in greenfield sites that the devices may already be communal offsite. The submitter supports the requirements for water conservation features, however, requests that these been clarified to include tanks for re-use that fulfil any required retention/detention.	The provisions should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton	343.70	25.14 Transportation	25.14.2 Objectives and	Support in part	Objective 25.14.2.1, Policies 23[25].14.2.1a-q The submitter has several concerns that include:	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Campground Limited - Tristan Jones			Policies: Transportation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of policies which refer to other policies - this is not considered to be appropriate drafting of a policy • Reference to creation of a continuous tree canopy along corridors – the submitter is concerned that this will create undesirable outcomes for urban environments. • Reference to minimising building new roads. Greenfields areas should be excluded from this policy. • Referencing to “have fun” and “playfulness” in relation to transport corridors. The submitter supports the movement of people via various methods, however, considered that “fun” and “play” is better enabled in open space/green corridors. • Requiring provision of public transport infrastructure – it is considered more appropriate for development to “enable” and “future proof” for these features. • Referencing to minimising vehicle crossings – this should be limited to streets with dedicated cycle lane or dedicated 3m (or wider) shared path facilities. • Referencing to reverse sensitivity should be clear that it does not relate to all road networks. <p>The submitter specifically opposes policy 25.14.2.1oii which appears to “misunderstand” the use of rear lanes through requiring them to be safe for pedestrians. These are service lanes for vehicles not thoroughfare. In addition, not all lanes will require rubbish collection services and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The submitter supports the general principle of making the best use of transport corridors provided. However, this needs to be paired with other policies which enable efficiencies to be gained in the road corridor designs (particularly service berm widths) set by Appendix 15 (Table 15-a).</p>	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.71	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 f - Quantity</p> <p>The submitter opposes the retention of the operative maximum number of vehicle crossings per site. This undermines the achievement of medium density development fronting a transport corridor. The provision should be deleted and/or new provisions added to enable a minimum of one crossing per dwelling.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.72	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards		<p>25.14.4.1 h- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The widths for a single residential unit are “missing” from the rule. Until these can be reviewed, the submitter is unable to provide any comment and/or confirm consistency with the outcomes sought by the Chapter 4 changes.</p> <p>The widths for internal vehicle access for 2-6 units appear to be inappropriately wide, thus reducing the potential for developable land, and conflict with the detailed parking provisions in Chapter 4.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.73	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 j- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The submitter opposes the restriction on rear lanes as outlined in previously.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.74	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	<p>25.14.4.1 m-p- Design an Access Widths</p> <p>The submitter opposes the further restrictions applying to all development. Standard m in particular should not apply to all individual lot vehicle crossings, and standard p should be clear that it does not apply to the transport corridors.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton	343.75	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General	Oppose	The submitter opposes this forming a requirement for development, and has significant concerns as to the ability of providers to enable this.	The provisions should be deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Campground Limited - Tristan Jones			Standards			
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.76	25.14 Transportation	25.14.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes this forming a requirement for development and any associated provisions/information requirements for waste management.	The provisions should be deleted
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.77	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	<p>Apartments / terraced housing</p> <p>The submitter supports the revised definition for apartments and a new definition for terraced housing.</p>	Retain as notified
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.78	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support	The submitter supported amendments to broaden the definition of Rotokauri North features (e.g rear lanes, shared paths) to be applicable citywide.	Retain as notified
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.79	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The drafting of both is too broad and complex to be a definition.	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.80	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The drafting of both is too broad and complex to be a definition. The definition of Urban Heat island effect is a explanation of how it occurs, not a definition of what it is.	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.81	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Oppose	<p>1.2.1 h</p> <p>Requirement for urban design assessments</p> <p>The submitter opposes the requirement for a specific “urban design” assessment and “CPTED” assessments for all applications for 4 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The submitter considers it unnecessary for applications of such a small scale, and will add increased cost, complexities and delays to the delivery of housing.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.82	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General		<p>In regards to Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria</p> <p>B (inclusive)</p> <p>G (inclusive)</p> <p>J (inclusive)</p> <p>The submitter opposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any changes to the assessment criteria which attribute lengths/percentages to being an appropriate outcome “rules of thumb”. These are rules not assessment criteria. any reference to retention of existing vegetation, or viewshafts references to local microclimatic features 	The provisions should be amended/deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • repetition of outcomes required by development standards • outcomes that undermine permitted activity development controls, such as parking areas, garage percentages to street frontage • any other matter raised by the detailed submission on the chapters repeated in the assessment criteria. • requirements to provide rather enable/future proof for public transport infrastructure • reference to roads providing for “play” • duplication of matters • relevance of JJ where there is an approved ICMP/SC-ICMP • Reference to consistency with permitted standards <p>The submitter also considered that the new detail of 1.3.3. in relation to design and layout makes The Design Guides redundant (and they should be deleted).</p>	
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.83	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-1 Parking, Loading Spaces and Manoeuvring Areas – Tables and Figures	Oppose	<p>Table 15-1a and figure 15.1.a.a</p> <p>The submitter opposes the cycle parking rates and provision for lockers. Specifically, but not limited to those listed for apartments and residential units/duplexes being required per bedroom, and the required parking dimensions.</p>	The provisions should be amended or deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.84	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-2 Integrated Transport Assessment Requirements – Tables	Oppose	The submitter opposes the additional requirements for ITAs, specifically (but not limited to) a design statement addressing matter such a rubbish collection and parking (these are better suited to be addressed at detailed engineering plan approval stage) the requirement for assessment of greenhouse gas emissions.	The provisions should be amended/deleted to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.85	Appendix 15 Transportation	15-5 Criteria for the Form of Transport Corridors and Internal Vehicle Access	Oppose	<p>Table 15-5a & 15-5aii</p> <p>The submitter is of the opinion that there could be considerable efficiencies in amending the transport design corridors- in particular reducing the expectation for significant service berms – whereas the PC12 amendments have in some cases increased the widths of vested roads. The submitter is also concerned that these changes combined with the policies on tree canopy could further increased the vested road network, which impacts on the available land for the delivery of housing.</p>	The provisions should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.86	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	General	Support in part	<p>All objectives and Policies</p> <p>As the Chapter 2 strategic framework has been used to guide the changes made in detailed chapters, the submitter generally supports those matters raised in the above table which are supported, where these themes are addressed in the Chapter 2 objectives and policies (and explanatory text).</p> <p>Likewise the submitter opposes those matters raised in the above table which are opposed where these themes are addressed in the Chapter 2 objectives and policies (and explanatory text).</p>	The objective and policies should be amended to address the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones	343.87	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	<p>While the submitter supports the areas of intensification identified in PC12, it also considers that there has been a considerable missed opportunity in rezoning land in proximity to existing and planned employment hubs, along major roading networks (and in proximity to public transport) and that the sites should be rezoned as Medium Density Residential to give effect to the NPS and RMAA.</p> <p>The Council has effectively cherry picked some centres and corridors for intensification opportunities, while other locations with similar opportunities for intensification because of their location, public transport and arterial road access, access to employment, and education and community facilities have not been upzoned. This level of inconsistency has significantly reduced the opportunity to provide housing opportunities in locations where there are significant benefits from developing there., particularly in respect to intensification, public transport use and general reduction in VKT.</p> <p>The submitter has interests in the sites are located at the intersection of Ruakura and Peachgrove Roads, which are major public transport routes and arterial roads. In addition, the sites have a public transport existing bus stop directly on the Ruakura Road boundary.</p> <p>In particular, PC12 has failed to acknowledge the significant investment and planned growth on the eastern frame of the city with the Proposed Ruakura Inland port and the effect this growth will have on shifting the axis of industrial and economic activity within the city. There is a missed opportunity to support this growth with necessary housing opportunities.</p>	<p>The submitter seeks the rezoning of the “Hamilton Campground”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 104/106 Peachgrove Rd, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 108/110 Peachgrove Rd, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 114/112 Peachgrove Rd, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 116/118 Peachgrove Rd, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 1-10 Emmadale Lane, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 11-16 Joshua Lane, Hamilton East, Hamilton • 14 Ruakura Road, Hamilton East, Hamilton. <p>Rezone all walkable catchments of centres and arterial roads at least Medium Density Residential. In particular amend the zoning of the sites to at least Medium Density Residential and provide for a height variation overlay which enables 6 storeys.</p> <p>Delete the Infrastructure Constraints Overlay.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt this submission for rezoning could expand to the adjacent sites on the corridor that have the same locational attributes.</p>
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.1	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	City Urban Form	Support in part	The submitter supports objective 2.2.14 and policies 2.2.14a-2.2.14d as they promote intensification and alternative modes of transport.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.2	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support in part	The policy set reads as though development must incorporate the matters referenced, such as solar energy when the explanation suggests development may incorporate such matters.	Policy 4.1.2.5a be amended as follows: "Development must encourage the efficient use of energy and water, <u>for example</u> by:...."
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.3	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter generally supports objective 4.1.2.3 and its associated policies to the extent that it promotes intensification [though the] imposition of the medium density zone and because it acknowledges that developments that do not meet permitted activity standards can still be acceptable.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.4	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Support	The submitter supports this objective to the extent [that it] doesn't restrict what can occur on land adjoining SNA [and] leaves consideration of activities or work to being [effects] based assessment.	No specific relief requested
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.5	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the inclusion of the [High] Density Zone in Hamilton City. Notwithstanding the general support for this zone and the purpose, the submitter considers that the type of [buildings] that are intended for the zone should enable as [permitted] activities without the automatic need for consent ([similar] the medium density and general residential zone). Currently the general residential and medium density residential zones do not require consent for 3, 3 storey buildings on a site but the high density zone does.	Amend the purpose as follows: "The design and layout of sites and buildings in the [High] Density Residential Zone are critically important. [Resource] consent is <u>may be</u> required to ensure that development provides for high quality urban design and visually [attractive] buildings, and that adequate on-site amenity and privacy consistent with the expected urban built characters of the Zone is provided for."
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.6	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.3.1 Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter generally supports this activity status table [as it] promotes higher density development in the zone. [Could] seek permitted activity?	[Could] seek permitted activity?

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.7	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.1 Density	Support	Rule 4.4.5.1 is supported. The submitter supports the minimum density Standard	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.8	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.2 Building Coverage	Support	Rule 4.4.5.2 is supported.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.9	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.3 Permeable Surface and Landscaping	Support in part	Rule 4.4.5.3i is supported in part. For an apartment building with multiple units on [multiple] stories it may be impractical to provide a tree for [every unit].	Amend rule 4.4.5.3i as follows: "Terraces and/or apartments: Minimum of one tree per site with an additional tree for every 150m² of site area."
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.10	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.4 Building Height	Support	Rule 4.4.5.4 is supported as it promotes development options.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.11	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support	Rule 4.4.5.5 is supported as it promotes development options.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.12	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.6 Building Setbacks	Support	Rule 4.4.5.6 is supported as it promotes development options.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.13	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.7 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter generally support rule 4.4.5.7, except standard a. Units at the ground floor should not have to have fencing to help screen living areas.	Amend rule 4.4.5.7a as follows: "transport corridor boundary and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building line of the building: Maximum height 0m <u>1.8m provided the [fence is] visually 50% permeable</u> "
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.14	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.8 Public Interface	Support in part	The submitter general supports rule 4.4.5.8 but requests amendment to allow for more flexibility at the ground floor.	Amend rule 4.4.5.8a(i) as follows: "a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade <u>across the [at]</u> ground level <u>and first level</u> in glazing. This can be in the form of clear-glazed windows[, balconies or doors."
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.15	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.9 Outlook Space	Support	Rule 4.4.5.9 is supported as they promote development options but still require an outlook space [to] be provided.	No specific relief requested
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.16	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support	Rule 4.4.5.11 is supported as it acknowledges that a [service] area is not necessary for most households (particularly apartment living), and they provide flexibility for development to provide service areas and waste management facilities in a way that suits the proposed development.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.17	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.13 Accessory Buildings,	Support in part	The submitters supports in part rule 4.4.5.13. The submitter opposes that garages cannot be provided at the ground floor for dwellings with a small frontage. Active street fronts and CPTED principles [can] be included on sites as well as garages and this should [not] be requested.	Amend rule 4.4.5.13c as follows: "Where the residential unit has a frontage width facing a street or a publicly accessible on-site access way (for pedestrians) greater than 7.5m but less than 12m: One single-width garage or car port space, and one driveway / parking pad up to 3.5m wide may be provided." And delete rule 4.4.5.13d.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
			Vehicle Access and Vehicle Parking			
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.18	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.14 Built Form	Oppose	Rule 4.4.5.15c is opposed as a 4m setback is [missing text] restrictive and may consume some of the buildable area on smaller sites and potentially compromise good design outcomes for a new build. The submitter considers that other standards can control the built form.	Delete rule 4.4.5.15c.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.19	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	Objective 23.2.3 and its policies are supported to the extent that it promotes an integrated approach to development in the high density zone.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.20	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	Objective 23.2.5 and its policies are supported to the extent that it promotes an effects-based approach to assessing development in the vicinity of HHA's, SNA [or] features.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.21	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	Activity 23.3 v. fee simple subdivision that complies with rule 23.7.2 b) is supported as the appropriateness of such subdivision are determined [by the] appropriateness of the underlying or proposed [building].	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.22	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.1 Allotment Size and Shape	Support in part	Rule 23.7.1 is supported in part. The submitter opposes the HHA minimum lot sizes and considers sites in such areas should retain the [underlying] lot sizes.	Delete rule 23.7.1r.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.23	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.7.2 Subdivision Suitability	Support	Rule 23.7.2 is supported in that it enables the concurrent consideration of land use and subdivision consents.	No specific relief requested.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	344.24	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter supports this objective to the extent that [it] doesn't restrict what can occur on land within HHA's [but] leaves consideration of new activities to being effects [based] assessments	No relief sought
Bruce and Julie Macdonald	345.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter has concern for traffic, and impacts on view that two or three story developments would have.	When considering giving resource consent for such developments, consider the size and the age of the street.
Dr Andrew and Louise Swales	346.1	4.1 All Residential Zones	4.1.2 Objectives and Policies: All Residential Zones	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about street parking issues as a result of intensification and opposes 4.1.2.6c (xi). In addition, the submitter supports the intent of 4.1.2.6 (f) to protect urban trees and in particular, native trees.	That off street parking is required along narrow streets; and The retention of mature native trees in suburbs; and Use the STEM method to identify notable trees; and Make the removal of mature native trees and discretionary activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn	347.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed zoning over 29 Petersburg Drive. The site is 400-600m from the Borman Road neighbourhood centre and the adjoining park, playground, school and retirement village that are associated with it, and is within an easily walkable catchment suitable for intensification. Converting the site to general residential will offer some opportunity to increase density in an area where the further intensification may be challenging. The submitter is currently working through a resource consent application and the maintenance of the Operative Open Space Zoning through PC12 will further complicate the process.	Rezone 29 Petersburg Drive as General Residential.
What A Property Ltd - David and Barbara Yzendoorn	348.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed zoning over 1 Whatawhata Road and seeks amendments to make greater allowance for residential use as a permitted activity. The Business 5 zone allows residential activity above the ground level with ground floor commercial use. It also allows motels and Residential centres as a permitted activity. Ground floor parking areas where the parking area is for first floor dwellings is not permitted. The view is that the parking is a part of the residential activity and therefore not permitted as of right.	We are seeking to have this rule amended through an amendment to the current zoning as part of plan change 12.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.1	General	General		The submitter notes and appreciates the time and effort that has gone into the District plan changes.	The submitter would much prefer to follow Christchurch's stand against Governments demand for residential intensification, even part of Governments changes could be removed for the good of communities and our environment. e.g. RMA should be applied to all developments to maintain the sustainable practises. It is an important part of river care. Intensification is detrimental to the environment therefore monitored guidelines would be necessary.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.2	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Residential Development	Support in part	The submitter is concerned with how it will be determined what high density areas require.	No relief stated.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.3	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Hamilton's Identity, Character and Heritage		The submitter supports the protection of built heritage but considers that there has been no changes to enhance this.	The submitter seeks more control over issuing of permits to protect the few villas left in Hamilton East. Suggests a panel to pass or reject the heritage homes.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.4	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency		The submitter notes that the building industry is known to be one of the biggest producers of toxic materials going into landfills. A lot of their waste could be used for numerous smaller projects (tiny homes, henhouses, book shelves etc.)	The submitter seeks that the excess materials can be assembled along with materials from demolished buildings and made available to sell.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.5	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency		The submitter supports the idea of multi-purpose buildings but questions what other uses would be considered.	No specific relief sought.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.6	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency		The submitter states that in regards to Climate Change that increased heavy rain storms will require a lot more than 20% permeable land to soak up the water.	The submitter seeks that wooden decks should not be included in the 20% and that rainfall from the roof for both house and garden use can be collected. This would be safe security for summer droughts.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.7	Chapter 2 Strategic Framework	Resource Efficiency		<p>The submitter considers that with a large increase in population will place a big demand on Electricity use. New developments rely solely on electricity for heating, cooking, extractors, heat pumps, chargers, clothes driers (usually no clothes lines are available). Already there are winter power cuts, this could get worse. What do you have in place for energy shortages and water restrictions? We need to be a lot more resilient.</p> <p>The submitter also considers that building materials need to be less toxic for the sake of human health.</p>	The submitter asks what do you have in place for energy shortages and water restrictions.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.8	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.5 Height in Relation to Boundary	Support in part	The submitter considers that there should be some flexibility to adjust the heights and boundary distance in certain circumstances because for example One being if a 3 storey development is built beside a heritage home, it may have to be sited further from the boundary shared with a heritage home, if it is casting a shadow on the home over the winter. This should be prevented so the wooden home can see the sun and dry out rather than rot.	The submitter seeks flexibility to adjust the building heights and boundary distance in certain circumstances (example adjoining heritage homes).
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.9	4.4 High Density Residential Zone	4.4.5.11 Waste Management and Service Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that waste management are necessary and pleased that they are part of the design planning. Thoughtful planning will hopefully improve on the lack of cohesion seen at new developments at present.</p> <p>As I have stated, I am already living in a high density area, for a long term resident in my own home, it has been a challenge. Rubbish is a huge problem in these areas. I have found that a lot of people living in kainga ora compounds do not grasp the recycling methods. I believe that someone within the organisation or a local resident needs to be appointed to monitor the recycling and teach new residence.</p> <p>There are new developments who are using a skip bin instead of recycling. This counteracts the efforts everyone else puts into recycling.</p> <p>Please do not give developers the option of skip bins.</p>	Supports the waste management requirements for residential development but opposes giving developers the option to use skip bins.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.10	25.14 Transportation	General		The submitter considers that parking on site for big developments should be essential because cars parked on the road site are subject to theft. Carports are multipurpose.	Seeks the requirement of onsite car parking for large developments.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.11	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.1 Purpose		The submitter considers this all looks good on paper but they have not seen these purposes applied developments. The submitter considers the Councils vision has not delivered on good urban design, there is no enhancement of the environment, communities are destroyed and slums are developing.	The submitter would like to see good urban design implemented but has not confidence that council can follow through with it because of the developments that have been permitted.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	349.12	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies: Urban Design		The submitter questions how the new vision for urban developments will be put into practice and monitored because the submitter believes that planners have been swayed by developers to gain what they can to the advantage of their developments. The developers come into a neighbourhood without any consultation and display unsavoury behaviour towards the community and destroy the community.	No specific relief sought.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) -	349.13	25.15 Urban Design	25.15.2 Objectives and Policies:		The submitter asks how do you plan to enhance the city to be safe and crime free. There are issues with different groups all being placed in the same neighbourhood.	The submitter considers that organisations should have to seek permits to set up project for people with problems and that it should be monitored to ensure they do not all location in one area. The submitter also considers that these organisations have no regard for the community they are being placed in. The submitter also notes similar attitudes with developers and social enterprises.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Sought
Cheryl Noble			Urban Design			
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	350.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The Residents of Frankton East are opposed to Plan Change 12 for a wide variety of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The submitters are opposed to the High Density Residential Zone that applies to the east side of Norton Road to the gully. They consider that the proposal is based on market forces being used to remove homes and neighbourhoods to establish housing for others. This is considered extreme and the implications, if PC12 were to be realised as notified, would be stressful. There is concern that single residential units as a non-complying activity signals that the district plan does not anticipate this housing typology in this location.2. The submitters are concerned about Council's lack of consultation and information provided in relation to Plan Change 12 and Plan Change 9. The submitters consider their area to be of heritage value.3. The submitters are concerned about Governments lack of consultation on the Amendment Bill. The submitters are fearful that development can occur on adjacent sites that will block sunlight and place pressure on infrastructure capacity, car parking availability and access through residential streets. Existing infrastructure is old and cannot sustain higher densities without further impacting the Waitawhiriwhiri Stream.4. Buildings setbacks are insufficient; site coverage is too excessive; more existing urban trees should be retained and scheduled as Notable Trees.5. The submitters are concerned about privacy and outlook areas; and retaining the existing amenity of residential areas through built and urban design outcomes.6. The district plan should not preclude any form of notification, allowing the submitters to provide feedback on developments that could have a significant impact on them, their identity and the functioning of the community.	<p>Removal of the proposed Residential High Density Zone from Taniwha, Wye, Torrington, Norton and Avon Street.</p> <p>Urgent consultation with the residents of Frankton East, who are the most affected by the proposed removal of our homes and clearing our neighbourhood for high rise apartments.</p> <p>Retaining the Character Zone, and placing our area within this as the option of being within the proposed historic heritage area has been undertaken in Plan Change 9 without most of us being aware of this. We seek inclusion in the historic heritage area as we have not been consulted with and these streets form part of the historic area.</p> <p>A neighbourhood plan which will be within the district plan rules, consulted in partnership with our Frankton East neighbourhood, retains its existing character, and includes aspects such as trees and street parking.</p> <p>We seek existing use rights to be specifically a rule in the district plan that allows us to continue to own and live in our homes and make changes as planned, dated for owners to before July 2022.</p> <p>We seek better rules within the residential high density zone chapter that improves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Building set backs including adjacent to the proposed historic heritage area;• Reduces the proposed Site coverage• Retention of more urban trees and vegetation, including adding private trees to the Notable Trees Schedule of Chapter 19 Infrastructure and only places high density residential zones in areas that are modern where it is easier to increase capacity to the scale required• Require the design and layout of the development to be assessed through a resource consent process; recognising that the need to achieve a quality design is increasingly important as the scale of development increases.• Provide quality on-site residential amenity for residents and the street.• Manage the height and bulk of development to maintain daylight access and a reasonable standard of privacy, and to minimise visual dominance effects to adjoining sites and developments.• Require housing to be designed to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ provide privacy and outlook; and○ to be functional, have access to daylight and sunlight, and provide the amenities necessary to meet the day-to-day needs of residents. <p>We seek better rules for Infrastructure which includes but is not limited to: street parking plans before the new zone rules are active, plans developed by suburb not streets in all densities with 3 x 3 government based infill and new development.</p> <p>We seek that existing infrastructure must be modern and able to have the capacity for the proposed density now. Old existing infrastructure should be avoided.</p> <p>Improved residential rules that include good design, privacy, reducing overshadowing and sun, protection of residential amenity and provision of off road car parking.</p> <p>Clear objectives and policies written in the District Plan that protect and enhance existing character and amenity and ensure that consideration is given to neighbouring properties and the impact on the wider neighbourhood of housing developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Achieve, protect and enhance existing character and amenity of the zone;• manage the effects of development on adjoining sites, including visual amenity, privacy and access to daylight and sunlight; and• achieve high quality on-site living environments and for neighbouring properties to development sites.• integrate development with the adjacent and wider neighbourhood; <p>Notification to affected neighbours is required for medium and high density developments, with resource consents required and clear assessment criteria (with strong objectives and policies) that do not allow for poor quality housing that can adversely affect neighbours and lower the tone of the neighbourhoods we live in.</p>