

Proposed Plan Change 9 Historic Heritage and Natural Environment

Summary of Submissions

28 October 2022

Note: In this Summary of Submissions document there will be instances where submitter and submission point numbering is not consecutive. For clarity, this does not mean that submission points are missing. It is due to administrative amendments during the preparation of the Summary of Submissions document.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
John Elliott Stevenson	1.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the intention of introduction and implementation of Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, including having one common approach across city for all Historic Heritage Areas as it will make it easier for people and plan users to understand. The submitter fully supports the intention and enhanced protection for Claudelands Historic Heritage Area as Plan Change 9 notified.	Implement Chapter 19 as notified.
John Elliott Stevenson	1.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the options of discretionary via resource consent as that "appears balanced".	Implements Plan Change 9 as it notified.
John Elliott Stevenson	1.3	General	General	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 in its entirety and states that " <i>The work that has gone into plan change 9 is extensive, qualified, clear and workable. It provides for consistency across the city for Archaeological and Cultural sites, Built Heritage, Notable Trees, Significant Natural Areas ('SNA'), Historic Heritage Areas ('HHA')</i> ".	Implement the improvements as per plan change 9
Mark White	2.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of 7 King Street (H225) as a B-ranked building in Schedule 8A. A New Zealand Herald article written by Anne McEwen points out that this particular property holds no historic value. The submitter considers that there is no consistency over built heritage selection. The submitter considers 7 King Street is a Bungalow built in 1929 and it seems to be selective or a matter of opinion. The submitter states that the property is the only residence on King Street surrounded by industrial/commercial buildings. The submitter is concerned that the proposed built heritage will remove private property rights, decrease property values and impose additional costs to the property owner.	Seeks the reasons why 7 King Street was selected over other properties and amend Schedule 8A by removing built heritage item H225.
Mark White	2.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and scheduling of 7 King Street (H225) as a B-ranked building in Schedule 8A. The submitter is concerned that the proposed built heritage will remove private property rights and impose additional costs on property owners. The submitter is also states that the property owner does not agree to the change.	Seeks the reasons why 7 King Street was selected over other properties and amend Schedule 8A by removing built heritage item H225.
Scott Bicknell	3.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 24 Te Aroha Street, Hamilton East within the Myrtle Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area. Seeking to have 24 Te Aroha Street removed from the Historic Heritage Area and thus any rules and provisions associated with it. This position is on the basis of an assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified professional expert that identified that neither the house located at 24 Te Aroha Street nor the Myrtle Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area constitutes a historic heritage area that merits scheduling within the Hamilton District Plan. Specifically, they identify that the south side of Te Aroha Street should be excluded from it in view of the level of modification in this part of the proposed Historic Heritage Area.	Remove 24 Te Aroha Street from the Myrtle Street and Te Aroha Street (West) Historic Heritage Area, HHA21, and any rules and provisions associated with it.
Scott Bicknell	3.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the root protection area around the notable tree identified as T45 on 659 Grey Street. I seek its reduction by several metres to more appropriately align to the realistic extent of the root network. The current root protection area currently exceeds what would be more commonly interpreted at the dripline of the tree by several metres.	Reduce the Protected Root Zone radius extent for the notable tree T45 by 2-3metres.
Owen Woollaston	4.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C40) on 7 Berkley Avenue, on the grounds that "the canopy obscured the retaining wall and paths we've built (preventing accurate desktop research) and basically it's now fully landscaped".	Remove the SNA (C40) from the property at 17 Berkley Avenue.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Iris Lake Properties Limited - Toni and Adrian Hamlin	5.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 9 Fowlers Avenue as built heritage item H198, because of the current poor condition of the structure and considering they have recently obtained a Certificate of Compliance (HCC Ref 012.2022.0003965.001) to demolish the building which was based on a Building Inspection Report.	Remove H198, 9 Fowlers Avenue from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, and from the Planning Maps.
Iris Lake Properties Limited - Toni and Adrian Hamlin	5.2	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 9 Fowlers Avenue as built heritage item H198, because of the current poor condition of the structure and considering they have recently obtained a Certificate of Compliance (HCC Ref 012.2022.0003965.001) to demolish the building which was based on a Building Inspection Report.	Remove H198, 9 Fowlers Avenue from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, and from the Planning Maps.
Wright Finance - Kathy Wright-St Clair	6.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C83) on 361 Ulster Street Beerescourt, stating: " I have had an Ecological Impact Assessment completed on the property and there is nothing in this report that supports the requirement for the SNA being place on this section of land. I am looking to put three town houses on the site, because Hamilton needs more housing, but the DNA would restrict this build, because I am required to retain the bank which has been caught up in the SNA land allocation."	Remove the SNA (C83) from the property at 361 Ulster Street, Beerescourt.
Julie Y Coward	7.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports PC9 and the proposal to place a Heritage B ranking over 504 Tuhikaramea Road, but considers that the provisions may mean that smaller, subtle changes to the structure may require input from the Council, which will increase costs for the property owner.	That HCC works willingly with the property owner to ensure if any desired improvements to the property are proposed that the review process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is kept simple and not onerous • costs to the owner are not increased • the desired outcomes are mutually beneficial to the property owner, HCC, and if applicable, to the Church and community.
Julie Y Coward	7.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter generally supports PC9 and the proposal to place a Heritage B ranking (H294) of the dwelling at 504 Tuhikaramea Road, but considers that the provisions may mean that smaller, subtle changes to the structure may require input from the Council, which will increase costs for the property owner.	If the proposed plan change to place a Heritage B ranking over 504 Tuhikaramea Road property is to proceed, I respectfully ask the HCC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - receive my support for such change to ensure history is maintained - work willingly with the property owner notwithstanding another layer of review will be required, to ensure if any desired improvements to the property are proposed that the review process: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) is kept simple and not onerous b) costs to the owner are not increased, and c) the desired outcomes are mutually beneficial to the property owner, HCC, and if applicable, to the Church and community. In other words, if heritage B ranking over this property is imminent, the property owner "suffering" from an increase in costs or bureaucracy wouldn't be a desired or supported outcome.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Suit Shop Ltd - Murray Donald Jenkin	8.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports in part the protection of notable trees T8.14 on the condition that: 1) Removing all dead wood on a regular basis (yearly) 2) Removing all fallen leaves, limbs and debris on a regular basis (monthly) 3) Pruning the trees on a regular basis (yearly) 4) Removing all limbs protruding over the adjoining property on a regular basis (yearly)	That the following work is completed by the Hamilton City Council: 1) All dead wood is removed on a regular basis (yearly) 2) All fallen leaves, limbs and debris are removed on a regular basis (monthly) 3) The tree is pruned on a regular basis (yearly) 4) All limbs protruding over the adjoining property are removed on a regular basis (yearly)
Kathleen Blanche Orr	9.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C3) at their property because it is a private property, the trees in the gully have been planted by different owners (with no assistance by the Council) and the Council appropriating/requisitioning land that belongs to me as the owner.	That my land remains my land to care for and protect as I see fit.
Carlene Eves	10.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the intention, introduction and implementation of Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 as it notified.	Approve the proposed changes.
Carlene Eves	10.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports their property within the Historic Heritage Area.	Approve the proposed changes.
Carlene Eves	10.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the intention, introduction and implementation of Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 as it notified.	Approve the proposed changes.
Carlene Eves	10.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the intention, introduction and implementation of Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 as it notified.	Approve the proposed changes.
David Neil Mans	11.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable trees (T136) on Claude Street, stating: "These trees have no great age, are subject to branch drop, the shallow roots are breaking up the footpath (creating trip hazards) and their leaves block the storm water in Autumn. Several were removed after the February storm damaged them. A more suitable tree would be a native evergreen".	Remove all reference to the notable trees (T136) on Claude Street from Schedule 9D - Notable Trees.
LightEcho - Leighton Fletcher	12.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 259 Grey Street as Built Heritage because it has been highly modified and does not have significant heritage features.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage by deleting the scheduled item: H211, 259 Grey Street.
LightEcho - Leighton Fletcher	12.2	Planning Maps	General		Hamilton City Council have notified that the property at 259 Grey Street is within the protected root zone of a notable tree. This is incorrect, and according to the notified plan - the property is not within any protected root zone. The root zones of notable trees are clearly marked, and do not come into the property at 259 Grey Street.	The submitter seeks confirmation from Council that 259 Grey Street is not within the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Paul Dodunski	13.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes at the extent of the SNA (C12) that has been identified over 54 Herbert Road.	Undertake a site visit and review the extension of the SNA (C12) at 54 Herbert Road.
Lucy Smith	14.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the provisions and implementations of Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, in particular for Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area, as it will protect the pedestrian-friendly layout and the placement of the houses in the area from destruction and intensification. The submitter however raises particular concerns of the requirement of obtaining resource consent for the construction and establishment of scaffolding or falseworks, for the need of maintenance works, under Rule 19.3.2.j as they meet the definition of 'building' under the District Plan. There are safety risks should people do not use scaffolding or falsework whereas they are required to or are needed.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.j to exempt scaffolding and falseworks from requiring a resource consents, due to safety concerns.
Lucy Smith	14.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the provisions and implementations of Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, in particular for Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area, as it will protect the pedestrian-friendly layout and the placement of the houses in the area from destruction and intensification. The submitter however opposes requiring resource consents for garden sheds and/or small scale accessory buildings, which both will be classified as building under the District Plan definition and Rule 19.3.2.j. A garden shed, at appropriate setbacks from the boundary, should be permitted. Since the paramedic of COVID-19, the submitter also considers there is an increased demand of providing small scale accessory building on site as home offices for people who are or will be working from home. The submitter acknowledges the Building Code allows for building for up to 30smq and would like to see amendment to Rule 19.3.2.j allowing for an additional small building.	Amends Rule 19.3.2.j to allow the construction and establishment of garden shed and accessory buildings up to 10sqm as permitted activities.
Heather Morris	15.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 regarding Built Heritage, stating "All amendments to Build Heritage should NOT go ahead as this an infringement on home owners rights to live peacefully in their own home without illegally imposed and unnecessary rules".	Remove all amendments to Plan Change 9 regarding Built Heritage.
Rupert Lewis Clive Hodgson	16.1	General	General	Support	The submitter fully supports the plan change.	Retain the plan change as proposed.
Denis and Rosemary Whittle	17.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the plan change with the proviso that there be flexibility allowed in the areas of maintenance and improvements to the property so that the property value is not diminished by the changes.	That Riro Street, Hamilton East be deemed an Historic Heritage Area (HHA24), on the proviso that there be flexibility allowed in the areas of maintenance and improvements to the property so that the property value is not diminished by the changes.
Denis and Rosemary Whittle	17.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter considers that given the existing nature of Riro Street (small pocket containing several houses of the 1920s era) that it meets all the criteria of an HHA and that it should become an HHA, but that flexibility must be allowed in the areas of maintenance and improvements to the property so that the property value is not diminished.	Retain Riro Street as a Historic Heritage Area (HHA 24).
Chris OConnor	18.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter has advised that "there are no archaeological and cultural sites, no built heritage, no heritage areas, no notable trees, no significant natural areas hear [here]".	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Simon John Mahoney	19.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the property (129 Grey Street) within the proposed Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12, on the basis that it will impact their ability to use the property for future use to resell, develop, rebuild, renovate, or whatever may be decided.	No relief sought.
Ruakura Motors Tractorparts Ltd - Susan Hopkins	20.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of Archaeological sites at 143 & 147 Riverlea Road - A27 (S14/79) and A176 (S14/325). These sites have had extensive sand removal with an Archaeological report noting that the remains of Burrow pits are no longer present on the site. To not remove the Archaeological sites would disadvantage the current owners from from development of the properties due to resource consent requirements.	Remove the Archaeological sites at 143 & 147 Riverlea Road - A27 (S14/79) and A176 (S14/325).
Ruakura Motors Tractorparts Ltd - Susan Hopkins	20.2	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks that Archaeological Sites which have been destroyed should not have to meet the same assessment criteria as other sites.	That Archaeological Sites that have been documented as destroyed be removed, or alternatively, have different assessment criteria.
Elisabeth Staal	21.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T159.1 alongside 8 Fairfield Road, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The branches dropped in every storm which caused safety issues and damage to the submitter property and neighbours • Blockage of leaves in gutters caused damage to the property such as water damage. • It is not native, common and are not of any significant value. • It is not a species the council currently considered suitable to be planted in urban areas. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T159.1 from Schedule 9D and remove these trees entirely for safety and property damage reasons. Replant the trees with a more suitable (native) species.
Elisabeth Staal	21.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T159.2 alongside 8 Fairfield Road, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The branches dropped in every storm which caused safety issues and damage to the submitter property and neighbours. • Blockage of leaves in gutters caused damage to the property such as water damage. • It is not native, common and are not of any significant value. • It is not a species the council currently considered suitable to be planted in urban areas. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T159.2 from Schedule 9D and remove these trees entirely for safety and property damage reasons. Replant the trees with a more suitable (native) species.
David Wayne Mason	22.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed SNA (C7) over 10 Deborah Place because the area is currently landscaped with retaining and planting, has a pathway and raised gardens.	Remove the SNA (C7) from 10 Deborah Place; and look at a consultative solution involving further plantings in Bremworth Park.
Shaun Pattenden	23.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C46) on 23C Howden Road Fairfield, stating: "We strongly oppose the SNA in relation to our property as we hold the property title in relation to this and don't believe this is a reasonable outcome unless there is an offer to purchase the property at market value. This has a waste manhole that overflows and needs upgrading and is historically a dumping ground so has no historical significance".	Remove the SNA (C46) from the property at 23C Howden Road, Fairfiled or financial compensation at full market value; and undertake repairs to the sewage system.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Melissa Broussard	24.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C16) because it is not a natural area.	The vegetation in C16 is nearly 100% invasive bamboo along much of this stretch of gully.
Melissa Broussard	24.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter disagrees with the inclusion of additional Historic Heritage Areas given the developed nature of some proposed Heritage Areas.	Reduce the number of new Historic Heritage Areas.
Melissa Broussard	24.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T26 at (Te Aroha x New Street) because the submitter advises that this tree is dangerously tall and thin, so that it can easily fall over upon the multiple houses and can create a hazard. (T26 is being identified at 3 New Street in Schedule 9D).	Remove the notable tree T26 from Schedule 9D - Notable Trees.
Melissa Broussard	24.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Victoria Street as a Historic Heritage Area.	Keep Victoria Street a Historic Heritage Area.
Yanling He	25.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of HHA's.	Removal of HHA's from the Plan.
Dean Parkes	26.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes all SNA and the provisions as notified, and states "an amendment should be made compensation be given to all land owners who's land is proposed to be classified as a SNA".	Compensation be given to all land owners who's land is proposed to be classified as a SNA, and that this compensation be in way of either (as example) monetary payment as compensation for loss of potential earnings from this newly classified, land rates relief, different rates classification, the SNA areas on property be maintained by the council, at council expense purchase of the land etc.
Tony and Frances Schramm	27.1	General	General	Support in part	In general the submitter supports the concept of HHA's however believes that the land owner is unfairly prejudiced by having to incur the cost of a resource consent. The concept of HHA's is to preserve and maintain the Historic Heritage Values for all of the inhabitants of the city. So it is only fair that all citizens continue contribute to the cost in preserving and maintaining this cultural asset. It is unfair to lumber the very citizens who are having their rights curtailed for the benefits of others.	That where a landowner is required to obtain a resource consent solely due to a Historic Heritage Area overlay, then there should be no fees or processing costs for a resource consent.
The Home Bakery Ltd - Jeremy Lee Nicholas Baker	28.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C66) on the properties at 11, 13 and 15 Cussen Street because this steep bank area is largely overgrown with wandering dew and some exotic trees, and it is a small total area, not linked to any established gully system. The submitter has also requested a site visit.	Undertake a site visit and review the desktop assessment for the delimitation of the SNA (C66) affecting the properties at 11, 13 and 15 Cussen Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
W P Vautier	29.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C18) on the property at 20A Donny Avenue Chartwell because the trees were planted by the owners (there were not trees on site when the house was built); the owners have planted a variety of trees and shrubs with the idea that they can be thinned out when they reach maturity. This will allow underplanting to the owner's design. The submitter does not wish to be inconvenienced in their final design by having a category rating on the section and subsequent intervention, stating: "The garden design will be attractive".	Remove the SNA (C18) from the property at 20A Donny Avenue, Chartwell.
Jane McLeod	30.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports protection on established trees on private property because trees are valuable for: (i) Carbon sequestration; (ii) Providing habitat for native (and other) birds; (iii) Helping create native bird corridors between other established trees on public and private land; (iv) Improving air quality in increasingly dense housing with little space for trees. 64 Knighton Rd has significant trees.	Established trees on private land initially identified by the owner and reported to the Council are assessed by the Council's contracted Arborlab Consulting Services. If the trees meet the STEM criteria they are protected from being felled. Developers are obliged to protect these trees including their root area in the process of planning housing for the site.
Jane McLeod	30.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support	The submitter supports protection on established trees on private property because trees are valuable for: (i) Carbon sequestration; (ii) Providing habitat for native (and other) birds; (iii) Helping create native bird corridors between other established trees on public and private land; (iv) Improving air quality in increasingly dense housing with little space for trees. 64 Knighton Rd has significant trees.	Perform an assessment of the trees at 64 Knighton Road to check if they meet STEM criteria to be protected.
Alison Gray	31.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of notable tree T235 (Street Trees) on Marire Avenue due to the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roots were extremely shallow and likely to fall in extreme weather conditions The roots of trees are growing into the private properties The submitter advises trees required to be properly maintained not to cause damage and costs to private properties and for safety of people.	Reconsider for scheduling of the group of notable trees on Marire Avenue in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees.
Zanite Limited - Ian Robert Mackie	32.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.2 at the rear of 10,12, 14 Opoia Road due to the following reasons; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees are on a very steep bank, are not stable and are not suited in position for such large specimens, which is likely to create hazard to people and properties. Significant overhanging of branches likely to create hazard to properties and people and difficult to maintain as the trees located on steep bank. The submitter advises to plant the Kowhai and Pohutukawa as ideal replacements. (T253.2 is being identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D).	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.2 from Schedule 9D,

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Zanite Limited - Ian Robert Mackie	32.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.3 at the rear of 10,12, 14 Opoia Road due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees are on a very steep bank, are not stable and are not suited in position for such large specimens, which is likely to create hazard to people and properties. Significant overhanging of branches likely to create hazard to properties and people and difficult to maintain as the trees located on steep bank. <p>The submitter advises to plant the Kowhai and Pohutukawa as ideal replacements.</p> <p>(T253.3 is being identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D).</p>	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.3 from Schedule 9D.
John Higgins and Gabriella Bakk Higgins	33.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The Submitters oppose the scheduling of 58a Lake Crescent as a heritage item. (Schedule 8A:Built Heritage, Item H230)	Delete 58a Lake Crescent, H230, from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage.
Justin Mulligan	34.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (C44) on the property at 39 Millthorpe Crescent Pukete.	Remove part of the SNA (C44) from the property at 39 Millthorpe Crescent Pukete.
Justin Mulligan	34.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of the Augusta Street, Casper Street and Roseberg Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA4, and in particular the inclusion of property at 17 Augusta Street as part of the HHA, because these areas already established. The submitter also supports any other property owners that oppose this Augusta Street and Casper Street Historic Heritage Area.	Remove 17 Augusta Street from the Augusta Street, Casper Street and Roseberg Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA4.
The Young Ones Trust - Murray and Allison Grant	35.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the notable trees (T184 - group of Street Trees) on George Street, Hamilton for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all the trees are of an age that they should be considered heritage. They cause ongoing problems with damage to the road, footpaths and drains/sewer. The tree roots and leaf litter are dangerous to pedestrians on George Street. The leaf litter also blocks drains, so when medium/large rain event the water does not flow away and floods private property. 	Do not schedule the street trees (T184 - group of Street Trees) on George Street as heritage trees and to physically remove the trees next to 32 and 34 George Street.
ECS Group - Jason Smith	36.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter seeks removal of Archaeological Site A158 (S14/89) from 47 Maui Street given the consented industrial development that has occurred on the site.	Reconsider and remove Archaeological Site A158 (S14/89) from 47 Maui Street.
Debbie Manktelow	37.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the inclusion of 12A Clifton Road within the protected root zone of a proposed notable tree because the property is down a right of way (RoW) and the root protection zone touch the carriageway access to our RoW.	Removal of 12A Clifton Road from the protected root zone of the proposed notable tree (T142.8).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Mitchell Arndell Trust - Dianne Miller	38.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone of the notable tree (T234.2) over 14A Mardon Road because the property is a small cross lease section and imposing this will have significant limitations on the use of the property and further development of the site such as garaging (which it does not have at present).	Remove the protected root zone (for notable tree, T234.2) from the property at 14A Mardon Road.
Tom Andrews	39.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Discretionary activity status for accessory buildings or new buildings within any scheduled site ranked A (Rule 19.3.1 d).	Amend Rule 19.3.1d to read: Accessory buildings or new buildings <u>up to a maximum of xxx (perhaps 30m2)</u> within any scheduled site ranked A = P And - Consider implementation of design guidelines for owners of heritage items, which may include paint colour, design of/height of fencing etc.
Tom Andrews	39.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Restricted Discretionary activity status for Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site (Rule 19.3.1 o). Managing the effects of such small structures would be better dealt with via design guidelines rather than regulation.	Amend the activity status of Rule 19.3.1o, from Restricted Discretionary to Permitted, And - Consider implementation of design guidelines for owners of heritage items, which may include paint colour, design of/height of fencing etc.
Nicola Stewart	40.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 89 Tristram Street as Built Heritage because, the buildings is already surrounded on 3 sides by low buildings that have the option of being replaced by multi level buildings "that would leave Tristram St a small dark sunless island in the middle of mountains. (We are all ready feeling and seeing the effects of this, with the erection of ACCs building that gave no thought to being next to a residential block. There was no consideration to privacy and sun. And I am not sure what provision has been made to ensure the lights are not shining all night from the inside.)". The building being in the middle of town is very noisy and the option to replace windows as several apartments have done all ready with double glazing should be available.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage by deleting the scheduled item: H293, 89 Tristram Street. or If the building remains scheduled that the following is applied to future development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surrounding buildings be required to take into consideration that 89 Tristram Street is residential; The requirement for sun and privacy for the apartments residents is protected; and That the options to upgrade the building with double glazing and modern heating options be always available.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Ian McLeod	41.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of Archaeological Site A166 (S14/185) from their property at Lot 129 DPS 61646 (77 Harrowfield Drive). The submission notes the absence of iwi consultation and ground truthing in the site's assessment. The subject site was included as an investigation area, however, this is different to an archaeological site. The submission considers the site to be significantly altered due to Wairere Drive's construction which resulted in fill relocated to the site and the site's recontouring.	Remove Archaeological Site A166 (S14/185) from the property at Lot 129 DPS 61646 (77 Harrowfield Drive).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Ian McLeod	41.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support	<p>This submission supports the C54 insofar that it affects the property at 77 Harrowfield Drive (Lot 129 DPS 61646).</p> <p>The owner has planted both native and exotic trees on his property, on top of the gully edge to enhance the indigenous vegetation within SNA C54.</p>	<p>Retain the extent of C54 as shown on the planning maps insofar that it affects 77 Harrowfield Drive.</p> <p>Retain the entry in Schedule 9C C54.</p>
Patsy Maree Briggs	42.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of their property at 9 Seifert Street within the Seifert Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA26 on the basis that it is a 1960's Huntly brick home that is not in its original state; and they are part way through the design stage of a substantial exterior alteration/addition and this rule change has serious financial implications to our project.</p>	<p>We seek for our home to not be deemed historic given the nature of this home.</p>
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Clyde Bunker Limited	43.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the archaeological and cultural sites overlay of A121 on property at 8 Clyde Street (Lot 1 DPS 62259) as per notified planning map, this is because Schedule 8C Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites does not include or identify this property being affected by A121. The existing A121 overlay under the Operative District Plan also does not identify this property being affected. The submitter also opposes the identification of such property being affected by the archaeological and cultural site overlay given the technical report prepared by WSP as notified for Plan Change 9 does not say that it is an archaeological site and does not recommend that the A121 listing be identified as such.</p>	<p>Remove the archaeological and cultural sites overlay of A121 from property at 8 Clyde Street (Lot 1 DPS 62259) from notified planning map.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Clyde Bunker Limited	43.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) as it does not provide maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as footpaths, as a Permitted Activity. The submitter considers the requirement of resource consent for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces or upgrades to existing street frontages is onerous, because of the additional costs and time required, and a more specific rule is required to manage adverse effects.	<p>Amend Rule 20.3.w, and any subsequential changes as necessary, to read:</p> <p>a. The following activities located within the Protected Root zone of any notable tree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Earthworks (excluding as provided for by v., i., ii. or iii). ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface <u>that increase the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at 9date of plan change</u>. iii. The alteration of the ground level by impervious materials iv. Additions to, or the replacement of, any existing building or structure that is proposed to exceed the envelope or footprint of the existing building(s) or structure(s) v. The placement and/or construction of any building or structure vi. Directional drilling or boring for trenchless pipe/duct installation less than 800mm below the ground surface vii. The storage, release, injection or placement of chemicals or other toxic substance viii. The storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment ix. Planting of trees <p>a.</p> <p>The storage, release, injection or placement of chemicals or other toxic substance</p> <p>The storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment.</p> <p>Planting of trees</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Clyde Bunker Limited	43.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (b) - (d) as these standards are too restrictive and affect the the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites. The submitter also considers this rule will be extremely difficult to show compliance with and monitor by Council	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (b) - (d). Any subsequential amendments necessary.
Monaco Properties Ltd - David Charles and Christine Robyn Couch	44.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	Protected Tree and Inability to fully develop site because of potential damage to tree from damage to root system. If the protection of the tree [T22] on Princes Street adversely affects the potential development of our site at 2 Princes Street, Hamilton we are concerned and suggest HCC investigate a root pruning system that will preserve the tree and we retain our existing rights of ownership.	Seeks the HCC approval to fully develop 2 Princes Street, Hamilton and that Council investigate a system to prune the protected tree in question - prune the roots system.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Panama House Limited	45.1	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the extent and location of archaeological overlay of A116, A172 and A173 does not extend to property at 15 Grantham Street (Lot 1 DP 447697) as showing on the Planning Map. This is because an extensive archaeological assessment has been undertaken on this site and no archaeological features found.	Retain the extent and location of archaeological overlay of A116, A172 and A173 on the planning map as notified.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Panama NZ Limited Partnership	46.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The Submitter supports the identification of the building at 14 (20) Garden Place (Lot 1 DP 29766) as a Heritage B item (H207).	Retain the identification of the building at 14 (20) Garden Place (Lot 1 DP 29766) as a Heritage B item (H207) in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage as notified.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Panama NZ Limited Partnership	46.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes in part provisions of 19.3.1 as no Rules permit the upgrade of street level facades for the purpose of enhancing shopfronts for retail, for enabling pedestrian interaction (other than access), or adding to the vibrancy of the streetscape. While the Submitter supports the preservation generally of heritage buildings, and understands this as a matter of national importance, economic and social considerations also needs to be had. Excessive levels of regulation over matters such as altering shopfronts and restricting signage can add financial burden and deter landlords from owning heritage buildings. It is the uncertainty of whether a heritage building can be 'opened' up at street level will affect the ability to attract a tenant, thus adversely impacting of the vibrancy at the street level and the investment of the owner. ie, if a retailer cannot be 'seen' then they are less likely to tenant a building.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that alterations to shopfronts and signs below the verandah level /at street level is permitted. This could be provided by way of a new permitted Rule, or an amendment to 19.3.1h, or 19.3.1j to include retail and office shopfront alterations as permitted. Additionally, a new rule, or amendment to 19.3.1q could be made to permit signage below the verandah for the purpose of retailing/office identification.</p>	Amend Rule 19.3.1h to include retail and office shopfront alterations as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Panama NZ Limited Partnership	46.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes in part provisions of 19.3.1 as no Rules permit the upgrade of street level facades for the purpose of enhancing shopfronts for retail, for enabling pedestrian interaction (other than access), or adding to the vibrancy of the streetscape. While the Submitter supports the preservation generally of heritage buildings, and understands this as a matter of national importance, economic and social considerations also needs to be had. Excessive levels of regulation over matters such as altering shopfronts and restricting signage can add financial burden and deter landlords from owning heritage buildings. It is the uncertainty of whether a heritage building can be 'opened' up at street level will affect the ability to attract a tenant, thus adversely impacting of the vibrancy at the street level and the investment of the owner. ie, if a retailer cannot be 'seen' then they are less likely to tenant a building.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that alterations to shopfronts and signs below the verandah level /at street level is permitted. This could be provided by way of a new permitted Rule, or an amendment to 19.3.1h, or 19.3.1j to include retail and office shopfront alterations as permitted. Additionally, a new rule, or amendment to 19.3.1q could be made to permit signage below the verandah for the purpose of retailing/office identification.</p>	Amend Rule 19.3.1j to include retail and office shopfront alterations as a permitted activity.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - Panama NZ Limited Partnership	46.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes in part provisions of 19.3.1 as no Rules permit the upgrade of street level facades for the purpose of enhancing shopfronts for retail, for enabling pedestrian interaction (other than access), or adding to the vibrancy of the streetscape. While the Submitter supports the preservation generally of heritage buildings, and understands this as a matter of national importance, economic and social considerations also needs to be had. Excessive levels of regulation over matters such as altering shopfronts and restricting signage can add financial burden and deter landlords from owning heritage buildings. It is the uncertainty of whether a heritage building can be 'opened' up at street level will affect the ability to attract a tenant, thus adversely impacting of the vibrancy at the street level and the investment of the owner. ie, if a retailer cannot be 'seen' then they are less likely to tenant a building.</p> <p>The Submitter seeks that alterations to shopfronts and signs below the verandah level /at street level is permitted. This could be provided by way of a new permitted Rule, or an amendment to 19.3.1h, or 19.3.1j to include retail and office shopfront alterations as permitted. Additionally, a new rule, or amendment to 19.3.1q could be made to permit signage below the verandah for the purpose of retailing/office identification.</p>	Add new rule or amend Rule 19.3.1q to allow signage below the verandah on scheduled built heritage, for the purpose of retailing/office identification as a permitted activity.
Martin Bourke	47.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the premise that having state house styles, is justification for inclusion of Marire Ave into the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street HHA and further is unclear why certain houses were excluded when others, that are clearly not of a 'State Style', are included, reinforcing the perception that the proposal has been insufficiently ground truthed.	Exclude Marire Ave from the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA 19.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - The Riverbanks Limited	48.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the archaeological overlay showing A170 on properties 286-298 Victoria Street (Lot 1 DP 432586) as these properties are not listed under Schedule 8C Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites.	Remove the archaeological overlay showing A170 on properties 286-298 Victoria Street (Lot 1 DP 432586).
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - The Riverbanks Limited	48.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes there is a lack of permitted controls for upgrade of street level facades for the purpose of enhancing shopfronts for retail, for enabling pedestrian interaction (other than access), or adding to the vibrancy of the streetscape. While the submitter supports the preservation generally of heritage areas, and understands this as a matter of national importance, economic and social considerations also need to be had. The submitter raises concerns that the current provisions and controls under Rule 19.3.2 restricting the alterations of shopfronts can place financial burden on, and deter landlords from owning heritage buildings and adversely impacting of the vibrancy at the street level.	Add a rule or amend Rule 19.3.2.a to allow alterations to street level facades (for the purpose of enhancing streetscape character, vibrancy and pedestrian interest/interaction) as a Permitted Activity.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Matt Stark - The Riverbanks Limited	48.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the archaeological overlay showing A170 on properties 286-298 Victoria Street (Lot 1 DP 432586) as these properties are not listed under Schedule 8C Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites.	Remove the archaeological overlay showing A170 on properties 286-298 Victoria Street (Lot 1 DP 432586).
Robert Mitchell	49.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 in its entirety.	Remove Plan Change 9 in its entirety.
Simon and Mily Leadley	50.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter requests that the lower part of their property, 35 Balfour Crescent is included as a SNA.	That the SNA is correctly identified on the lower part of 35 Balfour Crescent and on the neighbouring property of 37 Balfour Crescent.
Simon and Mily Leadley	50.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of the archaeological site, A20 as notified.	Retain as notified the protection of the archaeological site A20.
Rachel Coffin	51.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter supports heritage protection but does not believe property owners should have to pay consent costs to ensure this happens.	Private home owners of heritage buildings/trees will be supported to uphold the heritage character without having to pay additional fees, defined as fees above what non-heritage home owners have to pay.
Johanna M.G. Minkhorst	52.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of heritage areas and character houses of Hamilton East.	the protection of heritage areas and character houses of Hamilton East.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sandra Margaret Eaton	53.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes heritage standards that allow the building of residential structures that do not blend in with the heritage of the city.	The retention of character areas would be possible if new single and double height structures are blended into these areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Style, materials, colours, landscaping and streetscape must ensure that new structures harmonize with existing homes. • Onsite parking and provision for rubbish and recycling receptacles need to be provided to ensure streets, footpaths and verges are clean, tidy and accessible. • Of UTMOST IMPORTANCE is that our architectural heritage is valued and preserved for the future and that streetscapes retain their heritage/character attributes.
Sandra Margaret Eaton	53.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	That 6 storey buildings are limited to the close confines of the CBD and that 3x3s are not erected in a piecemeal fashion throughout old residential areas. These should be confined to specified blocks within suburbs.	That 6 storey buildings are limited to the close confines of the CBD and that 3x3s are not erected in a piecemeal fashion throughout old residential areas. These should be confined to specified blocks within suburbs.
John and Kim Kelly	54.1	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes chapter 25:2 and the provisions relating to protected root zone, stating that there needs to be greater support for land owners should roots damage a property including Council obligation to protect landowners.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete any requirement for a resource consent and replace with managing issue by consultation between Council and the affected party 2. Include an obligation for the Council to protect landowners property if damage is being caused.
John and Kim Kelly	54.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes chapter 25:2 and the provisions relating to protected root zone, stating that there needs to be greater support for land owners should roots damage a property including Council obligation to protect landowners.	Delete any requirement for a resource consent and replace with managing issue by consultation between Council and the affected party Include an obligation for the Council to protect landowners property if damage is being caused.
Raymond Keith Kett	55.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (C12) at 15 Jennifer Place Chartwell because the area has been modified, has sewer pipe, open stormwater drain and the vegetation is not significant.	Remove the SNA (C12) from the property at 15 Jennifer Place Chartwell.
Raymond Keith Kett	55.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (C12) at 15 Jennifer Place Chartwell because the area has been modified, has sewer pipe, open stormwater drain and the vegetation is not significant.	Remove part of the SNA (C12) from the property at 15 Jennifer Place Chartwell.
GE and R Bourne Family Trust	56.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the Hamilton East HHA, as the new provisions will have a financial impact (consent needed for many activities) and will restrict potential future changes/development of the property.	To not impose a HHA on the Hamilton East.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Foster Develop Limited - Lloyd Stephenson	57.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the built heritage scheduling of the building at 3 Hardley Street because, the site contains a dwelling with WSP Heritage Assessment of predominately low ratings and an unknown history. There is a moderate rating for architectural qualities. The land owner holds a Certificate of Compliance for the demolition of the heritage identified buildings and re-development of the site within a root protection zone (there is now a notable tree fronting Hardley Street). The certificate is valid for 5 years and demolition is planned to take place in quarter 4, 2023.	Remove all reference of H219 - 3 Hardley Street from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage.
Foster Develop Limited - Lloyd Stephenson	57.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the extent of the Protected Root Zone and the scheduling of notable tree T207.3, 3 Hardley Street because, it is not a native tree and has been damaged by recent storms. The root protection provision is significant and extends a considerable distance into the site without the root system being known.</p> <p>Seeks the removal of the notable tree listing in order to complete demolition of existing building (have received the letter from HCC for demolition on 19th July 2022 without a resource consent), stating "We are happy to provide additional roadside planting in the event any damage to the existing tree is caused".</p> <p>(T207.3 is being identified at 1 Hardley Street in Schedule 9D).</p>	Remove all reference to the notable tree T207.3 from Schedule 9D and any consequential amendments.
Hestia Investments Ltd - Michael John Neale	59.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree and protected root zone because the submitter believes the restricting of future development by the protected root zone provisions will devalue the property.</p> <p>It is unreasonable to pay for and gain a resource consent to do any work within the protected root zone by affected property for HCC owned and maintained tree on a council verge.</p> <p>The submitter stating that "if I had a tree on my property that adversely affected powerline for example, outside my property, then the liability falls on my to maintain my tree so as to not cause such an issue".</p>	Delete the notified tree requirement when it affects a residential property or provide compensation for property owners affected by notable tree provisions, including the cost of gaining any Resource Consent, and the effect that it will have on a property's value.
Cherian Sebastian	60.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes their property at 158 Ulster Street being scheduled H295 in Appendix 8A: Built Heritage	Delete the scheduled item: H295, 158 Ulster Street from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage.
Cherian Sebastian	60.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes their property at 164 Ulster Street being scheduled H295 in Appendix 8A: Built Heritage.	Delete the scheduled item: H295, 164 Ulster Street from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jacqueline Naomi Fitchman	61.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter advises that 18 Plunket Tce is not within the protected root zone of the notable tree of T260, but the submitter received the letter from HCC the property is within the protected root zone of a notable tree.	The location of the tree [T260] in Plan Change 9 corrected to reflect its actual location.
Nidhi Singh	62.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter notes that there are no trees, canopies or any other notable trees on 84 Lake Crescent.	The submitter would like Council to acknowledge the site does not have any notable trees or SNAs and remove them from the planning maps.
Rosemary Margaret and Rodney Darrall Lugton Stephanie Kay Lugton	63.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter supports the Council in increasing indigenous trees and vegetation and protecting it, but does not agree with the approach requiring resource consent for simple structures (stairs, fencing).	Seeks that Council provide the exact boundaries of SNA on the property at 13 Keitha Place, Glen view.
Rosemary Margaret and Rodney Darrall Lugton Stephanie Kay Lugton	63.2	General	General	Support in part	Seeks the LIM report including details related to the recorded SNA on their property at 13 Keitha Place, Glenview.	Seeks the LIM report including details related to the recorded SNA on their property at 13 Keitha Place, Glenview.
Grant Svendsen	64.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support	The submitter supports the changes to the SNA as notified.	Seeks rates relief for where the SNA is on private property for those parts that can never be developed as a result of the SNA.
Harris St John Ditchburn	65.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the classification of SNA on their property, stating "Since the house was built in the '70's previous owners and myself have retained the property and planted all plant life without assistance from council. We are also constantly fighting with weeds from surrounding properties. So I fail to see how it can be deemed a significant natural area. The area has mixed exotic and native planting and is full of noxious weeds such as Wandering Dew, ivy, blackberry etc which we constantly battle".	That the area around and in my property not be designated as Significant Natural area. [23 Eton Drive, cSNA, C40]
Edward Arthur Gann	66.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone of the scheduled notable tree T298.6 on 12 and 14 Tisdall Street.	Would like H.C.C. to remove restrictions re roots.
David and Jennifer Hake	67.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C35) on 5 Huntington Drive Huntington because it is not natural (it has been planted either by the owners or previous owners and has little of native trees and growth).	Delete the SNA (C35) from 5 Huntington Drive Huntington.
Rosemary Margaret and Rodney Darrall Lugton	68.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the Council in increasing indigenous trees and vegetation and protecting it, but does not agree with the approach requiring resource consent for simple structures (stairs, fencing). The Submitter agrees that large structures should not be allowed and that indigenous trees and vegetation should not be removed.	Seeks amendment of the rules to allow for simple structures to be built without without resource consent. Seeks the definition of a large structure and amendment of rules to not allow large structures.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Rosemary Margaret and Rodney Darrall Lugton	68.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter seeks that Council provide the exact boundaries of SNA on their property at 7 Clements Crescent, including a site visit with owners present.	The submitter cannot agree with the extended SNA until exact details of the boundary are provided by Council, including a site visit by qualified staff with us present.
Rosemary Margaret and Rodney Darrall Lugton	68.3	General	General	Oppose	<p>Our property is at 7 Clements Crescent, Queenwood on the edge of the Kirikiriroa gully system adjacent to the Waikato river. The property is extensively planted in mature indigenous trees and vegetation. Restoration of the gully began 55 years ago. It was cleared of pine trees, blackberry, honeysuckle, willow and is now relatively easy to maintain but left to its own devices would quickly return to weeds.</p> <p>We support Council wishing to increase the indigenous trees and vegetation and protecting it but not the way they are going about it. Simple structures eg fences and steps should be exempt from Resource Consent. We agree large structures (these should be defined) not be allowed and indigenous trees and vegetation not removed.</p> <p>Landowners with SNAs need support and encouragement to plant native trees to control weeds. They need Council to educate them on what ecologically correct trees to plant and where taking into account that small trees eventually become very large trees and throw shade. Remembering we are planting in a city where people build houses for sun and views. Council needs to be looking at this as a 100 year + plan if it is serious about extensive native planting and have staff to support that.</p>	Seeks Council support for landowners who want to genuinely enhance gully corridors with no further cost to the landowner.
Duncan McAdam	69.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Restrictions to existing buildings are already strict and do not need to be made more difficult.</p> <p>If building restrictions are made more difficult and planning permission is always a requirement then the actual value of houses in HHA's are false and the rates should be subsequently reduced.</p> <p>I have always wanted to replace the flat roof on the front bedroom of my house that was added in the 50s with one more in keeping with the historical design of the house but to have to obtain planning permission + building consent is not a financially viable option!</p> <p>Yes we do not want building intensification in HHA's from developers but we do want to allow sensible alterations inside and out!</p> <p>[Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area, HHA13]</p>	Seek advice from locals not so called experts in their field. The Hayes Paddock HHA only came about thanks to the hard work of local residents and now once again the Hamilton City Council is trying to drive through legislation without true and proper consultation with local residents first!

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Duncan McAdam	69.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Restrictions to existing buildings are already strict and do not need to be made more difficult.</p> <p>If building restrictions are made more difficult and planning permission is always a requirement then the actual value of houses in HHA's are false and the rates should be subsequently reduced.</p> <p>I have always wanted to replace the flat roof on the front bedroom of my house that was added in the 50s with one more in keeping with the historical design of the house but to have to obtain planning permission + building consent is not a financially viable option!</p> <p>Yes we do not want building intensification in HHA's from developers but we do want to allow sensible alterations inside and out!</p>	<p>Seek advice from locals not so called experts in their field. The Hayes Paddock HHA only came about thanks to the hard work of local residents and now once again the Hamilton City Council is trying to drive through legislation without true and proper consultation with local residents first!</p>
Jan Brassington and Glen Kilgour	70.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part the built heritage scheduling of 2 Kitchener Street, but conditional on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there being a annual 5 % rates rebate for the recognition of the contribution heritage makes to the amenity of Hamilton • being permitted to create a shared driveway at 2 Kitchener Street, to be shared between the current home and the new dwelling that will be constructed on the tennis court area on the bottom level of the section; • being permitted to build a tasteful second dwelling on the section, on the flat lower level of the property where there is currently a tennis court; • ability to replace the cracked concrete block wall along the front of the property; • being permitted to replant the garden surrounding the current home, to improve its aesthetics, now that the original concrete blockwork has been painted. 	<p>The retention on Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage of H227, 2 Kitchener Street, but conditional on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there being a annual 5 % rates rebate for the recognition of the contribution heritage makes to the amenity of Hamilton • being permitted to create a shared driveway at 2 Kitchener Street, to be shared between the current home and the new dwelling that will be constructed on the tennis court area on the bottom level of the section; • being permitted to build a tasteful second dwelling on the section, on the flat lower level of the property where there is currently a tennis court; • ability to replace the cracked concrete block wall along the front of the property; • being permitted to replant the garden surrounding the current home, to improve its aesthetics, now that the original concrete blockwork has been painted.
Jan Brassington and Glen Kilgour	70.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The concrete block fence at the front of the property is currently cracked and leaning over due to tree roots disturbing the ground underneath.</p>	<p>We require permission to replace this concrete block fence at some stage in the ensuing 5-10 years.</p>
Jan Brassington and Glen Kilgour	70.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	<p>The submitter has identified errors in the Built Heritage Inventory for 2 Kitchener Street (H227) and seeks those to be corrected.</p>	<p>That the Built Heritage Inventory for H227 - 2 Kitchener Street be reviewed and information corrected.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Karen Burgess	71.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T241 at 20 Naylor Street due to the following reason; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fallen leaves causing blockage of gutters and very near to toby tap. • Growing roots interfering with the sewer system and damaging the fence. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T241 from Schedule 9D.
Karen Burgess	71.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter is seeking advice as to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. why their property will not meet the new heritage protection criteria and 2. what that will mean for future sales potential 	No specific relief sought.
Robyn and Graham McBride	72.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	General	Oppose	The submitter requests that the lower part of their property, 37 Balfour Crescent is included as a SNA.	That the SNA is correctly identified on the lower part of 37 Balfour Crescent.
Robyn and Graham McBride	72.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of the archaeological site, A20 as notified.	Retain as notified the protection of the archaeological site A20.
William Courtney McMaster	73.1	General	General	Support	In general, the submitter supports Plan Change 9 and in particular the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas (HHAs). Support for the inclusion of 259 River Road, in the new Claudelands HHA. Submits that there is a need for detailed urban design guidelines/principals for new buildings and alterations to existing buildings in HHA's. Submits that the rules should exclude any future 'three plus three' development in HHA's. Submits that owners of Heritage Buildings within HHAs should have access to an expanded Hamilton Heritage Grant Fund.	No specific relief sought.
William Courtney McMaster	73.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	The submitter supports the new provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas (HHAs).	Seeks that the provisions relating to HHA's be retained unless otherwise submitted on by the submitter.
William Courtney McMaster	73.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports proposed provisions in relation to built heritage under Plan Change 9.	Retains proposed provisions and controls in relation to built heritage under Plan Change 9.
William Courtney McMaster	73.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the identification and provisions related to the Claudelands HHA.	Seeks that the provisions relating to the Claudelands HHA are retained in full unless otherwise submitted on by the submitter.
William Courtney McMaster	73.5	4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	4.3.1 Activity Status Table – General Residential Zone, Residential Intensification Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of activities (Chapter 4, provision 4.3.1 - oo, pp, ss, tt, uu, vv) which require recognition of scheduled HHA In Vol 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8D	Retain the inclusion of activities 4.3.1 oo, pp, ss, tt, uu, vv as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
William Courtney McMaster	73.6	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	4.4.8 Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter is of the opinion that fences that are 1.8m high should be a permitted activity in a HHA, if they meet HHA design guidance.	Amend Rule 4.4.8 to allow 1.8m fences as a permitted activity if they meet HHA design guidance.
William Courtney McMaster	73.7	4.5 Rules – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.5.1 Comprehensive Development Plan Process	Support	The submitter supports inclusion of new text in Comprehensive Development Plan Process (Rule 4.5.1 v).	Retain new text in Rule 4.5.1 v relating to Comprehensive Development Plan Process as notified.
William Courtney McMaster	73.8	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of provisions within the District Plan relating to the Special Residential Zone - Claudelands West.	Retain all provisions relating to Special Residential Zone - Claudelands West.
William Courtney McMaster	73.9	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support	The submitter support Objectives and Policies in 5.2 relating to Special Character Zones (5.2.1 and 5.2.2) and Special Residential Zones (5.2.3).	Retains Objectives and Policies in 5.2 Special Character Zones (5.2.1 and 5.2.2) and Special Residential Zones (5.2.3).
William Courtney McMaster	73.10	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports that the matters of discretion and assessment criteria (RD activities) must include HHAs.	Retain HHA's in 5.6 as part of Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria.
William Courtney McMaster	73.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports provisions 19.1 (Purpose) and j, k, l, m and n relating to HHA's.	Retain provisions 19.1 - Purpose of HHA's (j, k, l, m and n)
William Courtney McMaster	73.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports objectives and policies relating to HHA's (19.2.4 and 19.2.5). Does not support 19.2.5a iv in respect of small scale modifications in an HHA.	Retain 19.2.4 and 19.2.5 and question need for 19.2.5a iv for activities that are of a small scale within a HHA.
William Courtney McMaster	73.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports all the rules in 19.3.2 relating to HHAs but considers that fences and/or walls located forward of the front building line of the dwelling, have a maximum height of 1.2m permitted, have a maximum height of 1.8m should be Permitted if it meets HHA design guidance as outlined in 19.4.3.	Retain 19.3.2. Amend 19.3.2 h to reflect that fences of 1.8m in an HHA are a Permitted activity if they meet specified HHA design guidelines as outlined in 19.4.3.
William Courtney McMaster	73.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports new buildings in an HHA being classified as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Seeks retention of new dwellings being Restricted Discretionary activity status where they are in an HHA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
William Courtney McMaster	73.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support	The submitter supports provisions for fences in an HHA.	Retain Rule 19.4.3 as notified.
William Courtney McMaster	73.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports provisions under 19.6 but seeks inclusion of a new requirement under Matters of Discretion that sets out specific urban design guidelines for new buildings or modified buildings in HHAs.	Retain 19.6 as notified. Add new requirement for Restricted Discretionary that sets out specific urban design guidelines for new buildings or modified buildings in HHAs.
William Courtney McMaster	73.17	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	The submitter supports Objective 23.2.5 and Policy 23.2.5 a in relation to HHAs.	Retain Objective 23.2.5 and Policy 23.2.5 a.
William Courtney McMaster	73.18	25.1 Development Suitability	25.1.2 Objectives and Policies: Development Suitability	Support	The submitter supports inclusion of Policy 25.1.2.2.b ii as notified.	Retain Policy 25.1.2.2b ii.
William Courtney McMaster	73.19	25.10 Signs	25.10.2 Objectives and Policies: Signs	Support	The submitter supports 25.10.2.1e in regards to signage in HHAs must not compromise the identified heritage values and the heritage resources.	Retain Policy 25.10.2.1e.
William Courtney McMaster	73.20	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	Supports definition of HHA.	Retain HHA definition in 1.1
William Courtney McMaster	73.21	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support	The submitter supports the provisions of 1.2.2.8 a to e but suggests that a Heritage Impact Report should not be required for small small scale modifications etc in HHAs.	Retain 1.2.2.8 a to e
William Courtney McMaster	73.22	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports proposed assessment criteria E1 a to r, E2 and E3 a to f.	Retain assessment criteria E1 a to r, E2 and E3 a to f as notified.
William Courtney McMaster	73.23	1.4 Design Guides	General	Support	To protect the integrity of HHAs, the submitter seeks the addition of new urban design guidelines for new buildings or modifications in HHAs.	Add new urban design guidelines for new buildings or modifications in HHAs. These design guidelines must be a requirement under Restricted Discretionary activity assessment for HHAs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
William Courtney McMaster	73.24	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support	The submitter supports 8-3 Assessment of HHAs. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3].	Retain 8-3 as notified. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3].
William Courtney McMaster	73.25	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.1 Heritage Themes that Historic Heritage Significance to the City	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of 8-3.1 Heritage Themes. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.1].	Retain 8-3.1 as notified. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.1].
William Courtney McMaster	73.26	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.2 Historic Heritage Area Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of 8-3.2 HHA Assessment Criteria. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.2].	Retain 8-3.2 as notified. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.2].
William Courtney McMaster	73.27	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of 8-3.3 HHA Assessment. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.3].	Retain 8-3.3 as notified. [Submission incorrectly refers to 8.3.3].
William Courtney McMaster	73.28	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of Schedule 8D 8 Claudelands HHA.	Retain Schedule 8D 8 Claudelands HHA as notified.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	74.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all matters and provisions in relation to built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 and considers they do not align with the purposes, objectives and goals for climate change. The submitter also raises concern the implication of built heritage and historic heritage area will reduce the ability to modernise the property or adapt the property to meet the challenges of climate change, such as install north facing solar panels.	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	74.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all matters and provisions in relation to built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9, in particular considers the implications of built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas will adversely affect development potentials and property values. The submitter also considers there is a lack of demonstration of benefits of protecting historic heritage for the city and the citizens.	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	74.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes all matters and provisions in relation to built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9, in particular considers the implications of built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas will limit and restrict variations, alterations and modification to the existing property.	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	74.4	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all matters and provisions in relation to built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9, in particular concerns the additional costs as a result of the implications of built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9. The submitter also opposes there is a lack of compensation to property owners as a result of Plan Change 9.	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	74.5	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all matters and provisions in relation to built heritage and Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9, in particular considers there is a lack of public consultation and engagement with the community at Hayes Paddock area.	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Christine Barbara Doube	75.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	General	Support	The submitter supports scheduling of Notable Tree in front of the 9 Masters Avenue because it is important and valuable tree for carbon link. It cools the environment in summer and is greatly beautiful. The submitter also support the requirement of resource consent for any activities to be done within protected root zone.	Seeks the protection of the tree in front of 9 Masters Avenue as well as all the trees along Masters Avenue.
Dr Warren and Paula Gumbley and Money penny	76.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter oppose the proposed changes relating to the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and seek to have the existing rules and provisions retained.	Retain the existing rules and provisions for Hayes Paddock.
Dr Warren and Paula Gumbley and Money penny	76.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Policy Framework of the Chapter	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for a site-specific Heritage Impact Statement and considers that, given the wide ranging controls of PC9, that this will require Heritage Impact Assessments for trivial modifications, which is considered unreasonably burdensome.	Retain the existing rules and provisions for Hayes Paddock.
Dr Warren and Paula Gumbley and Money penny	76.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.j (New Buildings - RD activity status) and considers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This rule appears contradictory and incompatible with proposed rule 19.3.2.c, which permits "ancillary residential structures". 2. Given the definition of buildings in the proposed plan, that this is a significant escalation of controls both in terms of the extent and scale (existing rules do not control the erection of structures in the rear of sections). 	Retain the existing rules and provisions for Hayes Paddock.
Alvin Bryce Cooper	77.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed boundaries for the HHA for Hamilton East, specifically those associated with our property at 13 Nixon Street and neighbouring properties in Cotter Place which are not in the HHA.	This issue could be resolved by HCC making one of the following 3 decisions, in order of preference: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excluding 13 Nixon Street (and presumably 1 Cotter Place, on the other corner) from the HHA, making it subject to the same rules as the Cotter Place enclave.* 2. Including Cotter Place in the HHA, making these properties subject to the same rules as 13 Nixon Street and 1 Cotter Place.* 3. Least preferred, applying the HHA Overlay height in relation to boundary and setback standards to non-HHA sites adjacent to HHA properties (as recommended in the Knott report) and remove the extra fencing rules proposed for HHA properties. <p>*Note: The HHA assessment report for Nixon Street (SH to Brookfield Street) scores the lowest of those included in the HHAs, with some of the criteria scores highly subjective and contestable. My point here is not to denigrate the work done but merely to show that it 'just scraped in' and is not of high heritage value.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports the relocation of buildings and structures within Schedule 8A, is avoided, except where the relocation is necessary to facilitate the on-going use, adaptive re-use, or protection of the building or structure or to ensure public safety.	Retains Policy 19.2.3b(i) as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports the relocation of buildings and structures within Schedule 8A, is avoided, except where the relocation allows for significant public benefit that would not otherwise be achieved.	Retain Policy 19.2.3b (ii) as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports work for earthquake strengthening, fire protection, building services and accessibility upgrades to heritage buildings and structures must ensure that the materials and design reflect the heritage values, and avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on heritage values including by minimising visual effects of additions to the heritage structure.	Retain Policy 19.2.3i as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports maintenance and repair of buildings or structures in Schedule 8A where compliance with Rule 19.4.1 is achieved is a permitted activity. as it will allow for maintenance and repair of built heritage as a permitted activity for the continued operation and functioning of railway activities involving built heritage.	Retain Rule 19.3.1(a) as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1 d. because it is not always possible to avoid adverse effects on SNA areas in relation to the operation of existing infrastructure.	Seeks the retention of Policy 20.2.1 d. as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1 g. because it enables infrastructure to be located near or within SNA's recognizing they have an operational and functional need for that location; provide public benefits; and contribute to the economic, social, cultural and environmental well-being of people and communities. Maintaining the rail network, includes vegetation pruning to ensure that it is a resilient network and can function efficiently and effectively in the long term.	Seeks the retention of Policy 20.2.1 g. as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1 h. because of the recognition that the need for essential pruning, maintenance and tree removal within the SNA is necessary in instances where a high risk is posed to public health and safety and property. The specific ability to improve or increase the safety or avoid harm to existing infrastructure provides for a resilient rail network that can function safely and efficiently.	Seeks the retention of Policy 20.2.1 h. as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports the protection of Notable Trees by assessing the character of the area in which the tree is located, including streetscape and public realm areas. The submitter also supports a policy that recognises existing activities and the environment where the tree is located.	Retain Policy 20.2.3a as it notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitters supports Rule 20.3 a. because it allows for the pruning, maintenance and removal of vegetation and trees in the SNA where there it poses a risk to public health, safety or proper as a permitted activity.	Seeks the retention of Rule 20.3 a. as notified.
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3 k. because it allows for the operation, maintenance and renewal of existing infrastructure within SNA's as permitted activity, subject to standards.	Seeks the retention of Rule 20.3 k. as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kiwirail Holding Limited (Kiwirail) - Jodie Mitchell	78.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.7 A. permitted activity standards for the maintenance or removal of vegetation or trees where required for operation, maintenance, renewal and upgrade of, or access to existing infrastructure.	Seeks the retention of Rule 20.5.7 A.
Rasha Ejeilat	79.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	While supporting heritage protection in general, the submitter considers blanket restrictions of Historic Heritage Areas on house demolition and removal too generic and inconsistent with other housing objectives.	Remove blanket demolition and new builds for all sites within Historic Heritage Areas regardless of their specific status.
Alexander and Clair Gillespie and Breen	80.1	General	General	Support	The submitters support intensification, provided it is done in areas which are suitable, that historical sites are protected, and it is to a high quality.	No specific relief sought.
Alexander and Clair Gillespie and Breen	80.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitters partly support the proposed B listing over 45 Firth Street but consider that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Owners should be able to make reasonable changes to their houses, consistent with the historical values of the site and street. 2. The surrounding houses should be subject to some control over height and density, so as to maintain an overall integrity to the street. 3. Additional controls (height and density) are needed for adjoining properties. 4. Home owners should be supported when they maintain or restore houses of historic value 	The protection of the historical value of the current Villa precinct areas of Firth Street, consistent with the above points. Conservation needs to be seen beyond individual houses, to an area which can be ensured for future generations, via rules which ensure its overall integrity via both density and height.
Alexander and Clair Gillespie and Breen	80.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support	The submitters seek maximum protection for the natural environment.	Strong protection for the natural environment and restoration of degraded areas.
Alexander and Clair Gillespie and Breen	80.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitters support the protection of all notable trees.	Please continue to conserve all of the protected trees in Hamilton East. Make sure also, that regular maintenance is done on them, to ensure that they are as safe as possible.
Ruth Eliatamby and M Q Fine	81.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 in its entirety in relation to 16 Grey Street.	Remove Plan Change 9 in its entirety in relation to 16 Grey Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Rhys Jones	82.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Regarding the proposed Te Aroha St (East) Historic Heritage Area, HHA29, the submitter would like to make changes to the properties included within the area and specifically to exclude the properties along the northern boundary (adjacent to the eastern rail corridor). The reasons given are that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These houses are generally of lower heritage value due in part to their proximity the rail line (increased levels of noise and vibration) 2. These homes could be replaced with a more intensive strip of properly insulated two story terrace houses which would provide a sound-dampening corridor for the rest of the HHA. 	To exclude the properties adjacent to the eastern rail corridor from the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, HHA29.
Parish of the Holy Cross - Fr Andrew Stuart Young	83.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the object of Chapter 19 - Historic Heritage, however requests that the heritage status applies only to the identified heritage building and not the entire site related to the building at 86-88 Clarkin Road.	Seeks that the heritage status applies only to the identified heritage building (H173 St Joseph's Fairfield Chapel and Spire) and not the entire site related to the building at 86-88 Clarkin Road.
Bourke Family Trust - Bernard Bourke	84.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of the full title (e.g. cross-lease situation) of a heritage building because it imposes heritage status on buildings that do not meet the heritage rules.	Amend Schedule 8A to use a specific property identifiers rather than the property's legal description to ensure other buildings in a cross-lease situation are not impacted by the heritage status of the scheduled building.
Bourke Family Trust - Bernard Bourke	84.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		The submitter oppose the proposal that imposes the built heritage regulations on properties that are not envisaged to be covered by the proposals and those properties CAN BE separated by recognising the specific property identifiers.	That the council use specific property identifiers for imposing heritage status on buildings that do not meet the built heritage rules, and which those other properties can be identified separately from the heritage building.
Pamela Francis Jean McAdam	85.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	With the intense property development in this area I feel that on my demise any developer would clear the site of all history including the trees. Part of my property was an original gully which was filled in during the construction of the arterial route in the late 50's early 60's. An aerial view of my property shows an area of lovely native bush worth protecting.	Seeks some protection of the trees on the property.
Pamela Francis Jean McAdam	85.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Support	With the intense property development in this area I feel that on my demise any developer would clear the site of all history including the trees. Part of my property was an original gully which was filled in during the construction of the arterial route in the late 50's early 60's. An aerial view of my property shows an area of lovely native bush worth protecting.	Seeks some protection of the trees on 9 Manning Street.
Pamela Francis Jean McAdam	85.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter acknowledges 9 Manning Street as being a built heritage item (H235).	No relief stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Abby Leigh Van De Ven	86.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of their property at 13 Mangakoea Place within Archaeological Site A112 (S14/4).	Review the Archaeological Site A112 (S14/4) to exclude 13 Mangakoea Place.
Vetora Hamilton - Elizabeth Foo	87.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter is wanting an extension of the Hamilton East HHA to include Galloway Park and the properties along Fox Street (with restrictions on building height) The reasons for this are to recognise the importance and history of the Park including that it is a social hub for the community.	To include Fox St and Galloway Park within the Hamilton East HHA with restrictions on building height.
Vetora Hamilton - Elizabeth Foo	87.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The original special Character Zone of Hamilton east in the current Operative district plan should be transferred to HHA zoning.	To extend the Hamilton East HHA to reflect the area covered by the special character zone of Hamilton East as per the operative district plan
Vetora Hamilton - Elizabeth Foo	87.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter requests that rear sites, within the HHA, should be protected from overshadowing, excessive run off and privacy from adjoining lots that are not in the HHA, by including such adjoining properties into the HHA.	Introduce provisions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect rear lots from overshadowing, loss of privacy and drainage issues from the possible intensification of adjoining properties • acknowledge that rear sites do not impact the streetscape • ensure flexibility in set backs, site coverage and building facades for rear sites • allow 2 storeys height for sites 3 houses back from the street
Oliver Schurmann	88.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C83) at 18 Taniwha Street because (i) part of the proposed SNA area encompasses a flat concreted terraced area as well as a small hut built on a deck extending the flat area; (ii) another part encompasses an orchard tree and not indigenous vegetation; (iii) the extension of the SNA at 18 Taniwha Street is higher then on other sites (such as 22 Avon Street); (iv) the owner prevents the existing native trees from being strangled and smothered by weeds and the SNA	Move the boundary of the SNA (C83) for 18 Taniwha Street 10m further into the gully.
Oliver Schurmann	88.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the proposal for SNAs because it is insufficient to ensure that the requirements stated on 20.2.1e, 20.2.1m and 20.2.1o are met. The Maeroa gully is infested with blue morning glory bind weed which kills trees unless they are actively and routinely protected. The property at 18 Taniwha Street has established native trees as the owner and the previous owner look have been looking after the trees (otherwise they would be dead in two years). The restrictions, therefore, disincentive owner participation by imposing restrictions and devaluing property.	HCC should provide evidence that the proposed restrictions will lead to an improved Maeroa gully area, particularly in light of the invasive weeds. Without evidence it should be scrapped or amended in the Maeroa Gully Area. Example Amendment proposal - The plan could provide incentives and support to owners who actively protect native trees within the SNA. For example - x\$ council tax rebate for each native tree over x age which is proven alive and protected. Annual photo updates submitted to council. A scheme like this would support citizen engagement and mobilisation.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jennifer Anne Elgie	89.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C78) as its current delimitation at 1133 River Road because the area does not seem to have significant high quality floristic. The submitter supports in part that classification as a 'corridor' to habitation on one side of the property (road side).	A site visit and reassessment of the extent of the SNA (C78) boundary at 1133 River Road.
Doug Moon	90.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C54) at 4 Harrowfield Drive because the existing 1950's house is very close to the edge of the bank (which presented signs of erosion and may have been established with planting). However, significant retaining walls may need to be constructed at some point in the future and the SNA will make the process even costly and complex.	Remove the SNA (C54) from the property at 4 Harrowfield Drive.
Doug Moon	90.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter provides the History, Geography and actions carried out at 4 Harrowfield Drive and have specific concerns for costs of requiring consents for future slope stability works for steep bank section. The submitter opposes to proposed boundary of SNA at 4 Harrowfield Drive in terms of existed tree which support stability of the steep section.	Seeks the proposed SNA boundary (the section of the bank behind the house, through to the southern boundary), to move back to the legal boundary to give the ability to manage and stabilise the whole bank.
Jess and Ben Tiley	91.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports heritage protection, however, believes house alterations such as those that support growing families should be better enabled. The submitter also wishes for overhead lines to be placed underground to protect street trees.	No relief sought.
Trevor George Nye	92.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter points out that if a property is identified as a 'built heritage' funding is necessary because the owners option of demolition and rebuild is prohibited once the property is listed Historic Heritage.	Take into account the responsibility council has when determining a property is Built Heritage by ensuring the building provides long lasting benefit to the wider community. The built Heritage designation is now a joint responsibility including owner and council.
Graham Gilbert Bryers	93.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of notable trees in Schedule 9D and its protected root zone at 13 Sexton Road because the root zones have increased and encroached onto the submitter property (9 Sexton Road) and neighbouring properties. In relations to these trees, there are also issues such as excessive growth, possible storm toppling, shading, leaves falling and debris problems. T50.1, T50.3, T50.4, T50.5, T50.6, T50.8, T50.9 and T50.10 are scheduled under ID T50.	Delete the group of notable trees in the area at 13 Sexton Road from Schedule 9D and their protected root zone and a meeting between HCC and neighbouring residents to address the adverse effects of tree overgrowth/nuisance.
Graham Gilbert Bryers	93.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of notable trees and associated root protection due to the impacts on private property rights. This proposal has potential to restrict building and property improvements, various usage activities, and impact resale values.	Plan Change 9 tree root protection proposal simply be null and voided.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Errol Mithcell Barks	94.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.2 at 12A Opoia Road due to the following reasons as stated;</p> <p>" 1. They are exotic trees that are in the wrong place in the landscape and built environment. 2. They shade out private dwellings - exacerbated by being at the top of a high natural bank an their own height and girth. 3. They effectively enhance winter frosts and cold periods. 4. They are a hazard to property and people. 5. They subdue natural native plants on the bank. 6. They spread their seeds on the loose bank material requiring significant work to stop their spread on private property. 7. They are either incorrectly located in Council's map or they are on private land. 8. I object to Council stealing private property rights by stealth - they are not yours!! 9. They interfere with power lines!"</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the tress from the register. 2. Remove the trees. 3. Work with the landowners to establish appropriate Native plantings.
Errol Mithcell Barks	94.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.3 at 12A Opoia Road due to the following reasons as stated;</p> <p>" 1. They are exotic trees that are in the wrong place in the landscape and built environment. 2. They shade out private dwellings - exacerbated by being at the top of a high natural bank an their own height and girth. 3. They effectively enhance winter frosts and cold periods. 4. They are a hazard to property and people. 5. They subdue natural native plants on the bank. 6. They spread their seeds on the loose bank material requiring significant work to stop their spread on private property. 7. They are either incorrectly located in Council's map or they are on private land. 8. I object to Council stealing private property rights by stealth - they are not yours!! 9. They interfere with power lines!"</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the tress from the register. 2. Remove the trees. 3. Work with the landowners to establish appropriate Native plantings.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Earthbrooke Properties Ltd - Megan Ruby Balks	95.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.2 at 12A Opoia Road due to the following reasons as stated by submitter;</p> <p>"1. These two trees are a health and safety hazard that we, our tenants, and our neighbours have repeatedly requested Hamilton City Council remove. They are heavily pruned on the River Road side to keep them away from the road and powerlines. They cannot be easily pruned on the Opoia Road side as they are at the top of a steep bank. Thus they are very lop-sided and overhang on the Opoia Rd side. Large branches have fallen on the path by the door of 10A Opoia Rd which is a danger to our tenants. If the whole tree were to fall it could seriously damage the homes at 10, 12, and 14 Opoia Rd. Similar trees have recently fallen, or had dangerously large branches fall, nearby at Memorial Drive, Memorial Park, Steel Park and recently an Oak of similar age fell and killed one person in Cambridge.</p> <p>2. Being situated at the top of a steep bank above 10, 12 and 14 Opoia Rd means the two trees provide an exceptionally high shade footprint that adds to the shading, and thus cold and dampness in the houses below them.</p> <p>3. Oak pollen causes allergy issues for some people.</p> <p>4. We appreciate trees within the city but consider that you must have the right tree in the right place. Large specimen Oak trees belong in open grasslands and park land, not jammed against powerlines at the top of a steep, and potentially unstable, bank, overhanging people's homes. We consider that a planting of smaller native trees, such as kowhai, would be far more appropriate at this site. Kowhai would attract native birds such as tui, bell bird (for flower nectar) and keruru (who eat the leaves of kowhai) and continue the theme of kowhai planting on the adjacent riverbanks and Claudelands Road.</p> <p>5. Oak trees are effectively a symbol of colonialisation - we consider it appropriate to replace these trees with natives such as kowhai.</p> <p>6. At 10 Opoia Rd we have tried to control weeds and plant natives and other shrubs on the steep slope. However many trees we planted have not survived under the dry shade of the oak, and only the toughest weeds thrive there. The steep nature of the bank means that it is not practical to establish grass and mow it."</p>	Do not classify the two oak trees at the rear of 10, 12 and 14, Opoia Road as "notable" trees [T253.2 and T253.3], but instead remove them (as they are a health and safety hazard) and replace them with a planting of native trees - we suggest Kowhai and Pohutukawa.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Earthbrooke Properties Ltd - Megan Ruby Balks	95.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.3 at 12A Opoia Road due to the following reasons as stated by submitter;</p> <p>"1. These two trees are a health and safety hazard that we, our tenants, and our neighbours have repeatedly requested Hamilton City Council remove. They are heavily pruned on the River Road side to keep them away from the road and powerlines. They cannot be easily pruned on the Opoia Road side as they are at the top of a steep bank. Thus they are very lop-sided and overhang on the Opoia Rd side. Large branches have fallen on the path by the door of 10A Opoia Rd which is a danger to our tenants. If the whole tree were to fall it could seriously damage the homes at 10, 12, and 14 Opoia Rd. Similar trees have recently fallen, or had dangerously large branches fall, nearby at Memorial Drive, Memorial Park, Steel Park and recently an Oak of similar age fell and killed one person in Cambridge.</p> <p>2. Being situated at the top of a steep bank above 10, 12 and 14 Opoia Rd means the two trees provide an exceptionally high shade footprint that adds to the shading, and thus cold and dampness in the houses below them.</p> <p>3. Oak pollen causes allergy issues for some people.</p> <p>4. We appreciate trees within the city but consider that you must have the right tree in the right place. Large specimen Oak trees belong in open grasslands and park land, not jammed against powerlines at the top of a steep, and potentially unstable, bank, overhanging people's homes. We consider that a planting of smaller native trees, such as kowhai, would be far more appropriate at this site. Kowhai would attract native birds such as tui, bell bird (for flower nectar) and keruru (who eat the leaves of kowhai) and continue the theme of kowhai planting on the adjacent riverbanks and Claudelands Road.</p> <p>5. Oak trees are effectively a symbol of colonialisation - we consider it appropriate to replace these trees with natives such as kowhai.</p> <p>6. At 10 Opoia Rd we have tried to control weeds and plant natives and other shrubs on the steep slope. However many trees we planted have not survived under the dry shade of the oak, and only the toughest weeds thrive there. The steep nature of the bank means that it is not practical to establish grass and mow it."</p>	Do not classify the two oak trees at the rear of 10, 12 and 14, Opoia Road as "notable" trees [T253.2 and T253.3], but instead remove them (as they are a health and safety hazard) and replace them with a planting of native trees - we suggest Kowhai and Pohutukawa.
Peter Were	96.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is concerned with ongoing loss of character homes and is encouraging the protection and preservation of a number of pre-1940's homes along Queens Avenue (between 1 and 100 Queens Avenue). A number of these are examples of California Bungalows, Arts & Crafts Cottages and Interwar Houses.	That all properties (comprising pre-1940 housing stock) between 1 Queens Avenue and 100 Queens Avenue be included in a Historic Heritage Area and be subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - building controls that limit any further multi-unit development - building controls that ensure future development will ensure an architectural aesthetic sympathetic to the character streetscape of Queens Avenue

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Alison Cradock	97.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the built heritage scheduling of 89 Tristram Street (H293) because "the body corporate for this block of flats has an awesome long term maintenance and improvement plan but adding costs will put extra pressure on apartment owners, will add complexity, and may prevent some improvements being made".	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to delete all reference to H293, 89 Tristram Street. or If the building remains scheduled - to give leniency in the changes that can be made and do not incur extra charges from the council.
Raymond Noel Mudford	98.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter is unsure about the criteria and weighting applied to determine what should be included in the heritage and archaeological site.	A comprehensive, round-table, dialogue with the various suburbs in the community, discussing: 1. Heritage & Archaeological criteria. 2. Specifically how this criteria will be applied. 3. How heritage will be preserved in the long term. 4. How compensation will be applied to those affected. 5. The timeframe for change
Raymond Noel Mudford	98.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter is unsure about the criteria for determining a significant natural area, how the boundary of a significant natural area is legally defined, what the consequence of extension of SNA into private property, how property owners are being compensated when their property rights have been impacted.	A comprehensive, round-table, dialogue with the various suburbs in the community, discussing: 1 Significant Natural Areas criteria. 2. Specifically how this criteria will be applied. 3. How these natural areas will be maintained. 4. How compensation will be applied to those affected. 5. The timeframe for change
Raymond Noel Mudford	98.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter is unsure about the criteria for determining a notable tree, the consequence if a notable tree, located on council land, falls and damages a private property and the criteria for removing a notable tree.	A comprehensive, round-table, dialogue with the various suburbs in the community, discussing: 1. Notable Tree criteria. 2. Specifically how this criteria will be applied. 3. How these trees will be maintained. 4. How compensation will be applied to those affected. 5. The timeframe for change
Raymond Noel Mudford	98.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarity on what compensation is being given to the existing land owners, who have purchased these properties with a known criteria, possibly with changes in mind and having this criteria changed, without consultation. And, if there is compensation contemplated, the community have not been informed about the financial impact and therefore the rate impact of this decision.	A comprehensive, round-table, dialogue with the various suburbs in the community, discussing: 1. Heritage & Archaeological criteria. 2. Specifically how this criteria will be applied. 3. How heritage will be preserved in the long term. 4. How compensation will be applied to those affected. 5. The timeframe for change
Raymond Noel Mudford	98.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter asks, if Council are serious about heritage, why do we not have a heritage park where high value heritage items are restored and maintained for future generations?	A comprehensive, round-table, dialogue with the various suburbs in the community, discussing: 1. Heritage & Archaeological criteria. 2. Specifically how this criteria will be applied. 3. How heritage will be preserved in the long term. 4. How compensation will be applied to those affected. 5. The timeframe for change

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Joseph Desmond Healy	99.1	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.3.1 Activity Status – Special Residential, Special Heritage, Special Natural Zones and Rototuna North East Character Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Rule 5.3.1(b) because this will trigger resource consents and additional costs, which will discourage the development.	Amend the Rule 5.3.1(b) to remove any requirements for Resource Consents or consultations for additions, alterations and demolition etc.
Joseph Desmond Healy	99.2	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.3.1 Activity Status – Special Residential, Special Heritage, Special Natural Zones and Rototuna North East Character Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes proposed the Rule 5.3.1(qq) because this will trigger resource consents for the dwellings under the overlays of the schedule HHA and which in turns affects HHA area regarding demographic, built-environment and property values.	Amend the Rule 5.3.1(gg) to remove any requirements for Resource Consents or consultations for additions, alterations and demolition etc.
Joseph Desmond Healy	99.3	General	General	Oppose	<p>I strongly oppose Plan Change 9. The imposed changes are too harsh and are ultimately removing the underlying rights associated with property ownership from the Registered Proprietors of the affected areas, including myself.</p> <p>This looks like a cheap and lazy blanket approach around the preservation of the "historical" areas which define Hamilton. The requirement for Resource Consents to make changes will be extremely cumbersome and expensive for owners. It will detract peoples willingness to improve their dwellings, which will result in lower quality dwellings in the area.</p>	No relief sought.
Premier Group NZ Limited - Michael Powell	100.1	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of definition of 'pest control' because it does not emphasise the essential of maintaining and enhancing native bush. The submitter also asks for inclusion of the definitions the right of an owner to remove dead and early colonizing native trees, for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing native bush.	Amend the Plan and definitions specifically for 'pest control', to either update document references or clarify that the definitions do not apply to SNA; and to allow the above exemption for mature properties containing native bush . Also expand the definitions to allow for removal of all exotic species and noxious weeds if they are part of a plan to replace them with native species. Also include an obligation on owners of native bush to continually maintain poison bait stations for Opossums and Rats.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Premier Group NZ Limited - Michael Powell	100.2	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of definition of 'Vegetation trimming and maintenance' because it does not emphasise the essential of maintaining and enhancing native bush. The submitter also asks for inclusion of the definitions the right of an owner to remove dead and early colonizing native trees, for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing native bush.	Amend the Plan and definitions specifically for 'vegetation trimming and maintenance', to either update document references or clarify that the definitions do not apply to SNA; and to allow the above exemption for mature properties containing native bush . Also expand the definitions to allow for removal of all exotic species and noxious weeds if they are part of a plan to replace them with native species. Also include an obligation on owners of native bush to continually maintain poison bait stations for Opossums and Rats.
Premier Group NZ Limited - Michael Powell	100.3	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of definition of 'vegetation removal' because it does not emphasise the essential of maintaining and enhancing native bush. The submitter also asks for inclusion of the definitions the right of an owner to remove dead and early colonizing native trees, for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing native bush.	Amend the Plan and definitions specifically for 'vegetation removal' to either update document references or clarify that the definitions do not apply to SNA; and to allow the above exemption for mature properties containing native bush . Also expand the definitions to allow for removal of all exotic species and noxious weeds if they are part of a plan to replace them with native species. Also include an obligation on owners of native bush to continually maintain poison bait stations for Opossums and Rats.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Premier Group NZ Limited - Michael Powell	101.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seek amendments to Rule 20.3 a. to e. to ensure faster progress of maintenance and clearing of invasive species that allowed for in the notified plan change, because of the state of neglect by all owners of the gully systems over a number of years and that the responsibility be shared between HCC and private landowners.	<p>The submitter seek amendments to Rule 20.3a. to Rule 20.3e. to ensure faster progress of maintenance and removal of invasive species within the SNA by including the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That homeowners and HCC are both under the plan made responsible within 30 days of receiving written notice from a member of the public or from HCC requesting to remove all noxious weeds and invasive exotic tree species such as self sown gums, willows, Japanese walnuts, etc on SNA land that impede or threaten growth of indigenous species - that within 30 days of that notice the receiving party shall ensure that the offensive vegetation is removed and replaced with native species suitable for the site. • That a meaningful penalty provision shall apply for every day exceeding the 30 day period. • That maintenance of SNA sites shall be subject to the same notice process but with a 14 day requirement for remedy. • Seeks that surveillance cameras should be erected on all gully paths to protect the public and to aid apprehension of motorbike riders through gullies that destroy indigenous vegetation off path and endanger pedestrians. • Seeks that motor bikes should be banned from all paths by both notice and stiles and full access fencing to all SNAs
Robert George	102.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed Te Aroha St HHA and is supportive of Bond St and the general area being included in the proposed HHA.	That the proposed Te Aroha St HHA, Bond St and the general area is included in the proposed HHA.
Fleur Marillier	103.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the proposed Ashbury Ave HHA but would like 5 and 7 Ashbury Avenue added.	Extend the Ashbury Ave Historic Heritage Area to include 5 and 7 Ashbury Avenue.
Marx Davis Investments Ltd - Sonya Maree Marx	104.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the scheduling of 10 Boundary Rd, Claudelands (H167), because Hamilton's historical and heritage attributes are protected and preserved by building preservation rules.	Retain H167 on Appendix 8A : Built Heritage

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Marx Davis Investments Ltd - Sonya Maree Marx	104.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the Historic Heritage Area #10 - Frankton Railway Village because 12 Weka Street and the surrounding 1920 era Railway Cottages on streets Pukeko, MakoMako, Kea, Moa, Rifle Range Rd, The Community Hall & Original NZ Railways Joinery Factory. Make up the largest of unique architectural history of NZ Railway Buildings. Their historical and heritage attributes need to be protected and preserved by building preservation rules.	Retain the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area (HHA10).
G and M Donald Family Trust - Michelle Donald	105.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports all provisions that protect specific heritage buildings and sites.	Include provision for that protect specific heritage buildings and sites that are ground truthed.
G and M Donald Family Trust - Michelle Donald	105.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the provisions that protect Hamilton's Gully System.	Seeks the promotion of provisions that protect Hamilton's gully system from inappropriate development
G and M Donald Family Trust - Michelle Donald	105.3	General	General	Support	The submitter supports provisions that protect Hamilton's Gully system, provisions that protect the Waikato River from inappropriate development, provisions that protect specific heritage buildings and sites.	No specific relief sought.
Cherian Sebastian	106.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes 158 Ulster Street (H295) being a scheduled built heritage item.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H295, 158 Ulster Street.
Cherian Sebastian	106.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes 164 Ulster Street (H296) being a scheduled built heritage item.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H296, 164 Ulster Street.
Max Walker Verran	107.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Support in part	The submitter supports part of their property at 222 Baverstock Road, 3373m ² of developed wetland, being identified as SNA (F14).	Review the boundary of the SNA (F14) at 222 Baverstock Road to only include the redeveloped wetland area (3373m ²).
Margaret Melsom	108.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	Submitter supports the exclusion of 4 Albert Street from the Hamilton East HHA.	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Phillip Currow	109.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the protected root zone for the notable tree T227.8 at 42 Liverpool Street due to the following reasons as stated by the submitter;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The identified tree is located on public land and it is considered onerous for a street tree protection zone to extend within Mr Curnow's private land. • The root protection zone radius is 15.2m from the centre of the street tree and cuts significantly into Mr Curnow's land. • The vast majority of the proposed root protection zone already contains concrete hardstand, carparking and built form and it is considered onerous to apply a consent requirement for future works located within this area. • There is also concern raised about the lack of exemptions, lack of empirical evidence and blanket application of such a large root protection zone. Especially, when the hard stand and built form may have already dictated root growth away from the subject site or away from any future work areas. • Phillip Curnow's land is zoned commercial and further development of the land is therefore a likely outcome. The proposed changes will significantly impact on any future development of the land". 	Removal of the protected root zone from 42 Liverpool Street.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Phillip Currow	109.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the consent requirements because these will create financial and timing issues.	<p>Amend rule 20.3w to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to the development of the site.</p> <p>Seeks to make significant changes to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to the development of the site.</p>
Waikato Farmers Trust - Kara Gerrand	110.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the 'Protected Root Zone of a Proposes Notable Tree' on private property because of the impact on owners wishes to undertake any work in the future within this 'protected root zone', the resource consent requirements, and the de-value of the property by restricting future development.	Delete the "Protected Root Zone of a Proposed Notable Tree" when it effects a private proper owner. or, if this is not an option, then at the bare minimum private property owners should be compensated by Council, including the cost of having to obtain any Resource Consent plus the effect that it will have on the property's future value.
Timothy Raymond Jeffs	111.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to PC9 in its entirety, along with the introduction of the Acacia Crescent HHA ,and considers that this will devalue the properties and limit owners options in terms of future redevelopment.	To keep our properties in a general residential zone - we don't want a Heritage Zone.
ETJ Investments - Nicola Susan Moon	112.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Plan Change 9, but opposes the provisions and controls for Historic Heritage Areas that presently limited development opportunities at the rear of the existing properties. The submitter seeks the change in the activity status for such developments to be permitted. This will also align with the existing provisions and controls under Special Character Zone, provided that the additions and alterations are of sympathetic to the existing building onsite and the surrounding environment.	Amend Rule 19.3.2 (a) to allow additions and alterations to occur at the back of the existing properties as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
ETJ Investments - Nicola Susan Moon	112.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Plan Change 9 but opposes the provisions and controls for Historic Heritage Areas should allow some developments to occur at the rear of the existing properties as a permitted activity. This will also align with the existing provisions and controls under Special Character Zone, provided that the developments, additions and alterations are of sympathetic to the existing building onsite and the surrounding environment.	Amend Rule 19.3.2 (j) to allow new buildings to occur at the back of the existing properties as a permitted activity.
ETJ Investments - Nicola Susan Moon	112.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers the extent of Graham Street Historic Heritage Area should be extended to includes parts of Naylor Street (between Graham Street and MacFarlane Street) and parts of Brookfield Street (between Graham Street and MacFarlane Street). This is because there are a number of properties on these streets have strong character attributes to the area. The two streets are also currently within the Special Residential Zone - Hamilton East thereby should be protected from inappropriate development.	Extend the boundary of the Graham Street Historic Heritage Area to include parts of Naylor Street (between Graham Street and MacFarlane Street) and parts of Brookfield Street (between Graham Street and MacFarlane Street).
Philippa Melton	113.1	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 5.2.1a-d however, amendments should be made to 1. If an immediate neighbour applies for resource consent to remove or demolish their house for a new build to be built, all neighbours should be notified. 2. All neighbours should have the right to make a submission in regard to the Resource Consent application. 3. The neighbours should also have the right to appeal if the Resource Consent is granted.	Amend Rule 5.2.1a-d as follows: 1. If an immediate neighbour applies for resource consent to remove or demolish their house for a new build to be built, all neighbours should be notified. 2. All neighbours should have the right to make a submission in regard to the Resource Consent application. 3. The neighbours should also have the right to appeal if the Resource Consent is granted. Apply these amendments, as stated above, should be applied in the Historic Heritage Areas.
Amanda Jane Beatson	114.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C18) on 22 McNicol Street, Fairfield due to potential errors relating to the location of the SNA boundary. The submitter has also requested a site visit.	That we have the opportunity to refine the mapped SNA boundaries on our property.
Amanda Jane Beatson	114.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C18) on 22 McNicol Street, Fairfield due to potential errors relating to the location of the SNA boundary. The submitter has also requested a site visit.	Would also want to know how this SNA might affect our rates. As a considerable portion of the rateable land is affected.
Lee Chong Guan	115.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to their property being included in the proposed Augusta Street, Casper Street & Roseberg Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA4 because they consider that the area is better suited for redevelopment.	The prioritization of the location of Historic Heritage protection to "old, worn & not well maintain properties" instead of the HHA coverage extent currently being proposed.
Amanda Marshall	116.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the new boundary of the proposed Claudelands HHA and the removal of the Claudelands West Special Character zone overlay.	Remove the Claudelands West Special Character zone overlay and apply the proposed Claudelands HHA as shown in the PC 9 maps.
Amanda Marshall	116.2	General	General	Support	The submitter supports PC 9 in its entirety and considers that the provisions will provide a more targeted protection of Hamilton's heritage and significant sites, while freeing up common sense areas to increase density, future proofing the city's housing supply.	Make Plan Change 9 operative in it's current form [as notified].

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Susan and Shane Angela and Burnett Housley	117.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter does not consider Rule 19.4.2(b) to provide sufficient direction that ensures recommendations by Mana Whenua relate directly to the proposal and the significance of any potential adverse affects.	Amended Rule 19.4.2(b) to provide further clarification.
Susan and Shane Angela and Burnett Housley	117.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of Lot 6 DPS 71459 within Archaeological Site A12 (S14/25, S14/28) as a Group 1 site due to site modification and ground disturbances.	That Archaeological Site A12 (S14/25, S14/28) over Lot 6 DPS 71459 be reclassified as a Group 2 site.
Ruakura Motors Tractor Parts Ltd - Brett Hopkins	118.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNAs (F31 and C40) at the property 1 County Crescent because the site is a large commercial site and 2 houses set on an area that has had significant sand removal in the 1940's by the Waikato District Council. The vegetation is not of any significance and supports a steep bank through the centre of the lot.	Remove the SNAs (F31and C40) from the property at 1 County Crescent.
Ruakura Motors Tractor Parts Ltd - Brett Hopkins	118.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNAs (F31 and C40) at the property 1 County Crescent because the site is a large commercial site and 2 houses set on an area that has had significant sand removal in the 1940's by the Waikato District Council. The vegetation is not of any significance and supports a steep bank through the centre of the lot.	Remove the SNAs (F31and C40) from the property at 1 County Crescent.
Ruakura Motors Tractor Parts Ltd - Brett Hopkins	118.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the attribution of archaeological site A176 to number 135, 143 and 147 Riverlea Road. These parcels are contiguous and were extensively modified more than 50 years ago. The submitter considers that evidence of prior usage related to maaori horticulture no longer remains. The submitter also opposes additional compliance measures imposed on future development through PC9. The submitter attaches a site record from from ArchSite which confirms that the pa site was destroyed by pumice mining in the 1950's.	Amend the extent of A176 so that it does not apply to numbers 135, 143 and 147 Riverlea Road. Amend to acknowledge that a severely modified site may no longer remain any of its past history.
Ruakura Motors Tractor Parts Ltd - Brett Hopkins	118.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the attribution of archaeological site A176 to number 135, 143 and 147 Riverlea Road. These parcels are contiguous and were extensively modified more than 50 years ago. The submitter considers that evidence of prior usage related to maaori horticulture no longer remains. The submitter also opposes additional compliance measures imposed on future development through PC9. The submitter attaches a site record from ArchSite which confirms that the pa site was destroyed by pumice mining in the 1950's.	Amend the extent of A176 so that it does not apply to numbers 135, 143 and 147 Riverlea Road. Amend to acknowledge that a severely modified site may no longer remain any of its past history.
Favor Properties Limited - Mahmoud Mohamed Shawky Mahmoud Abdebawwad Eid	119.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the part of the SNA (C39) at 22 Normandy Avenue, Melville because the original indigenous vegetation no longer exist (they have been cut down 2 years ago). This can be confirmed by sending a qualified person from the Hamilton City Council to inspect the site.	Delete the SNA (C39) from the property at 22 Normandy Avenue.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Favor Properties Limited - Mahmoud Mohamed Shawky Mahmoud Abdebawwad Eid	119.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C39) at 28 Normandy Avenue because the the area does not contain any of the five elements of the proposed Plan Change 9. The original significant indigenous vegetation were cut down two years ago. This can be confirmed by sending a qualified person from the Hamilton City Council to inspect the site.	Remove the SNA (C39) from the property at 28 Normandy Avenue.
Lydia Littlejohns and Claudio Arena	120.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Planned HHA areas should be restricted/contained in an entire block otherwise multiple 3-level houses will destroy the heritage look. 23 Oxford Street is not original, has been altered, and inconsistent with the other homes in the HHA. The submitter is concerned about restrictions under the HHA including fence height limits, building upgrades, and the lowering of property values. This submission also relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell Submission.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Lydia Littlejohns and Claudio Arena	120.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell Submission.	The commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA to see the housing types, variations and inconsistencies.
Lydia Littlejohns and Claudio Arena	120.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell Submission.	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
Aaron Paul and Therese Carter and Bailey	121.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter oppose 1188 Victoria (H306) being identified as built heritage.	Delete all reference to H306, 1188 Victoria Street from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Morth Trust Partnership (Stephen Wayne Morth/Rachel Caroline McGuire) - Steven Wayne Morth	122.1	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1 Significant Tree Assessment Valuation Method and Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable trees 7 x Quercus Robur / Oak tree (classified as potential status) at 1406 Pukete Road.	Remove all reference to the notable trees 7 x Quercus Robur / Oak tree (classified as potential status) from Schedule 9D.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton K.K Clayton	123.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed physical extent of the Frankton Railway Village HHA on the planning maps as it relates to Lot 13 DPS 86468 (RT: SA39D/575) and to all other land along Rifle Range Road identified as being within the extent of the HHA. The physical and visual characteristics associated with the cottages do not combine to make a positive contribution to the heritage significance or quality of the area and that it is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance.	Amend the relevant planning maps to delete the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area from all land fronting Rifle Range Road and the northern part of Pukeko Street and in particular from Lot 13 DPS 86468 (RT: SA39D/575).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton K.K Clayton	123.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.2 Historic Heritage Area Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed physical extent of the Frankton Railway Village HHA on the planning maps as it relates to Lot 13 DPS 86468 (RT: SA39D/575) and to all other land along Rifle Range Road identified as being within the extent of the HHA. The physical and visual characteristics associated with the cottages do not combine to make a positive contribution to the heritage significance or quality of the area and that it is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance.	Delete the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area from all land fronting Rifle Range Road and the northern side of Pukeko Street and in particular from Lot 13 DPS 86468 (RT: SA39D/575).
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 6 Claudelands Road as a Built Heritage Item.	Remove 6 Claudelands Road (H177) from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the associated rule framework that would apply to 6 Claudelands Road, specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed heritage listing.	That significant changes are made to the rule framework (Rule 19.3.1.b) that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the associated rule framework that would apply to 6 Claudelands Road, specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed heritage listing.	That significant changes are made to the rule framework (Rule 19.3.1.e) that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the associated rule framework that would apply to 6 Claudelands Road, specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed heritage listing.	That significant changes are made to the rule framework (Rule 19.3.1.i) that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the associated rule framework that would apply to 6 Claudelands Road, specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed heritage listing.	That significant changes are made to the rule framework (Rule 19.3.1.h) that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew David and Helen Nielsen	124.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the associated rule framework that would apply to 6 Claudelands Road, specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed heritage listing.	That significant changes are made to the rule framework (Rule 19.3.1.l) that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ewan Opie	125.1	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1.1 STEM Method of Evaluation	Support in part	<p>The submitter request to schedule as notable trees which are located on Mansel Ave and Masters Ave due to the following reasons:</p> <p>"In this section of street there are several significant and native trees. A very large Pohutukawa tree, substantial Kahikatea and Totara tree. I have marked these trees on the map above and they are shown in the individual pictures below. These trees, along with the mature planting of the homes in the area, bring lots of our native wildlife into the area (Tui, Piwakawaka, and Ruru) and having these trees in our neighbourhood makes it feel special".</p>	The submitter seeks the scheduling of trees located on Mansel Ave and Masters Ave as notable trees in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to the extent to the SNA (C78) at 1877 River Road because (i) these locational extents are considered prohibitive by the landowner on their property and to their knowledge, have been broadly applied across their property without an onsite examination or ground truthing of the significance of the vegetation to confirm these findings.</p> <p>Whilst the landowner recognises that the protection of SNA's from inappropriate subdivision, use and development is a matter of national importance under s6(C) and s6(f) of the Resource Management Act (RMA), the protection there are concerns about the wholesale application of the SNA across their property for the following reason: in terms of ecological significance, the SNA and where the physical boundary of the SNA sits has not been verified through a site visit, so its locational extent has not been confirmed.</p>	Remove or amend the SNA (C78) from the property at 1877 River Road so that it applies to the land/vegetation that is an SNA.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the application of Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) on 1877 River Road given there has not been a site visit and that the land has already been developed with no suggestion of archaeological features on the site.	Remove Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) from 1877 River Road.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3m because activities could lawfully be undertaken prior to PC9 now require a resource consent thereby stifling private property rights.	Amend Rule 20.3m to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3n because activities could lawfully be undertaken prior to PC9 now require a resource consent thereby stifling private property rights.	Amend Rule 20.3n to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3o because activities could lawfully be undertaken prior to PC9 now require a resource consent thereby stifling private property rights.	Amend Rule 20.3o to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3p because activities could lawfully be undertaken prior to PC9 now require a resource consent thereby stifling private property rights.	Amend Rule 20.3p to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3q because activities could lawfully be undertaken prior to PC9 now require a resource consent thereby stifling private property rights.	Amend Rule 20.3q to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter notes the proposed archaeological rules including Rule 19.3.3(b-e) would require consent for activities that were previously permitted where Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) applies.	Amend the rule framework to reduce the constraints and consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of a building or the site where Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) applies.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Helen Nielsen	126.12	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Oppose	The submitter notes the proposed archaeological rules including Rule 23.3.a (xi) would require consent for activities that were previously permitted where an Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) applies.	Amend the rule framework to reduce the constraints and consenting obligations in relation to redevelopment of a building or the site where Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) applies.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of “generally single level” as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or 2. That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Christine and David Bourke	127.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "generally single level" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 14 Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Wayne Giles	128.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitters partially support the SNA (C35) on their properties at 5A and 5B San Marco Lane, Rototuna. There are no issues to the area of being protected, however, there are concerns that regulations will restrict their ability to care the land which may, consequently, impact the ecological quality of the area.	Remove the SNA (C35) from the properties at 5A, 5B and 5C San Marco Lane, Rototuna.
C K Reddy Ltd - Chandra Kumar Reddy 20 Grey Street	129.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12, and in particular the inclusion of 20 Grey Street and considers that the area consists of modern (new) and old buildings and that the introduction of the PC9 provisions will limit the developmental potential of the property.	Maintain the existing zoning provisions for 20 Grey Street.
C K Reddy Ltd - Chandra Kumar Reddy 20 Grey Street	129.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12, and in particular the inclusion of 20 Grey Street and considers that the area consists of modern (new) and old buildings and that the introduction of the PC9 provisions will limit the developmental potential of the property.	Seek no further restriction on development potential of the property.
Kevin Burnard Nicholson	130.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the provisions introduced through PC9 including the HHA's and considers Hamilton East to be a vibrant community that is increasingly showing pride in their residences and that infill housing would destroy this.	Approve the Plan Change 9 Historic Heritage Area provisions as notified.
Kevin Burnard Nicholson	130.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with ongoing intensification including the strain that is put on ageing infrastructure, the lack of parking spaces and the lack of green spaces and parks.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require off-street parking for each residence 2. Require new intensification buildings to be in keeping with the surrounding area 3. Require screening for recycle and rubbish bins 4. Upgrade children's play areas and install more where appropriate 5. Reduce the number of liquor sellers

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Barbara Elizabeth Nicholson	131.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter advises to include enough controls for intensification of Hamilton East under Plan Change 9 and states following potential negative outcomes due to the rapid development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of green spaces and loss of habitat. • Car parking deficiencies. • Lack of space for numerous recycle bins. • New builds will look like dated slum area's in a very short space of time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impose strict controls to include parking space, bin areas and green spaces in Hamilton East. • Amend the council's regulations to use recycled materials for new builds and alterations. • To organize schemes such as competitions for implementation of cost effective housing designs.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	132.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter has concerns regarding the level of dilution that has already occurred in Hamilton East and that rather than demolition, restoration of heritage items is preferable to retain the heritage theme and streetscape. If demolition is necessary, that building materials, doors and windows etc should be made made available for renovations. Regarding 19.1 i, the submitter is of the opinion that to retain the original character, the priority should be to keep heritage homes on their site. This may devalue the home but this would help retain the overall character and streetscape. Submitter is concerned that the provisions will bring very little changes and security for heritage homes.</p>	Challenges Purpose 19.1 g. and i. but no specific amendments sought.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	132.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports that the provisions for fences and/or walls can be 1.2m or 1.8m, however is concerned about potential additional costs if there is a requirement to use the same materials for the fences and/or walls as the dwellings. The submitter is concerned about the requirement for 50% or more see-through visibility for fences up to 1.8m high which are difficult to design and may cause security issues. Prefers solid walls and gates.</p>	Challenges Rule 19.4.3 b. but no specific amendments sought.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	132.3	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>Submitter considers the minimum 20% permeable surface requirement under Rule 4.4.3 insufficient to reduce the volume of stormwater being discharged to existing infrastructure and to the river, and considers that referring to decking structures as permeable is inappropriate.</p>	Challenges Rule 4.4.3. but no specific amendments sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	132.4	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that care needs to be taken with the height in relation to boundary standard. The concern is the ability to protect and preserve heritage homes that share a common boundary with a 2-3 storey apartment, restricting light and causing rot.	Challenges Purpose Rule 4.4.5 b. but no specific amendments sought.
Hamilton East Advocacy Team (HEAT) - Cheryl Noble	132.5	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the requirement for outdoor living areas in Rule 4.4.10, in particular supports the maximum size requirement but opposes the minimum size requirement, as the majority will provide the minimum size. These green areas need to be maximum size only, so they can be put to some worthwhile use.	Submitter supports the maximum size requirement for outdoor living areas but seeks that the minimum size requirements be deleted.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.1	General	General		<p>In general, the submitter supports the Plan Change to capture the needs of the community, but wishes to ensure that its purpose in delivering a safe and reliable power supply is recognised and provided for. A number of changes to the provisions are requested in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable the operation and maintenance of network utility equipment in the Transport Corridor, in areas subject to Plan Change Overlays as a Permitted Activity. • Enable new aboveground and overhead infrastructure in some circumstances to avoid Archaeological Overlays. • Enable the operation and maintenance of network utility equipment in Significant Natural Areas and in the vicinity of Notable Trees. • Amend the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to be provided for works within a Historical Heritage Area (“HHA”) and instead include provisions for an equivalent report by a suitably qualified person. 	No specific amendments sought in relation to this submission point but amendments sought under the submission points that follow.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes provisions 19.1(l) and 19.1(m) in so far as it requires a site-specific Heritage Impact Assessment ("HIA") for development in an HHA. The submitter considers that this is unreasonable when other specialist reports can consider the compatibility of the development with the identified heritage values of the area.	That 19.1(l) and 19.1(m) are amended as per the submission to reflect that HIA's can be completed by other suitably qualified specialists or persons. Refer to submission for specific amendments sought.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Policies 19.2.4c and 19.2.5a in so far as that a site-specific Heritage Impact Assessment ("HIA") is required for development in an HHA. The submitter considers that this is unreasonable when other specialist reports can consider the compatibility of the development with the identified heritage values of the area.	That policies 19.2.4(c) and 19.2.5(a) are amended as per the submission, to reflect that HIA's can be completed by other suitably qualified specialists or persons. Refer to submission for specific amendments sought.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	WEL Networks supports in part Policy 19.2.6g subject to an amendment to provide for the maintenance of existing network utilities as a minor work. This will allow the submitter maintain existing utility equipment within Archaeological areas.	Amend Policy 19.2.6g as per the submission to include network utilities as a minor work. Refer to submission for specific amendments sought.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter, WEL Networks, proposes a new rule 19.3.3 f. that permits maintenance, repair or replacement (including associated earthworks) of existing established network utilities within an archaeological site.	Insert new Rule 19.3.3 f. that permits maintenance, repair or replacement (including associated earthworks) of existing established network utilities within a site identified in Schedule 8B and 8C. Refer to submission for specific drafting.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter seeks to amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 20.2.1 d. and Policy 20.2.1 g. to include the word "new" for clarity. Notably Rule 20.3(n) has been written to include 'new' infrastructure'. • Policy 20.2.1 h. to provide for the essential pruning and maintenance of SNA in close proximity to network lines given that severe weather conditions can negatively affect above ground equipment and overhead lines i.e. Falling trees/branches. Past occurrences has lead to electricity supply outages/disruptions. 	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the below policies as follows (refer to the submission for the proposed drafting in full):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 20.2.1 d. as follows: "Where it is not possible for <u>new</u> infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways to avoid the adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas..." • Policy 20.2.1 g. as follows: "Enable <u>new</u> infrastructure and public walkways." • Policy 20.2.1h: Recognise the need for essential pruning, maintenance and tree removal in Significant Natural Areas where these have minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, including customary activities and actions necessary to address a high risk to public health and safety, and property-, <u>including essential pruning, maintenance and tree removal to enable the operation, maintenance or upgrading of existing infrastructure.</u>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Amend Rule 20.3 a. to include reference to "infrastructure" as a preventative measure to enable pruning and maintenance or removal of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees and Notable Trees where it is identified that a tree or branch may fail and fall onto infrastructure. This will also give effect to the amendments sought to Policy 20.2.1h.	Amend Rule 20.3 a.ii. as follows: "There is an unacceptable risk to public health, safety or property <u>or infrastructure</u> ; or"
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3 k as it seeks to enable the operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of existing infrastructure, including associated pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees and associated earthworks, as a Permitted Activity, provided Standard 20.5.7 is complied with.	The submitter seeks that Rule 20.3 k. be retained as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the activity status in Rule 20.3 n. for cSNA and fSNA. Should the infrastructure be in accordance with Policy 20.2.1 g. then the activity status should be less restrictive.	Amend Rule 20.3 n. so that the activity status is Restricted Discretionary in the cSNA and Discretionary in the fSNA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3 s. as it seeks to enable emergency works to, or removal of, a Notable Tree where, as a Permitted Activity, if the tree has failed and is an imminent risk to public health or safety and property, or a network utility.	Retail Rule 20.3 s. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter supports Rule 20.3 t. as it seeks to enable removal of branches that are interfering with infrastructure when the work is carried out by or under the guidance of a qualified Works Arborist.	Retain Rule 20.3 t. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3 u. which provides for pruning and maintenance of a notable tree not in accordance with Rule 20.3 t. as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Retain Rule 20.3 u. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3 v. which enables non mechanical practices in the vicinity of Notable Trees for the purposes of maintaining network utilities as a Permitted Activity.	Retain Rule 20.3 v. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3(w) which enables non mechanical practices in the vicinity of Notable Trees for the purposes of maintaining network utilities as a Permitted Activity.	Retain Rule 20.3 w. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	Submitter supports Rule 20.3 x. which enables nonemergency works to, removal of, or transplanting of a notable tree as a Discretionary Activity.	Retain Rule 20.3 x. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.17	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.2 Pruning and Maintenance of Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.2 which provides the specific measurements for pruning and maintenance of a Notable Tree.	Retain Rule 20.5.2 as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.18	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.3 which provides the specific measurements for pruning and maintenance of a Notable Tree.	Retain Rule 20.5.3 as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.19	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.4 Emergency Works to, or Removal of, an Indigenous Tree in a Significant Natural Area or a Notable Tree	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.4 which provides for emergency works of a Notable Tree.	Retain Rule 20.5.4 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.20	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 20.5.7 A. subject to the inclusion of the words "existing infrastructure" to ensure consistency and clarity with Rule 20.3 k. which permits the operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure.	The submitter seeks the following amendment to Rule 20.5.7 A.a.: "a. The works are required to maintain <u>existing infrastructure</u> and an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure; and"
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.21	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.7 B. which provides for earthworks in the vicinity of a SNA.	Retain Rule 20.5.7 B. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.22	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.7 C. which provides for renewal or upgrading in the vicinity of a SNA.	Retain Rule 20.5.7 C. as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.23	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 25.2.3j which provides for earthworks and vegetation removal in the vicinity of a SNA.	Retain Rule 25.2.3j as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.24	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 25.2.3 k. which provides for pruning and maintenance in the vicinity of a SNA.	Retain Rule 25.2.3 k. as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.25	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.4 Rules – General Standards	Support	The submitter supports Rule 25.2.4.3 which provides for the general standards for pruning and maintenance in the vicinity of a SNA.	Retain Rule 25.2.4.3 as notified.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.26	Appendix 13 Network Utilities and the Electricity National Grid Corridor	General	Support in part	The submitter suggests a new rule be added as a Permitted Activity to enable the installation of new above-ground lines and support structures in the Transport Corridor. Significant concentrations of network utility equipment exists within archaeological overlays. The new rule would be applicable in circumstances where such infrastructure can be installed to meet demand but minimise impacts to archaeological sites that underground cabling may create.	Insert a new Permitted Activity rule as follows: <u>(nn) New above-ground lines and support structures in the Transport Corridor, adjacent areas identified in Volume 2 Appendix 8, Schedule 8B and 8C</u>
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.27	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter opposes 1.2.2.8 HHA in so far that these policies require a site-specific HIA to be provided. The submitter considers this to be unreasonable when other specialist reports can consider the compatibility of the development with the identified heritage values of the area.	Amend 1.2.2.8 a., 1.2.2.8 b., 1.2.2.8 c. and 1.2.2.8 d. and 1.2.2.8 e. by inserting " <i>or an equivalent report by a suitably qualified person</i> " to each provision as per the submission. Refer to the submission for the amended provisions.
WEL Network Limited - Sara Brown	133.28	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter proposes a new policy within 19.2.6 to enable overhead infrastructure to minimise or avoid adverse effects on archaeological sites, particularly those along transport corridors.	Add new Policy 19.2.6h to enable overhead infrastructure to be installed to minimise or avoid any adverse effects on the sites where avoidance is not practicable. Refer to submission for specific drafting sought.
Craig and Sonia Stephen	134.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to Plan Change 9 in its entirety and has listed a number of reasons for this (as per submission) including that the proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • infringe upon individual property rights • will increase costs with no compensation • benefits have not been demonstrated • have not been requested by the community • will have negative impact on property values • make it harder to maintain or modify homes 	Reject Plan Change 9 in its entirety

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Mark Chrisp Fonterra Limited	135.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the identification of a SNA (C59) within the Fonterra site at 1344 Te Rapa Road and the land owned by Fonterra to the north because (i) the overlay applies to the replanted vegetation around the gullies in the north-eastern portion of the site; (ii) these gullies were developed primarily for the disposal of wastewater and stormwater associated with dairy manufacturing activities occurring on the site; (iii) the existing exotic vegetation around these artificial gullies was historically cleared and subsequently replanted by Fonterra with native vegetation to provide additional discharge treatment. As stated, the modified gullies can be considered as 'artificial structures' and should not, therefore, be included as Areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.	Remove SNA (C59) from the Fonterra Te Rapa Site, 1344 Te Rapa Road, and the land to the north owned by Fonterra; Or Any alternative relief which achieves the same or similar outcome.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Mark Chrisp Fonterra Limited	135.2	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter disagrees with the additional information requirements in Appendix 1.2.2.8 as these requirements are unnecessary, as the same information is already required to be supplied to Heritage NZ to obtain relevant authorisations.	Delete section 1.2.28 from Appendix 1.2.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Mark Chrisp Fonterra Limited	135.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter does not disagree that the three archaeological sites A32, A33 and A144 that are present over the Fonterra site are included in Schedule 8C of the District Plan.	No relief stated.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Mark Chrisp Fonterra Limited	135.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter does not disagree that the three archaeological sites A32, A33 and A144 that are present over the Fonterra site are included in Schedule 8C of the District Plan.	No relief stated.
Mitchell Daysh Ltd - Mark Chrisp Fonterra Limited	135.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter does not disagree that the three archaeological sites A32, A33 and A144 that are present over the Fonterra site are included in Schedule 8C of the District Plan.	No relief sought.
Kukutaaruhe Education Trust - Bruce MacKay	136.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3(g) because together with Rule 20.3o effectively prevent (except through consent application): i. providing access tracks that enable site restoration and maintenance ii. removal of large exotic trees where there have been no significant bat records and there are no roost trees.	Amend Rule 20.3(g) so the rule enables/allows landowners to access their land with appropriate tracks without having to get a consent and the rules allow removal of large exotic trees where records already show that there are no bat roosts and little or sporadic (if any) bat activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kukutaaruhe Education Trust - Bruce MacKay	136.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	Submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.6 because the the limit of 50m ² and a requirement to revegetate within 12 months are impractical and not good practice.	Amend Rule 20.5.6 - Council needs to reopen discussion with experienced and qualified ecological restoration practitioners as to what are appropriate scales for restoration, control levels for exotic vegetation removal, and revegetation time frames. Council needs to align the rules with the "10%" goal of the NIC programme and ensure they enable the programme rather than stymie it as the current form of the rules will do.
Kukutaaruhe Education Trust - Bruce MacKay	136.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3(e) because making exceeding this standard RD is completely unnecessary and counter productive.	Amend Rule 20.3(e): Council needs to reopen discussion with experienced and qualified ecological restoration practitioners as to what are appropriate scales for restoration, control levels for exotic vegetation removal, and revegetation time frames. Council needs to align the rules with the "10%" goal of the NIC programme and ensure they enable the programme rather than stymie it as the current form of the rules will do.
Kukutaaruhe Education Trust - Bruce MacKay	136.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3(o) because together with Rule 20.3g effectively prevent (except through consent application): i. providing access tracks that enable site restoration and maintenance ii. removal of large exotic trees where there have been no significant bat records and there are no roost trees.	Amend Rule 20.3(o) so the rules enable/allow landowners to access their land with appropriate tracks without having to get a consent and the rules allow removal of large exotic trees where records already show that there are no bat roosts and little or sporadic (if any) bat activity.
Jack William Pennington	137.1	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the mapping changes which indicates the extent of the protected area created by notable tree roots.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jack William Pennington	137.2	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1.1 STEM Method of Evaluation	Oppose	<p>We Do Not support the logic driving the selection of many Notable Trees.</p> <p>Comments: The Street Tree Scape's are treasured by this community, however, on our street the tree(s) are neither historic nor suitable for purpose. Melia (Chinaberry) have an estimated life of 20 - 40 years. The tree on our Brookfield berm was mature when we arrived some 25 years ago. More importantly in high wind they are a potential hazard; to pedestrians, traffic, and real-estate, endangering all utilities; power, communications, plus the 3 water services, also their roots cause footpath unevenness.</p>	<p>1- Street Tree Scape be listed and protected, suggest types and upper height limits be set. This would lock in consenting dimensions with reference to root-ball, and place obligations on the powers who create them and wish them protected.</p> <p>2- Delist "Notable Trees" on street berms. Note: They could still be covered in historic or cultural terms.</p> <p>3- Selectively replace the unsuitable trees with, large, but less intrusive varieties.</p> <p>4- Create a maintenance schedule for works on the listed Street Trees Scape's along with budgets to implement this program.</p> <p>5-Posting this schedule annually and reference the funding reasonability's in the district plan.</p>
Jack William Pennington	137.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>Relating to Protected Root Zone - If the root-ball is a function of the tree height and counsel is unwilling or incapable of trimming 20% of the growth each year, and given the branches that can be trimmed 50mm diameter are at the top of the trees, then as the tree heads ever skyward the protected area could, in theory, consume our entire property, with no accountability or relief from the Council (HCC)</p>	<p>1- Street Tree Scape be listed and protected, suggest types and upper height limits be set. This would lock in consenting dimensions with reference to root-ball, and place obligations on the powers who create them and wish them protected.</p> <p>2- Delist "Notable Trees" on street berms. Note: They could still be covered in historic or cultural terms.</p> <p>3- Selectively replace the unsuitable trees with, large, but less intrusive varieties.</p> <p>4- Create a maintenance schedule for works on the listed Street Trees Scape's along with budgets to implement this program.</p> <p>5-Posting this schedule annually and reference the funding reasonability's in the district plan.</p>
Jack William Pennington	137.4	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1.1 STEM Method of Evaluation	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not support the logic driving the selection of many Notable Trees.</p>	<p>Re-evaluate the methods and traditional ways of defining Street Scape's and Notable Trees in our district plan, with the desire to maintain street scape's, reduce ongoing maintenance costs, increase utilities' reliability and reduce consent issues.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jack William Pennington	137.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The Street Tree Scape's are treasured by this community, however, on our street the tree(s) are neither historic nor suitable for purpose. Melia (Chinaberry) have an estimated life of 20 - 40 years. The tree on our Brookfield berm was mature when we arrived some 25 years ago. More importantly in high wind they are a potential hazard; to pedestrians, traffic, and real-estate, endangering all utilities; power, communications, plus the 3 water services, also their roots cause footpath unevenness.</p> <p>We have lived through winters with; blocked storm water drains, surface flooding, clearing gutters, now additionally with the cost and inconvenience for resource consents, but for what? Trees that have only a maximum 5-10 years life remaining. In our view, our district plan needs to reflect the value of "Street Tree Scape" and not the individual tree specimens that make it up.</p>	Replace all the Melia trees on Brookfield street with a more suitable type.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers CB Trustees 2010 Limited and Jones Family Trustees Limited	138.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) as it does not provide maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as footpaths, as a Permitted Activity. The submitter considers the requirement of resource consent for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces or upgrades to existing street frontages is onerous, because of the additional costs and time required, and a more specific rule is required to manage adverse effects.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 20.3.w, and any subsequential changes as necessary, to read:</p> <p>a. The following activities located within the Protected Root zone of any notable tree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Earthworks (excluding as provided for by v. i., ii. or iii). ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface <u>that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)</u>. iii. The alteration of the ground level by either permeable or impervious materials iv. Additions to, or the replacement of, any existing building or structure that is proposed to exceed the envelope or footprint of the existing building(s) or structure(s) v. The placement and/or construction of any building or structure vi. Directional drilling or boring for trenchless pipe/duct installation less than 800mm below the ground surface vii. The storage, release, injection or placement of chemicals or other toxic substance viii. The storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment. ix. Planting of trees
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers CB Trustees 2010 Limited and Jones Family Trustees Limited	138.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (b) - (d) as these standards are too restrictive and affect the the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites. The submitter also considers this rule will be extremely difficult to show compliance with and monitor by Council</p>	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (b) - (d).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w. ii. as it does not provide for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as driveways or footpaths. The submitter considers the requirement of resource consent for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces is onerous where management of adverse effects could be achieved through a more specific rule to manage adverse effects.	Amend Rule 20.3.w ii. to exclude maintenance and replacement of impervious surface, for example: "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface <u>that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)</u> ".
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 b. - d. as these standards are too restrictive and affect the the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites. The submitter considers this rule will be difficult to monitor and show compliance with.	Delete Rule 20.5.3 b. - d.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter supports removal of notable tree T19.8 at 104 Peachgrove Road from Schedule 9D and the relevant planning map because the tree was in poor health.	Retain removal of notable tree T19.8 from Schedule 9D and the relevant planning map.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w iii. This rule does not permit permeable-based improvements to the ground plane under the tree (eg laying of topsoil or mulching to protect existing exposed roots). The term 'permeable' should be removed from this Rule. In this case, the rule (referring only to 'impervious' surfaces is a duplication of 20.3w ii. and could be deleted in its entirety. This rule will also be extremely difficult for any person to show compliance with and equally as difficult to monitor by Council.	Delete Rule 20.3 w. iii. in its entirety. Alternatively, delete the word 'permeable'.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (v) as it states that a resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity is required for the placement and/or construction of a building or structure within the PRZ which is a duplication of Rule 20.3 w. ii. and Rule 20.3 w. iv.	Delete Rule 20.3 w. v. in its entirety.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Hamilton Campground Limited	139.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3 w. viii as the wording is vague and does not provide guidance to what would be permitted or not. It is also unclear whether temporary parking of vehicles would be classified as 'storage' or whether a wheelbarrow is 'equipment'. The rule also does not provide for existing storage. The submitter considers this rule is almost a duplication of Rule 20.3 w. ii. and Rule 20.3 w. iv.	Delete Rule 20.3 w. viii. in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Five Thirty Limited - Tristan Jones, Reghan Joans	140.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of heritage items as identified because "it is apparent that an assessment of existing built structures on Schedule 8A has not been undertaken and therefore, the Schedule may not be up-to-date, insofar that existing buildings on the list may no longer be worthy of heritage listing, or may have been demolished. An assessment of all existing Scheduled built structures should be undertaken to ensure that heritage listings are current and relevant".	Seeks a review of all existing scheduled heritage items on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to determine the appropriateness of their listing remaining on the schedule.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Five Thirty Limited - Tristan Jones, Reghan Joans	140.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 530 Victoria Street (H105) because it is in poor condition and has been significantly altered; the building is seismically compromised and has severe leaking occurring through the roof, through gaps around windows, through the enclosed lightwells and around the doors. Its authenticity as a heritage item is considered to be negligible.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A : Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H105, 530 Victoria Street and on the relevant planning map.
Andrea Joy Dornauf	141.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets Historic Heritage Area, HHA20.	Retain the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets Historic Heritage Area, HHA20.
Andrea Joy Dornauf	141.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter would like to extend proposed Historic Heritage Area, HHA20 to include the wider Maeroa area from Rimu Street to Hobson Street.	Extend the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets Historic Heritage Area, HHA20 to include the grid network of streets between Forest Lake Rd and Maeroa Rd, from (and including) Rimu Street to (and including) Hobson Street.
Andrea Joy Dornauf	141.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed policy direction with regard to HHA's.	Retain objectives and policies 19.2.4 and 19.2.5
Andrea Joy Dornauf	141.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support in part	The submitter considers that HHAs should be wider than single streets or small groups of adjoining properties and should be large enough to be effective in protecting streets from intensification.	Increase the size of the HHAs that are currently identified as individual streets or small groups of adjoining properties.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Basil Wood	142.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and assessment of Marama Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, this is because two of the existing dwellings on Marama Street (No. 4 & 6) have been removed and the property at 17 Seddon Road has also been significantly modified and altered. The submitter therefore disagrees with the assessment for Marama Street Historic Heritage Area regarding the scoring for Visual and Physical Consistency criterions. The submitter also notes that property at 17 Seddon Road does not face towards Marama Street and it represents a different architectural design, building layout and frontage treatment as the other properties on Marama Street within the Historic Heritage Area.	Remove Marama Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Basil Wood	142.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and assessment of Marama Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, this is because two of the existing dwellings on Marama Street (No. 4 & 6) have been removed and the property at 17 Seddon Road has also been significantly modified and altered. The submitter therefore disagrees with the assessment for Marama Street Historic Heritage Area regarding the scoring for Visual and Physical Consistency criterions. The submitter also notes that property at 17 Seddon Road does not face towards Marama Street and it represents a different architectural design, building layout and frontage treatment as the other properties on Marama Street within the Historic Heritage Area.	To reject the Marama Street assessment score and exclude Marama Street being designated as an Historic Heritage Zone To exclude 17 Seddon Road from the proposed Marama Street HHA as it is neither representative of nor consistent with the Marama Street development.
Rainer and Annegret Kunemeyer and Doerr	143.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictions of permitted activities in Rule 20.3 a. because it does not allow for activities to proactivity safeguard the riverbank. There are no trees of significance in the submitters section so proactive preventative work should be a permitted activity.	Seeks amendments to Rule 20.3 a to allow for proactive activities to safeguard the riverbank.
Rainer and Annegret Kunemeyer and Doerr	143.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictions of permitted activities in Rule 20.3b because it does not allow for activities to proactivity safeguard the riverbank. There are no trees of significance in the submitters section so proactive preventative work should be a permitted activity.	Seeks amendments to Rule 20.3b to allow for proactive activities to safeguard the riverbank.
Rainer and Annegret Kunemeyer and Doerr	143.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the restrictions of permitted activities in Rule 20.3f because it does not allow for activities to proactivity safeguard the riverbank. There are no trees of significance in the submitters section so proactive preventative work should be a permitted activity.	Seeks amendments to Rule 20.3f. to allow for proactive activities to safeguard the riverbank.
Brett Lidington	144.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter, a potential owner of the property seek the ability to demolish the building at 166 River Road, H279, built heritage item, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	The ability to demolish the building at 166 River Road.
C DS and R C Massey	145.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes property at 20 Rata Street to be part of Matai Street, Hinau Street and Rata Street Historic Heritage Area and considers the implication of Historic Heritage Area will restrict infill developments in the city.	Remove property at 20 Rata Street from Matai Street, Hinau Street and Rata Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	Clearly, case law has recognized a distinction between “historic heritage” and “special character.” Since Hamilton City Council places value on the fact that the property at 28 Thackeray Street is a great example of 1920s vernacular and bungalow architectural styles, it appears the property should be classified as “special character” rather than “historic heritage,” if any classification is appropriate. Furthermore, the case suggests that a property may have historically significant features, so should be protected for the amenity of character, rather than having “national importance.” A property may be derived from historical features, but that does not necessarily amount to historic heritage. Thus, it would be inappropriate to include the historical heritage objective in the special character provisions given their distinction in the RMA. Classifying a property under “special character” instead of “historical heritage” will mean the property has to fulfil less obligations. Older housing does not correlate to historical heritage, so Plan Change 9 appears to be overreaching in this regard. Furthermore, the criteria against which the heritage value of this property is measured against mostly has “low” and “moderate” indicators. Most of these indicators are also based on presumption and assumptions that are not unequivocally evidenced, so the Hamilton City Council appears to be arbitrarily making decisions. This is not enough for the property to be classified as having “national importance” under s 6 of the RMA.	Seek the removal of the heritage classification from 28 Thackeray Street as imposed by Plan Change 9. The property should be removed as a Built Heritage.
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	Does not qualify as historic heritage and is therefore not a proper “qualifying matter” for the purposes of the Amendment Act and the NPS-UD. We have a proper basis to seek the removal of the heritage classification from 28 Thackeray Street as imposed by Plan Change 9. The property should be removed as a Built Heritage.	The removal of the heritage classification [H291] from 28 Thackeray Street as imposed by Plan Change 9. The property should be removed as a Built Heritage.
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.3	General	General	Oppose	Plan Change 12 - The purposes and functions of Plan Change 9 and 12 appear to contradict each other. This is particularly apparent considering the property is situated right next to the commercial district that is proposed to have maximized building heights and residential intensification. Therefore, it is unreasonable and incongruous for the property to be subject to Plan Change 9, considering its close proximity to urban development. It will seriously affect the value of the property especially considering the building only takes up a small portion of the land. There is no historical or archaeological value over the rest of the land. We understand that Hamilton City Council plays a critical role in identifying and protecting Hamilton's heritage and natural environment, in all its forms. However, the work should be done in a proper and legitimate manner.	To review the Plan Change 9 and its procedure.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.4	General	General	Oppose	<p>Remedy and Compensation:</p> <p>If it is necessary to identify our property as built heritage, which would consequently limit our use of our own land and make us responsible for the maintenance and protection of the building, the government ought to provide a remedy and support for doing so.</p> <p>While we appreciate the Hamilton City Council protecting our heritage and natural environment, private rights must take priority over public actions. We as the landowner cannot be deprived of the use or enjoyment of our own land and property without just compensation. Hamilton City Council cannot take land from people and limit the right of their use without compensating them for their loss.</p>	To review the Plan Change 9 and its procedure.
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.5	General	General	Oppose	<p>Consultation:</p> <p>While we appreciate the Hamilton City Council protecting our heritage and natural environment, private rights must take priority over public actions. We as the landowner cannot be deprived of the use or enjoyment of our own land and property, and have limitations imposed on our rights without proper consultation.</p> <p>Work must be done properly and with a proper consultative process.</p> <p>The consultation procedure must be set clearly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How do you consult with the interested parties; b. How do you negotiate with the private owner; and c. What is a reasonable compensation for the landowner... <p>Hamilton City Council has breached consultation principles in accordance with s 82 of the Local Government Act 2002, and in particular ss 82(1)(d) and (f).</p>	To review the Plan Change 9 and its procedure.
PHZ Family Trustees Ltd - Puhan Zheng	146.6	General	General	Oppose	<p>Private Interest and Rights over the property:</p> <p>The submitter purchased the property in 2015 and has owned this property more than six years. The property itself is an estate in Fee Simple.</p> <p>Fee Simple interests are the common form of private residential land ownership in New Zealand. A fee simple absolute arises where the duration of the fee simple estate is not modified by any particular future event. Any land title issued in "fee simple", without further words, is a fee simple absolute.</p> <p>The submitter as the owner of their private land has the right to exclusive occupation, use and enjoyment of that land. A landowner's right to use and enjoyment is covered in Fejo v Northern Territory of Australia (1988) 195 CLR 96 (HCA) "every act of ownership which can enter into the imagination"</p> <p>Property law gives a landowner the right to the full use and enjoyment of his property, without any substantial interference from others.</p>	To review the Plan Change 9 and its procedure.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kiriana Elizabeth Winifred Isgrove	147.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>Appendix 9C which outlines criteria for identification of SNA's.</p> <p>I don't disagree with the criteria being used to identify SNA's, however I do not believe that sites are being assessed against these criteria when they are identified. I think the identification of SNA's needs to be more robust if having these identified is going to put restrictions on land use with no form of compensation (or funding for proper restoration efforts). I do not believe the SNA identified on my property fits these criteria (SNA information: site C16 - Dinsdale Gully, address: 88 Ranui Street, Dinsdale).</p> <p>My property was included as it was identified as meeting criteria 1 and 11 in Appendix 9C. This is not an area of biodiversity (it is mostly invasive), and the stream it borders is an urban stream which takes storm water from the roads and is filled with rubbish. The stream and current vegetation are not something I would deem as ecologically significant. If this area is a corridor SNA, then I do not understand why the two properties to the north of me were not also identified, as they border the beginning of the urban stream.</p>	the identification of SNAs against the criteria outlined in Appendix 9C to be more robust.
Kiriana Elizabeth Winifred Isgrove	147.2	General	General	Oppose	<p>Appendix 9C which outlines criteria for identification of SNA's.</p> <p>If these areas are going to be identified as SNAs, the submitter strongly believes there should be funding available restorative purposes.</p>	if SNAs are going to be identified on private land which puts restrictions on land use, there should be funding for restoration projects in these areas to restore the SNAs to their full potential and truly contribute to biodiversity and the protection of native flora and fauna.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Jean Carol Bourke	148.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the inclusion of 9B Riro Street in the Schedule 8D Historic Heritage Area (Riro Street HHA) including the associated rule framework that would apply and specifically the provisions requiring resource consent as a result of being within the HHA. The reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional restrictions placed on private property rights • consider that the provisions are a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework • the property does not match the broad description applied to the area • the property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) 	That the Rio Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA24, is removed or amended to exclude 9B Riro Street and / or that significant changes are made to the rule framework that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Jean Carol Bourke	148.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The associated rule framework that would apply to the property and specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the Riro Street HHA listing on Jean Carol Bourke's property. That rule framework is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 19.3.2 a o 19.3.2 d o 19.3.2 e o 19.3.2 f o 19.3.2 j o 19.3.2 k o 19.3.2m o 19.4.3 a o 19.4.3 b o 19.4.3 c o 19.4.3 d <p>6. The reasons for Jean Carol Bourke's submission are as follows: (a) Jean Carol Bourke's is opposed to the HHA listing across her property and the additional HCC Operative District Plan rules that accompany the listing due to the restrictions placed on their private property rights. Activities that they could lawfully undertake prior to PC9 now require a resource consent which could limit the activities that she may wish to undertake on the property and could create an unnecessary financial burden on her should she wish to undertake some form of development on the property.</p>	That significant changes are made to the rule framework that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Garron and Jan Smith	149.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T184.8 by 32 George Street due to the following reasons as stated by the submitter:</p> <p>"Our house at 32 George Street, Claudelands was built and completed years before this tree was planted (within the last 18 to 20 years), we requested at the time that the Council do not plant this type of tree so close to our property due to it's root structure. This request was ignored and the tree has caused problems for the last 8 to 10 years. This tree has blocked drains, cracks have appeared on our concrete garage floor, the root structure has moved into the storm water system and has damaged the driveway and foot paths outside our property. The Council staff have been out a number of times to cut the root structure, repair damaged drains, driveways footpaths."</p> <p>(T184.8 is being identified at 28B George Street in Schedule 9D).</p>	Remove all reference to the notable tree T184.8 from Schedule 9D.
Garron and Jan Smith	149.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Support	We note and support the George Street historical trees [T184].	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or 2. That significant changes are made to the rule framework that reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	<p>That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or</p> <p>That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.</p>
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	<p>That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or</p> <p>That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of “most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard” as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of “most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard” as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of “most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard” as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of “most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard” as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Deecan Holdings Limited	150.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA listing across their property and consider that the provisions place restrictions on their private property rights which could create an unnecessary financial burden should they wish to undertake some form of development and consider that the protection at this time is a knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or of archaeological significance. Further, it is considered that the property does not match the broad description applied to the area of "most of the 1920s dwellings are weatherboard" as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP. As such, the submitter considers that additional characteristics should come into play in the assessment for listing of their property/building including whether it is unique in the area, whether the location is better suited for a more intensive development outcome noting its proximity to the city centre and the likely landuse expected or already occurring on adjacent sites. The property is not listed with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT).	That the HHA listing is removed or amended from 9A Riro Street; and / or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Purpose for Chapter 19 - Historic Heritage, however noting that while paragraph a. states " <i>historic structures and their immediate surroundings</i> " it is proposed in Objective 19.2.3 that the word ' <i>immediate</i> ' is deleted and replaced with the word ' <i>setting</i> ' - they support the use of the term ' <i>setting and surroundings</i> ' as this is a more appropriate term to capture the area of interest within a site in which an historic building or structure is located, that is required to be protected and therefore assessed at the time of development for any impacts on historic heritage values. This will meet s 6(f) RMA.	Amend 19.1 Purpose, paragraph a. to read: Historic heritage is a natural or physical resource and is defined in the Act. This chapter addresses historic structures and their immediate <u>setting and surroundings</u> , historic heritage areas, and sites of archaeological or cultural significance, and relates to the relationship of Maaori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga. Amend historic heritage chapter as required to ensure consistent use of the term "setting and surroundings".
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter considers paragraphs a.b.c.d. of 19.1 Purpose would benefit from including Wahi Tupuna in relation to the recognition of Maaori and their culture and traditions.	Amend 19.1 Purpose, paragraph a.b.c.d. to also include the consideration of Wahi Tupuna in relation to the recognition of Maaori and their culture and traditions.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support in part	<p>The submitter acknowledges the discussion relating to the inclusion of archaeological sites and cultural sites in the Plan, and instances where in some location cultural values and archaeological values may have differing extents.</p> <p>The submitter considers that it is important that the Plan includes the extents of these important sites, to provide clarity for users of the Plan, These extents are most appropriately established through ground truthing to then be included in to the Plan maps.</p> <p>Given that some sites may have differing cultural and archaeological extents and possibly in some instances there may be no archaeological values present, the submitter considers that there would be considerable benefit in the establishment of two separate schedules relating to archaeological values and cultural values.</p>	That the proposed archaeological and cultural sites are ground truthed to confirm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that they have not been destroyed, and if so, that their correct extent is included into the planning maps, and • That if the archaeological sites are deemed to be destroyed, they should not be included into an archaeological schedule, and • that the proposed cultural sites are ground truthed as considered appropriate by Mana Whenua
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports 19.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures), paragraph i. Because, highlighting these concerns within the introductory text of the chapter helps the reader to understand the intention of the objective, policy and rules framework and the need to provide protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Retain, as notified 19.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures), paragraph i.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	<p>19.1 Purpose, Historic Heritage Areas.</p> <p>The submitter supports the purpose for Historic Heritage Areas and the addition into the District Plan of the 32 historic heritage areas, subject to amendments sought elsewhere in their submission; because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this proposal recognises existing character areas (e.g. Frankton Railway Village and Hayes Paddock) as historic heritage • identifies new historic heritage areas • this recognition and retention as the city changes and evolves, will ensure the ongoing contribution to the story of Hamilton's development as well as providing an important sense of place. 	That historic heritage areas are retained (subject to the submission points elsewhere in this submission are retained).
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.1 and the associated policy suite related to all historic heritage, because the recognition and protection through scheduling and associated rules will protect the heritage items and their important values, and the settings and surroundings, as well as contributing to a sense of place and identity; and this enables the Plan to provide for the matters of national importance (s 6(e) and s 6(f)).	Retain Objective 19.2.1 and associated Policies 19.2.1a - 19.2.1e
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage		The submitter opposes in part, Objective 19.2.1, Explanation because in the text of the Explanation related to 19.2 Objectives and related Policies, that the term 'social' has been deleted. That is one of the heritage values in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter (2010). If the ICOMOS Charter is cited as it is in Policy 19.2.1c, the values should align with those defined in the Charter.	Amend the first paragraph of the Explanation for Objective 19.2.1 by reinstating the term 'social'.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.2 and policies 19.2.2a, 19.2.2b and 19.2.2c. that recognises the value of scheduling a diverse and representative range of historic heritage items. The submitter also appreciates the extensive work that has been undertaken to research and identify the new heritage items and historic heritage areas that have values worthy of inclusion in to the heritage schedule of the district plan. The related rule framework will provide for the sustainable management of these items and areas into the future. This approach assists the Plan meet s 6(f).	Retain Objective 19.2.2 and associated policies 19.2.2a, 19.2.2b and 19.2.2c.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the use of the words 'shall' and 'will' in policy 19.2.2a and 19.2.2c, because there should be consistency in the use of these terms.	That a consistent approach is adopted with the use of either will or shall in Policy 19.2.2a and Policy 19.2.2c.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.3 as this objective clearly signals that both the buildings and structures, together with their settings and surroundings make up the complete heritage item/s and that all these elements are required to be protected through scheduling and the associated protective rule framework to ensure the most appropriate and sustainable management of historic heritage.	Retain Objective 19.2.3.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>Policy 19.2.3b</p> <p>While the submitter supports Policy 19.2.3b, and that it seeks to avoid relocation of an historic heritage item within the site on which it is scheduled, there are concerns that the exemptions stated in the policy are ambiguous and potentially detrimental to heritage values. Relocation should only be considered when all other alternatives to protect and maintain identified heritage values have been considered. Relocation within the existing setting should usually be preferred over relocation off-site. However, even relocating within the site reduces understanding of site development and can damage other heritage values. The importance of the earlier position of a structure and its relationship with other heritage features should be respected.</p>	<p>Policy 19.2.3b is retained insofar as it seeks to avoid relocation of items in Schedule 8A, and amended as follows:</p> <p>9.2.3b Relocation of buildings and structures in Schedule 8A within the site identified in Schedule 8A is avoided, except where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The relocation is <u>demonstratively necessary</u> to <u>maintain</u>facilitate the ongoing use, <u>or facilitate</u> adaptive re-use, or protection of the building or structure or to ensure public safety; ii. The relocation allows for significant public benefit <u>and accessibility</u> that would not otherwise be achieved <u>while maintaining heritage values</u>; iii. Measures will be taken to minimise the risk of damage to the building or structure; iii. The building or structure will remain in within the site as close to the original location as is possible; iv. The relocation maintains the heritage values and significance of the building or structure. v. <u>The relocation is necessary to provide protection of the building or structure or to ensure public safety.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part Policy 19.2.3c. While supporting the intent that subdivision and development on the site of a heritage item from Schedule 8A should retain and protect heritage values, HNZPT has several concerns:</p> <p>Subdivision can have an incredibly significant impact on heritage values. Subdivision should retain a heritage building or structure, together with its site and surroundings in one lot. In the event of a subdivision sufficient land should be provided within the same lot to provide a setting that maintains heritage values. The submitter seeks that the policy is reframed to ensure that subdivision of an historic heritage site with a building or structure, must not occur unless heritage values are retained. This will be achieved by involving a conservation architect at the time of the subdivision.</p> <p>Plus, the use of the word 'enhance' does not have a clear meaning in the context of historic heritage and should not be used.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3c is retained and amended as follows:</p> <p>19.2.3c Subdivision and/or development of the site identified in Schedule 8A shall retain, protect and enhance the heritage values of any building or structure listed within Schedule 8A, including by ensuring that:</p> <p>i. The proposal is compatible with the sensitivity of the heritage building or structure and its setting or surroundings to change and its capacity to accommodate change without compromising the heritage values of the building or structure <u>or the setting or surroundings, and the proposal is supported by a report from an appropriately qualified conservation architect:</u></p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that Policy 19.2.3f requires amendments to recognise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development may be potentially occurring in the setting and surrounding of an historic heritage building or structure, and development should be consistent and not detract from identified heritage values. 	<p>Amend Policy 19.3.2f to read:</p> <p>The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the <u>setting and surroundings</u> of a historic heritage building or structure in Schedule 8A, shall be consistent with <u>and not detract from</u> identified heritage <u>values</u>.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports Policy 19.2.3g that relates to the encouragement of adaptive reuse, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adaptive reuse ensures that historic heritage items are used and occupied, and that repairs and maintenance will be undertaken, all of which ensures their longevity and retention into the future. Adaptive reuse also provides for green solution with the retention of the same building rather than the construction of a new building. HNZPT seeks that this aspect is also captured within Policy 19.2.3g as it is an important consideration at the time of adaptive reuse. 	<p>Retain Policy 19.2.3g but amend it to include the consideration of the retention of embodied energy.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports the part of the policy that provides for earthquake strengthening, fire protection, building services and accessibility because these are important activities to ensure the health and safety of building users and to ensure the longevity of the building. Nevertheless, these works must be undertaken with the same care and consideration is required to avoid inferior outcomes and the loss of heritage values; therefore the term "as far as practicable" should be deleted.	Amend Policy 19.2.3i to read: Any work for earthquake strengthening, fire protection, building services and accessibility upgrades to heritage buildings and structures must ensure that the materials and design reflect the heritage values, and avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on heritage values, including by: i. Protecting, as far as practicable, architectural features and details that contribute to the heritage values of the building or structure;
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.20	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports the guidance offered in Policy 19.2.3j regarding the manner in which work should be conducted on heritage buildings and structures. However, they are concerned with the use of the words " <i>enhances</i> " and " <i>where possible</i> " in Policy 19.2.3j.; because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the context of historic heritage, "<i>enhance</i>" does not have a clear meaning and should not be used. that "<i>where possible</i>" serves to dilute the policy as all works should look to conserving the authenticity and integrity of the heritage building or structure. 	Amend Policy 19.2.3j. ii to read: ii. Conserves, and wherever possible enhances, the authenticity and integrity of the building or structure;
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.21	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part Policy 19.2.3k because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best conservation practice seeks to ensure the retention of historic heritage values at the time of works on a heritage building or structure. HNZPT listings cover the interiors, exteriors and settings of listed buildings or structures. Works to the interiors of heritage buildings should be undertaken in a sensitive manner. There is the potential, as already recognised in the plan for some interior works to have an adverse effect on the exterior values of a heritage building and these works shouldn't be readily enabled (e.g. interior earthquake strengthening works that are externally visible/ the alternation of an internal layout that may result in a window location being altered) <p>The submitter considers that Policy 19.2.3k should be reframed to ensure that consideration of these proposals ensures the retention of heritage values. The revised wording would contribute to the assessment required in the district plan related to earthquake strengthening proposal where interior works are visible from the exterior of the building.</p>	Delete Policy 19.2.3k as notified and replace with the following wording: Modification of the interior of buildings or structures in Schedule 8A is enabled as a means of encouraging use, re-use or adaptive reuse and facilitating the retention and protection of the exterior heritage values. <u>Any proposal to change the interiors of buildings or structures in Schedule 8A must avoid adverse effects on exterior heritage values.</u>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.4 because it supports the identification and protection of the heritage values of historic heritage areas. The submitter considers this approach will ensure that these identified elements of the history of the city is retained into the future; and should ensure that the district plan provides for Matters of National Importance (S 6(f), RMA).	Retain Objective 19.2.4 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part Policy 19.2.4a as it seeks cumulative adverse effects are avoided on historic heritage areas; however they oppose the inclusion of the exemption "wherever practicable".</p> <p>The importance of historic heritage areas lies in their distinctive, yet collective values. They have been chosen as a group as they represent a moment in time that a heritage specialist has considered has heritage values worthy of retention.</p> <p>Cumulative adverse effects must be avoided to maintain the integrity of the historic heritage areas.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.4a to read:</p> <p>Cumulative adverse effects on the heritage values of the areas are avoided wherever practicable.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.24	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Policy 19.2.4d because it covers both demolition and removal of a building on a "front, corner or through sites" as well as the demolition of detached buildings. These two matters are assessed differently in the activity table in terms of activity status and should be supported by separate policies.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.4d to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> strongly discourage the demolition or removal of buildings from historic heritage areas, in line with its discretionary activity status for this activity, and if the use of the term "front, corner or through sites" does not cover every building in the historic heritage areas, this term should be amended to a term that ensures all buildings are included.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.25	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports, in part Policy 19.2.6b. however raises concern that the district plan does not provide an appropriate means to give effect to this policy, as the sites contained in the related schedules 8B - Group 1 and 8C - Group 2 have not been ground truthed and the extent recorded in the plan maps or inventory forms.</p> <p>Ground truthing of both archaeological and cultural extents would provide certainty to landowners and assist them in fulfilling a duty of care to these sites to not modify, damage or destroy them.</p> <p>Given recent instances in Hamilton City of these important sites being destroyed it is important that the city undertakes ground truthing prior to decision making on this plan change, to ensure the extents of the sites are included into the planning maps.</p> <p>HNZPT acknowledges it may be that it is not appropriate to culturally ground truth all of the sites.</p>	<p>That the sites in Schedules 8B-Group 1 and 8C-Group 2 are ground truthed for both their archaeological and cultural extents; and the extents of the sites are included into the planning maps.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.26	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part Policy 19.2.6c but are very concerned that the district plan does not provide an efficient and effective means to give effect to this policy, as the archaeological sites and cultural sites have not been ground truthed, an exercise that would assist to create a better understanding of the sites and inform an understanding of their significance. At the current time HNZPT has concerns that a lack of information may mean that the sites have been assigned to the incorrect schedule and may become subject to an inappropriate level of assessment.	That the sites in Schedules 8B-Group 1 and 8C-Group 2 are ground truthed for both their archaeological and cultural extents and the extents of the sites included into the Plan maps.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.27	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part Policy 19.2.6g, having some support for the consideration of permitted works within an archaeological and cultural site. However they are concerned with the reliance Policy 19.2.6g places on the term "minor works". This could be confusing for users of the Plan, as it refers to only a portion of the defined term 'minor works' and does not include the range of qualifiers found in the definition section.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there could be benefit in amending the policy to advise that a small level of specific types of minor works is enabled, and other earthworks require consent.</p>	Amend Policy 19.2.6g to advise that a small level of specific types of minor works is enabled, and other earthworks require resource consent.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.28	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the Historic Heritage Area - HHA 10 - Frankton Railway Village; but states the extent of the area should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> align with the HNZPT Frankton Railway Village Precinct Historic Area, List # 7014 Refer to Page 13, Appendix 1 - Scheduled - Historic Heritage Areas; include additional sites that contain buildings consistent with Railway buildings incorporate the area in the vicinity of Moa Crescent that contains a recreation building, parking, Marae offices and Kaumatua housing. 	<p>Amend the extent of Historic Heritage Area, HHA 10 - Frankton Railway Village to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> match the HNZPT listing Frankton Railway Village Precinct Historic Area, List #7014 include the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 53, 55 and 57 Rifle Range Road 62 and 64 Massey Street 1A Makomako Street the area in the vicinity of Moa Crescent <p>And</p> <p>The inventory form is amended to incorporate the need to consult with HNZPT in relation to the HNZPT listing Frankton Railway Village Precinct Historic Area, List #7014 in the event of any proposed building or development within the area of the HNZPT listing.</p>
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.29	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the Historic Heritage Area - HHA 30 - Templeview as the historic heritage area recognition acknowledges this important set of buildings which contain scheduled heritage items, and also includes several HNZPT covenanted buildings. This recognition will assist to ensure that any new buildings within the historic heritage area is compatible with and does not detract from the historic heritage values of this important location and collection of buildings.	Retain the Historic Heritage Area HHA 30 - Templeview as notified in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.30	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Historic Heritage Area, HHA31 - Victoria Street as the historic heritage area recognition acknowledges this important set of buildings which contains scheduled heritage items, some of which are also HNZPT listed items; the location is also culturally important.</p> <p>The recognition will ensure that any new building within the historic area is compatible with and does not detract from the historic heritage values of this important location and collection of buildings.</p>	Retain, as notified the Historic Heritage Area, HHA31 - Victoria Street in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.31	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>Appendix 8, Schedule 8B - Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites</p> <p>While HNZPT supports the intention of the addition of further archaeological sites into the district plan, they raise concern that there area a number of proposed sites that are recognised as destroyed or there is some uncertainty over a part of the site.</p> <p>HNZPT considers that for all the sites proposed to be part of the Plan, that further assessment of the location and extent of these sites should be undertaken through ground surveys. This process will determine the location of the extent of the sites and the area to which the suit of rules should be applied.</p>	That all sites identified on Appendix 8, Schedule 8B - Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites be ground truthed.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.32	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>Appendix 8, Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites</p> <p>While HNZPT supports the intention of the addition of further archaeological sites into the district plan, they raise concern that there area a number of proposed sites that are recognised as destroyed or there is some uncertainty over a part of the site. HNZPT considers that for all the sites proposed to be part of the Plan, that further assessment of the location and extent of these sites should be undertaken through ground surveys. This process will determine the location of the extent of the sites and the area to which the suit of rules should be applied.</p>	That all sites identified on Appendix 8, Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites be ground truthed.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.33	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	<p>Appendix 8, Schedule 8B - Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites</p> <p>While the submitter supports the intention of the addition of further archaeological sites into the district plan, they raise concern that there area a number of proposed sites that do not appear to have been correctly assessed in terms of their significance.</p> <p>The submitter considers that for all of these sites that after a ground truthing process has been undertaken, that the sites should be assessed as to their significance and if deemed to be of significance and worthy of inclusion in the Plan be assigned either a Group 1 or Group 2 status.</p>	That the proposed archaeological sites are assessed as to their archaeological significance and if deemed to be of archaeological significance and worthy of inclusion be assigned either Group 1 or Group 2 status.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.34	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		<p>Appendix 8, Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites</p> <p>While the submitter supports the intention of the addition of further archaeological sites into the district plan, they raise concern that there area a number of proposed sites that do not appear to have been correctly assessed in terms of their significance.</p> <p>The submitter considers that for all of these sites that after a ground truthing process has been undertaken, that the sites should be assessed as to their significance and if deemed to be of significance and worthy of inclusion in the Plan be assigned either a Group 1 or Group 2 status.</p>	That the proposed archaeological sites are assessed as to their archaeological significance and if deemed to be of archaeological significance and worthy of inclusion be assigned either Group 1 or Group 2 status.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.35	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	Appendix 8, Schedule 8B - Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites the submitter considers that further assessment is also needed for sites that are identified in the existing schedules but not recorded as archaeological sites to date (refer to Table 4 of the WSP report titled: Archaeological Investigations for Hamilton City District Plan Change).	That the archaeological sites on the existing schedule that are not yet recorded archaeological sites are reviewed and assessed, and an associated inventory form developed in the event that they remain in the schedule.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.36	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	Appendix 8, Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites the submitter considers that further assessment is also needed for sites that are identified in the existing schedules but not recorded as archaeological sites to date (refer to Table 4 of the WSP report titled: Archaeological Investigations for Hamilton City District Plan Change).	That the archaeological sites on the existing schedule that are not yet recorded archaeological sites are reviewed and assessed, and an associated inventory form developed in the event that they remain in the schedule.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.37	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter also sees benefit in a review of the pre-1900 sites from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to consider including these sites into the archaeological schedules to assist readers to understand the archaeological landscape; this would also assist those developing land to fulfil their legal obligations under the HNZPT Act 2014.	That pre -1900 sites from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage are also included in Schedules 8B and 8C Archaeological and Cultural Sites, depending on their archaeological significance.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.38	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that there are many locations within Hamilton City where there is a high potential for archaeological remains to be found. These area include, at a minimum, the City Centre and Hamilton East.</p> <p>While the explanation under the objectives and policies for archaeological and cultural sites indicates this could be the case and advises of accidental discovery protocols, they are concerned that this approach will result in damage to the archaeological resource and untimely delays to developments as parties will need to stop work to obtain an archaeological authority from HNZPT.</p> <p>The submitter considers the development of a Heritage Alert Layer and that being included into the Council's GIS system would assist those using and developing land in archaeologically sensitive locations to fulfil their obligations under the HNZPT Act 2014.</p>	That a Heritage Alert Layer is considered as part of the Council's GIS layer.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.39	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter does not support the classification of A107 (S14/48) as a Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Site. It considers that it should be a Group 1 site.	That the classification of archaeological site A107 is amended from a Group 2 site to a Group 1 Sites and the Schedules 8b and 8C are changed accordingly.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.40	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	A130 (S14/318) [noting submitter identifies the site as A145 - there was a renumbering post the WSP report being prepared] The submitter does not support the classification of A130 (S14/318) as a Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Site. This should be a Group 1 site.	That the classification of archaeological site A130 [A145] is amended from a Group 2 site to a Group 1 Site.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.41	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter questions why the sites associated with the Mangaharakeke Pa complex have been split between Group 1 (A33) and Group 2 (A125), when these site have all been recognised for their 'group value'. A125 should be a Group 1 category.	That the classification of archaeological site A125 is amended from a Group 2 site to a Group 1 Site.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.42	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter queries whether A152 should be removed from Schedule 8C if there is no archaeological evidence. It should be ground truthed or part of a cultural sites schedule.	That A152 (S14/49) is ground truthed and removed from Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Site is there is no archaeological evidence on the site. And, if appropriate the site is scheduled as part of a separate cultural sites schedule.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.43	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter queries whether A159 should be removed from the Schedule 8C if there is no archaeological evidence. It should be ground truthed and if appropriate, included on a cultural sites schedule.	That A159 (S14/91) is ground truthed and removed from Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Site is there is no archaeological evidence on the site. And if appropriate the site is scheduled as part of a separate cultural sites schedule.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.44	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	A20 (S14/44) The submitter is unclear why the extent of some sites have been drawn with 'cut outs' accommodating infrastructure - the extent of sites need to be based on the 'archaeological values', rather than the location of infrastructure.	That the extent of A20 (S14/44) is ground truthed and the mapped extent is amended to show actual extent.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.45	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with A112 because the extent or polygon is smaller than the area of garden soils identified which is noted as a more accurate depiction of the extent of the site in the site inventory form. The data does not match the scheduled area extent.	That the extent of A112 is amended after further investigation.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.46	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter advises that A175 was partly investigated under an HNZPT archaeological Authority. The proposed schedule extent is that of the previously investigated area. Instead, further assessment should be conducted to determine if the extent should be larger or different to the current polygon in the planning maps.	That the extent of A175 is further assessed to determine the actual extent of the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.47	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter queries the classification of A153 and that it should be ground truthed. And, if appropriate the site is scheduled as part of a separate cultural sites schedule.	That A153 (S14/52) is ground truthed and removed from Schedule 8C - Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Site is there is no archaeological evidence on the site. And, if appropriate the site is scheduled as part of a separate cultural sites schedule.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Carolyn McAlley	151.48	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter queries scheduling A176 as an archaeological site because the nature of horticultural sites, particularly garden soils mean it is unlikely that material would have survived the industrial development; if there is no archaeological evidence this site should be removed from the archaeological scheme; and if appropriate this site should be part of a cultural site schedule.	That A176 (S14/325) is removed from Schedule 8B - Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Site is there is no archaeological values. And, if appropriate the site is scheduled as part of a separate cultural sites schedule.
Melanie Nair	152.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to new rules relating to protected root zone for notable trees and amendment to rules for maintenance and pruning of notable trees under Chapter 20 because it will create additional and seemingly unnecessary step to require resource consent for pruning trees adjacent to property/neighbour. The submitter also concerns deficiencies leading to soil instability and erosion compromising safety of residents/tenants caused by the current retaining built next to a proposed SNA adjacent to the property.	Recommends an assessment by Council or an appointed contractor to assess the proposed SNA area, review state of retaining wall, amend/fixing to a satisfactory standard prior to changing the rules to protecting the root zone.
Melanie Nair	152.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to new rules relating to protected root zone for notable trees and amendment to rules for maintenance and pruning of notable trees under Chapter 20 because it will create additional and seemingly unnecessary step to require resource consent for pruning trees adjacent to property/neighbour. The submitter also concerns deficiencies leading to soil instability and erosion compromising safety of residents/tenants caused by the current retaining built next to a proposed SNA adjacent to the property.	Seeks an automatic exemption of requiring consent to prune trees entering into the submitter's property/boundary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton M J A Taylor Trust Ltd	153.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the registration of the existing dwelling at 65 Braid Road (H168) as a Group B Built Heritage Building in Schedule 8A and mentions that a certificate of compliance has recently been granted that enables the demolition of the existing dwelling on the land despite the provisions of Plan Change 9. The listing imposes significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. The submitter mentions that no reasoning has been provided for why buildings assessed as having high or moderate value in terms of one or more of the heritage criteria are deemed to be places of significant heritage value and of value locally or regionally.	Relief Sought Either: (a) Delete the existing dwelling at 65 Braid Road (H168) from Schedule 8A; or (b) Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to provide that in the event that a scheduled building is removed from a site or demolished that the provisions of Plan Change 9 do not apply and the consideration of further development reverts to that provided for in the underlying zone.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton M J A Taylor Trust Ltd	153.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the registration of the existing dwelling at 65 Braid Road (H168) as a Group B Built Heritage Building in Schedule 8A and mentions that a certificate of compliance has recently been granted that enables the demolition of the existing dwelling on the land despite the provisions of Plan Change 9. The listing imposes significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. The submitter mentions that no reasoning has been provided for why buildings assessed as having high or moderate value in terms of one or more of the heritage criteria are deemed to be places of significant heritage value and of value locally or regionally.	Either: (a) Delete the existing dwelling at 65 Braid Road (H168) from Schedule 8A; or (b) Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to provide that in the event that a scheduled building is removed from a site or demolished that the provisions of Plan Change 9 do not apply and the consideration of further development reverts to that provided for in the underlying zone.
Kemble Pudney	154.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Policy 20.2.1 (d) because the meaning of modifier "demonstrably" in 20.2.1 (d) (ii) and 20.2.1 (d) (iii) is unclear, and the phrase "minimised where practicable" implies no action if nothing is practicable. It is probably preferable to provide for degrees of minimisation with an assessment of what is acceptable. The word "demonstrably" is also used in 20.2.1 (d) (iv) and 20.2.1 (d) (v). The test in 20.2.1 (d) (iv) and 20.2.1 (d) (v) moves from "practicable" to "possible", which the submitter considers it is inappropriate in this context because practicable means able to be accomplished, while possible is a may be.	Amends Policy 20.2.1 (d) and amends Policy 20.2.1 (d) (ii) as "Where adverse effects cannot be demonstrably avoided, they are minimised where practicable; and".
Kemble Pudney	154.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3 g because they do not appear to provide for construction of access on private land to enable ecological restoration, which is contradictory to Policy 20.2.1l.	Amend Rule 20.3 to include access paths to facilitate restoration as permitted activities.
Kemble Pudney	154.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.6 because it restricts vegetation removal to 50m ² per site per year, which is insufficient.	Amend Rule 20.5.6 to include larger areas of exotic vegetation able to be removed provided they contribute to ecological restoration set out in a restoration plan.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kemble Pudney	154.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3. k because they do not appear to provide for construction of access on private land to enable ecological restoration, which is contradictory to Policy 20.2.11.	Amend Rule 20.3 to include access paths to facilitate restoration as permitted activities.
Kemble Pudney	154.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3. l because they do not appear to provide for construction of access on private land to enable ecological restoration, which is contradictory to Policy 20.2.11.	Amend Rule 20.3 to include access paths to facilitate restoration as permitted activities.
Kemble Pudney	154.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3.q because they do not appear to provide for construction of access on private land to enable ecological restoration, which is contradictory to Policy 20.2.11.	Amend Rule 20.3 to include access paths to facilitate restoration as permitted activities.
AREINZ - Colin Jones	155.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and extent of the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA). The submitter considers that PC9 does not comply with the NPSUD. The houses are not well-constructed and not well-maintained. Infrastructure upgrades will be needed. Sensible for more concentrated housing in these areas which are close to the CBD, university and inland port.	Review and redefine the Te Aroha (East) HHA as an "intensification zone".
AREINZ - Colin Jones	155.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and extent of the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA). The submitter considers that PC9 does not comply with the NPSUD. The houses are not well-constructed and not well-maintained. Infrastructure upgrades will be needed. Sensible for more concentrated housing in these areas which are close to the CBD, university and inland port.	Review and redefine the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street HHA as an "intensification zone".
AREINZ - Colin Jones	155.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and extent of the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA). The submitter considers that PC9 does not comply with the NPSUD. The houses are not well-constructed and not well-maintained. Infrastructure upgrades will be needed. Sensible for more concentrated housing in these areas which are close to the CBD, university and inland port.	Review and redefine the Hamilton East HHA as an "intensification zone".
AREINZ - Colin Jones	155.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA). The submitter considers that PC9 does not comply with the NPSUD. The houses are not well-constructed and not well-maintained. Infrastructure upgrades will be needed. Sensible for more concentrated housing in these areas which are close to the CBD, university and inland port.	Review and redefine the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street HHA (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA) as an "intensification zone".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
AREINZ - Colin Jones	155.5	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and extent of the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA). The submitter considers that PC9 does not comply with the NPSUD. The houses are not well-constructed and not well-maintained. Infrastructure upgrades will be needed. Sensible for more concentrated housing in these areas which are close to the CBD, university and inland port.	Review and redefine the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area, the Wilson Road and Pinfold Street Historic Heritage Area, the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area (which the submitter refers to as the Norton Road HHA) as an "intensification zone".
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton J R Marra	156.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	There are borrow pits on the eastern side of River Road but no visible features on the west of River Road, including on the submitter's property. The site on the eastern side of River Road (S14/165) was once a significant archaeological site but no longer is and has never been identified as extending to the western side of River Road in the location of the submitters' property or adjoining land. The WSP report does not provide any reasoning or justification for why the land on the western side of River Road in the vicinity of the submitters' land is identified as forming part of the archaeological site.	Seeks amendment to the planning maps to delete those parts of Archaeological Site A1/105 from all land on the western side of River Road (as identified in the diagram on pg 8 of the submission) and in particular from land described as Lot 3 DPS 73470 (RT: SA59A/805).
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton B C & K E Wilson	157.1	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The part of SNA-C18 that the submitters seek to be removed from their property is a developed garden area comprising retaining walls, paths, an accessory building and an old swimming pool (filled). Vegetation comprises ground covers (grass and weeds) and a few mature exotic trees. The existing vegetation is not representative of the vegetation in adjoining land to the east (dense vegetation). The submitters seek ground truthing to determine whether the SNA applies to their land as aerial and GIS studies may not suffice. They acknowledge the area does form part of a gully system but considers the nature and extent of exotic vegetation (including weed species) on their land and other development within, does not provide any significant fauna habitat or ecological buffering function.	1. That Hamilton City Council undertake a site visit to ground truth the appropriate extent of SNA-C18. 2. Amend the extent of SNA-C18 as it applies to land described as Lot 13 DPS 7313 (RT: SA1C/1041) and adjoining land to reflect that shown in the diagram on pg 4 of the submission or similar.
Gary and Louise Dela Rue	158.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Given the existing rule framework for Claudelands West, the submitter considers that the establishment of the HHA is unnecessary and may lead to additional costs for property owners and that some of the provisions are pedantic. However, would like to see a total ban on intensification in the area and considers that existing rules should apply to rear properties, due to the visual impact from the River and the adjacent bank not just from the road frontage.	No specific relief listed.
Gary and Louise Dela Rue	158.2	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support	The submitter supports the reduction of the extent of the current Claudelands West Character Zone.	No specific relief listed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gary and Louise Dela Rue	158.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter has put forward a range of suggestions and incentives to assist owners of heritage listed items and regarding changes to the provisions that apply within HHA's. The submitter considers that owning a heritage items results in additional costs for owners and this includes the newly introduced need for heritage assessment reports for properties within HHA's. Given the age and condition of some homes, the submitter considers that demolition, where appropriate, should be enabled but only if the replacement design is appropriate for the area. The submitter considers that the communication process followed for PC9 has been poor and that property rights are impacted without the introduction of any new incentives or compensation and is of the opinion that it is harder to sell heritage listed items and possibly, properties within an HHA.	Request that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the Hamilton Heritage Grant Fund to \$500,000 annually and review its scope and application. 2. Remove the requirement for resource consents and heritage reports for maintenance (excluding major improvements) for HHA's 3. That commissioners acknowledge the high cost of heritage ownership, to reinforce the value of heritage and to note that developers and owners of historic commercial properties can claim all expenses as tax deductions whereas private owners cannot. 4. Consider allowing demolition, where appropriate, but conditional on replacement architecture/urban design complementing the zone's character.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Samantha Jayne Bourke - 21 Jellicoe Drive, Hamilton East, Hamilton	159.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the proposed HHA listing across 21 Jellicoe Drive including the associated rule framework and additional rules and considers that this is a restriction of private property rights and that the additional restrictions will create an unnecessary financial burden and considers that the provisions (related to HHA's) appear to be knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or archaeological significance. Further that, for the property in question, that it does match the broad description applied to the area as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP assessment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That 21 Jellicoe Drive is removed from the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA and/or 2. That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Samantha Jayne Bourke - 21 Jellicoe Drive, Hamilton East, Hamilton	159.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the proposed HHA listing across 21 Jellicoe Drive including the associated rule framework and additional rules and considers that this is a restriction of private property rights and that the additional restrictions will create an unnecessary financial burden and considers that the provisions (related to HHA's) appear to be knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or archaeological significance. Further that, for the property in question, that it does match the broad description applied to the area as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP assessment.	That 21 Jellicoe Drive is removed from the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA and/or That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Samantha Jayne Bourke - 21 Jellicoe Drive, Hamilton East, Hamilton	159.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the proposed HHA listing across 21 Jellicoe Drive including the associated rule framework and additional rules and considers that this is a restriction of private property rights and that the additional restrictions will create an unnecessary financial burden and considers that the provisions (related to HHA's) appear to be knee-jerk reaction to the NPS-UD intensification framework, as opposed to a need to protect a particular building type/history because it is historically, physically, contextual or archaeological significance. Further that, for the property in question, that it does match the broad description applied to the area as listed in Appendix 9 of the WSP assessment.	That 21 Jellicoe Drive is removed from the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA and/or; That significant changes are made to the rule framework to reduce the constraints/consenting obligations on the property in relation to redevelopment of the building or the site.
Rintje (Ron) Willem Esselbrugge	160.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter makes submission regarding amendments and addition to Purpose 19.1 for Historic Heritage Area and considers housing around sixty years old and has valued character should be preserved. Infill housing should be in keeping with the look of the surrounding houses in-order to maintain that character, a sense of belonging and mental well being. The submitter believes multi-story buildings would have a negative impact on the character of the area, the sense of belonging and mental health of the community within.	Amends Glenview area and others like it to the Historical Heritage Area and provides as much protection to prevent the degradation of aging suburbs.
Tania Sorasti Dubois	161.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of St Winifreds Avenue and surrounding streets as a Special Character Zone. [Notes: The submitter made a submission regarding Historic Heritage Areas and St Winifred Avenue is located within the Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.]	Rezone St Winifreds Avenue and surrounding streets as a Special Character Zone.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Walter and Patricia Meister - 170 Pembroke Street, Hamilton	162.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 170 Pembroke Street (H264).	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H264, 170 Pembroke Street.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Nancy Caiger - PO Box 12360 Chartwell Hamilton	163.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 913 River Road (H284) as a built heritage item in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H284, 913 River Road.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Anne Barnett-Bell	164.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the proposed Anglesea Street Historic Heritage Area over 3 Anglesea Street and the extent identified for the area. The submitter concerns the area, streetscape and privacy outcomes will be compromised by potential high density zoning and developments on properties behind 3 Anglesea Street. The submitter also considers the implication of Historic Heritage Area overlay over 1 and 3 Anglesea Street will restrict owners' ability to redevelop and/or undertake maintenance due to the requirements of resource consent.	Remove the proposed Anglesea Street HHA in its entirety and/or extend the HHA to include the properties to the rear and side of 1 Anglesea Street.
Anne Barnett-Bell	164.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the proposed Anglesea Street Historic Heritage Area over 3 Anglesea Street and the extent identified for the area. The submitter concerns the area, streetscape and privacy outcomes will be compromised by potential high density zoning and developments on properties behind 3 Anglesea Street. The submitter also considers the implication of Historic Heritage Area overlay over 1 and 3 Anglesea Street will restrict owners' ability to redevelop and/or undertake maintenance due to the requirements of resource consent.	Amends Rule 19.3.2 (a) to undertake additions and alterations at the rear of the home without the requirement of resource consent.
Anne Barnett-Bell	164.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the proposed Anglesea Street Historic Heritage Area over 3 Anglesea Street and the extent identified for the area. The submitter concerns the area, streetscape and privacy outcomes will be compromised by potential high density zoning and developments on properties behind 3 Anglesea Street. The submitter also considers the implication of Historic Heritage Area overlay over 1 and 3 Anglesea Street will restrict owners' ability to redevelop and/or undertake maintenance due to the requirements of resource consent.	Amend provisions to, if ever the need should arise, install a security fence of up to 1.8 metre high at the front and at the side of the section, between 1 Anglesea Street and 3 Anglesea Street.
Victoria Collins and Troy Radovancich - Vicky Collins	165.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter notes a cSNA marked on the property at 237 Dixon Road (Lot 102 DP 505873) as C36, however, this is not registered as a cSNA within Schedule 9C. An error is presumed. If there is no error, the submitters oppose the cSNA due to portions of the SNA begin flat garden areas, nor in the submitters opinion, qualify as an ecological corridor that cSNA. It is a small pocket of gully flanked by housing.	That the planning maps be updated to exclude any part of 237 Dixon Road (Lot 102 DP 505873) from the cSNA that is currently marked on it.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Julia and Dean Masters	166.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support in part	As the Historic Heritage Area (HHA) relates to identification, protection, maintenance and enhancement of heritage attributes of an area, it is appropriate that development is provided for where sympathetic to the values of the areas. However, additions and alterations, as well as demolition of buildings where not located at the street frontage, will not adversely impact the overall heritage value associated with the streetscape. Therefore, a blanket requirement for all additions to a building or demolition of a building, to require assessment is not appropriate.	<p>Amend Purpose 19.1(k) as follows:</p> <p><i>k. The physical and visual qualities are attributes to the heritage values and they include the consistencies of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. Street and block layout</i> <i>ii. Street design and street trees,</i> <i>iii. Lot sizes, dimensions and development density,</i> <i>iv. Lot layout and position of buildings and structures onsite,</i> <i>v. Topography and natural environment,</i> <i>vi. Architecture and building typologies and</i> <i>vii. Street frontage treatments.</i> <p><i>The values of these heritage areas can be compromised by site redevelopment, infill development, demolition of existing buildings and structures, additions and alterations of existing buildings, and additions of other buildings and structures such as accessory buildings, fences and retaining walls, where located in close proximity to the street frontage, if these have little regard to the area's representatives and consistencies of those heritage attributes.</i></p>
Julia and Dean Masters	166.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	As the Historic Heritage Area (HHA) relates to identification, protection, maintenance and enhancement of heritage attributes of an area, it is appropriate that development is provided for where sympathetic to the values of the areas. However, additions and alterations, as well as demolition of buildings where not located at the street frontage, will not adversely impact the overall heritage value associated with the streetscape. Therefore, a blanket requirement for all additions to a building or demolition of a building, to require assessment is not appropriate.	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.4(c) as follows:</p> <p><i>The design, material use and placement of buildings and structures, including relocated buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings, demonstrate consistency with the physical and visual qualities of the historic heritage area through a Heritage Impact Assessment.</i></p>
Julia and Dean Masters	166.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	As the Historic Heritage Area (HHA) relates to identification, protection, maintenance and enhancement of heritage attributes of an area, it is appropriate that development is provided for where sympathetic to the values of the areas. However, additions and alterations, as well as demolition of buildings where not located at the street frontage, will not adversely impact the overall heritage value associated with the streetscape. Therefore, a blanket requirement for all additions to a building or demolition of a building, to require assessment is not appropriate.	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.4(d) as follows:</p> <p><i>The effects of demolition or removal of existing buildings, including detached accessory building, on a front, corner or through site within a historic heritage area is managed to protect the identified historic heritage values.</i></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Julia and Dean Masters	166.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The HHA identifies areas which as a whole have heritage value, it does not apply to individual buildings. Therefore, it is not appropriate to require resource consent for alterations and additions which do not change the front façade of individual buildings on front sites.	Amend Rule 19.3.2(a) as follows: <i>Alterations and additions <u>forward of the front building line</u> to an existing building on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage)</i>
Julia and Dean Masters	166.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The HHA identifies areas which as a whole have heritage value, it does not apply to individual buildings. Therefore, it is not appropriate to require resource consent for alterations and additions which do not change the front façade of individual buildings on front sites.	Amend Rule 19.3.2(b) as follows: <u>i. Alterations and additions to an existing building on a rear site, within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage)</u> <u>ii. Alterations and additions behind the front building line to an existing building on on a front, corner or through site, within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage).</u>
Julia and Dean Masters	166.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	No definition of “curtilage wall” is proposed and therefore it is unclear what this rule applies to.	Delete Rule 19.3.2(d).
Julia and Dean Masters	166.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The HHA identifies areas which as a whole have heritage value, it does not apply to individual buildings. Therefore, it is not appropriate to require resource consent for the demolition of buildings which do not change the streetscape of individual buildings on front sites.	Amend Policy 19.3.2(f) as follows: <i>Demolition of existing detached accessory buildings <u>forward of the front building line</u> on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings listed in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage)</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Julia and Dean Masters	166.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>It is not appropriate that the full range of assessment criteria be applied to activities requiring a resource consent within HHAs. The HHA identifies areas which as a whole have heritage value, it does not apply to individual buildings. On this basis, it is inappropriate to require assessments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga • Archaeological assessments (noting that accidental discovery protocol will apply) • Iwi consultation • Cultural effects • Provision for signage and landscaping <p>It is also noted that these changes will ensure consistency with the information requirements outlined in section 1.2.2.7 in Volume 2, Appendix 1".</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.6 ix to xv to identify specific assessment criteria to be applicable as follows:</p> <p>E – Heritage Values and Special Character <u>limited to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>E1 a to c, e to f</u> • <u>E2</u> • <u>E3 a, b and d</u> • <u>E4</u>
David John Venter	167.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T217.2 (Liquidambar styraciflua aka Sweet Gum) and its protected root zone due to the following reasons as stated by submitter:</p> <p>"1. Roots have damaged the drain systems to such an extent that every time there is significant rainfall my front driveway is flooded because the water cannot drain via the soakhole. The flooding is so bad that there are times when I have been unable to leave the house.</p> <p>2.The tree drops its hard round spiky balls (aka Sweet Gum Balls) almost all year round. They are dangerous to step on, constantly clog up my gutters and downpipes.</p> <p>3. I am wheelchair user and there are times when the sweet gum balls lodge under my front wheels causing me to fall out of my chair.</p> <p>4. The tree is not properly pruned or maintained by the Council. When there are strong winds large branches are broken off. There have been two occasions when large branches have dropped from the tree and damaged my cars and fence".</p> <p>[Notes: T217.2 is being identified at 188 Hukanui Road in Schedule 9D].</p>	<p>Remove the tree and repairs to the drainage systems that have been damaged by the roots.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David John Venter	167.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T217.3 (Liquidambar styraciflua aka Sweet Gum) and its protected root zone due to the following reasons as stated by submitter:</p> <p>"1. Roots have damaged the drain systems to such an extent that every time there is significant rainfall my front driveway is flooded because the water cannot drain via the soakhole. The flooding is so bad that there are times when I have been unable to leave the house.</p> <p>2.The tree drops its hard round spiky balls (aka Sweet Gum Balls) almost all year round. They are dangerous to step on, constantly clog up my gutters and downpipes.</p> <p>3. I am wheelchair user and there are times when the sweet gum balls lodge under my front wheels causing me to fall out of my chair.</p> <p>4. The tree is not properly pruned or maintained by the Council. When there are strong winds large branches are broken off. There have been two occasions when large branches have dropped from the tree and damaged my cars and fence".</p> <p>[Notes: T217.3 is being identified at 192 Hukanui Road in Schedule 9D].</p>	Remove the tree and repairs to the drainage systems that have been damaged by the roots.
William O'Connor	168.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendment regarding the protected root zone within 6 Clifton Road and opposes to Rule 20.3(w)(ix) as currently there are impermeable surfaces and a building located within it.	Update the inventory sheet for the notable tree where its protected root zone extends into 6 Clifton Road to record what currently exists within this area.
William O'Connor	168.2	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the lack of definition of tree under Rule 20.3(w)(ix). The submitter considers trees can vary in terms of form and size and clarity is required to exclude planting of small trees from requiring a resource consent.	Provide definition of tree applicable to Rule 20.3.w (ix) to exclude small trees that will not have an impact on the Protected Root Zone.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter states that the City should be referenced as Kirikiriroa - Hamilton. It was known as Kirikiriroa for centuries long before it was named Hamilton! Using Hamilton – Kirikiriroa implies the absurd notion that this country was "New Zealand" before it was known as Aotearoa.	Where the word "Hamilton" is referenced, replace it with " <u>Kirikiriroa</u> - Hamilton".
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.2	General	General		<p>Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment</p> <p>The submitter states, as manawhenua of this city, Ngati Wairere encourage the increase of our natural diversity and environment such as gully and river bank restoration with locally sourced native species of trees and flora and also expand increase existing pockets and small isolated groups of kahikatea located upon city parks and reserves.</p>	Encourage the increase of our natural diversity and environment such as gully and river bank restoration
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.3	General	General		<p>Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment</p> <p>The submitter encourages the return of traditional pre – European Maori names of the landmarks that bring a greater depth of understanding of the lands and the ancestors that once lived on them to be done in direct consultation with Ngati Wairere. An example given - "Earlier this year we successfully lobbied and worked with the city with Mr Ian Mc Michael to change Von Tempsky Street and revive the name <i>Putikitiki</i>".</p>	The return to traditional pre – European Maori names of these landmarks in consultation with Ngati Wairere.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.4	General	General		Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Historic Heritage and Natural Environment The submitter states that Te Papanui (Claudelands) has a wonderful stand of kahikatea and tawa but is under threat due to trees dying, some are over 500 years old; and there should be action to increase the area of this remaining stand.	Increase the area of the remaining stand of kahikatea and tawa at Te Papanui (Claudelands).
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter opposes the notified "overlays regarding all archaeological sites in the District Plan and as part of plan change 9", stating that they are currently deficient - because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The day to day activities were not confined only to Pa sites but a much wider area outside of Pa such as cultivations and other features associated with food gathering, events and preparation places for making and constructing canoes, houses and palisades. • They do not reflect up-to-date information from recent environment court hearings and mediations. 	Submitter seeks a review and input to update the extents of all scheduled archaeological sites informed by advice from a commissioner well-versed in Tikanga Maori and a Maori Land Court Judge.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified "overlays regarding all archaeological sites in the District Plan and as part of plan change 9", stating that they are currently deficient - because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The day to day activities were not confined only to Pa sites but a much wider area outside of Pa such as cultivations and other features associated with food gathering, events and preparation places for making and constructing canoes, houses and palisades. • They do not reflect up-to-date information from recent environment court hearings and mediations. 	Submitter seeks a review and input to update the extents of all scheduled archaeological sites informed by advice from a commissioner well-versed in Tikanga Maori and a Maori Land Court Judge.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter opposes the existing terms and recommends the use of the term/subtitle " Sites of hapu and archaeological significance" should be encouraged.	The term/subtitle " <i>Sites of hapu and archaeological significance</i> " be used.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter opposes the location of any high-rise buildings near any Pa site. Prefer to have those sites left as open as possible for cultural reasons/view shafts to the river.	That no high-rise buildings are located near any Pa sites, and that those sites be left as open as possible.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter seeks that landmarks and river features identified by Ngati Wairere such as landing sites and springs, not just confined to pa sites and garden soils, are scheduled. Engage professional services to examine the sites in the district plan, and other sites that should be included.	Landmarks and river features identified by Ngati Wairere such as landing sites and springs, not just confined to pa sites and garden soils, are scheduled. Engage professional services to examine the sites in the district plan and other sites that should be included.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.11	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter opposes the rankings proposed by the late Mr Owen Wilkes regarding our pa sites and they need to be removed.	Delete the rankings proposed by the late Mr Owen Wilkes.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.12	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Archaeological Sites The submitter opposes the rankings proposed by the late Mr Owen Wilkes regarding our pa sites and they need to be removed.	Delete the rankings proposed by the late Mr Owen Wilkes.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Refer to Full Submission - topic subtitle - Built Heritage Sites containing pre-1950s structures may contain features such as Maori garden soils within the building imprint that were associated features of pre European and post European activity such as buried taonga and human remains may still be preserved in situ. All such features, recorded or not, are protected under the HNZPT Act 2014; and would require an authority from HNZ, and research reports from a qualified archaeologist and from Ngati Wairere (Mana Whenua) to explain the sites of significance.	A process as part of the conditions of consent whereby, subject to gaining an authority from Heritage NZ, Ngati Wairere examine and record subsoils of pre-1950s houses and structures that are to be removed off-site.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.14	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Miropiko Pa - A7 (S14/38), Group 1, Schedule 8B: is a site of significance to this city and to Ngati Wairere and could be affected if large multi-story buildings were to go up near or on top of them.	Return the character of Miropiko Pa back to having native trees such as Miro and other suitable trees that once grew in the vicinity
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.15	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Opoia Pa A19 (S14/41), Group 1, Schedule 8B: is a well-known Pa sites that holds huge significance to this city and to Ngati Wairere and could be affected if large multi-story buildings were to go upon near or on top of them. It was occupied by Ngaati Haanui, Ngaati Paretaua and Ngati Iranui in pre European times. Poukawa was one of the main chiefs of Ngati Wairere in his era who signed Te Tiriti O Waitangi on April 28th 1840.	Commemorate the site with a carved Pou and interpretative panel as outlined in the Nga Tapuwae O Hotumauea – Maori Land Marks on Hamilton City Council Reserves Management Plan 2003.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.16	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of two oak trees (T253.2 and 1253.3) at the back of 10, 12 & 14 Opoia Road as notable trees, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oaks are not of any cultural value to Ngati Wairere and to the lands that were once part of Opoia Pa. They are regarded as a symbols of colonization. • Health and safety issue of slippery fallen leaves. • Gutter and drainage problems that affects the health and wellbeing of my place including damp and mould. • Other oaks that are more worthy and can be seen better by the public. • The oak trees block out significant view shafts. 	Delete Notable tree T253.2 from Schedule 9D: Notable Trees.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.17	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of two oak trees (T253.2 and 1253.3) at the back of 10, 12 & 14 Opoia Road as notable trees, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Oaks are not of any cultural value to Ngati Wairere and to the lands that were once part of Opoia Pa. They are regarded as a symbols of colonization. ○ Health and safety issue of slippery fallen leaves. ○ Gutter and drainage problems that affects the health and wellbeing of my place including damp and mould. ○ Other oaks that are more worthy and can be seen better by the public. ○ The oak trees block out significant view shafts. 	Delete Notable tree T253.3 from Schedule 9D: Notable Trees.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.18	General	General	Oppose	There are significant gaps in the maps and policies including data that is important to be added that only Ngati Wairere can provide.	Review the contractual performance of THAWK and other third parties that take in breaches of Tikanga Maori and s 6(e) RMA and our connection with the Treaty of Waitangi.
Ngati Wairere - Wiremu Puke	169.19	General	General	Oppose	Submitter has been working with the Department of Earth Sciences at Waikato University regarding the fault lines that have been found and are being mapped. The commissioners must seriously consider these matters.	Include in the plan change the fault lines that have been found and are being mapped by Waikato University.
Lorna McNaughton	170.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the inclusion of Cook Street, from Nixon Street to Galloway Street within the proposed Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area and considers that the physical and visual qualities described in Chapter 19 have been compromised in the area and that it therefore warrants exclusion from the Historic Heritage Area. Further that this area is well located to Hamilton East, the CBD and schooling and is well suited to further infill.	Remove the section of Cook Street, from Nixon Street to Galloway Street from the proposed Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 20.2.1 and Policy 20.2.1(c)(i) with amendments. The submitter recognises the potential tension caused by overly micromanaging and balancing the aspirations of landowners with protection of the environment. However, in some cases, such as if properties are not occupied but rather owned from overseas, some properties can end up becoming neglected to the detriment of the SNA that may be on their property.	Amend to add policies and rules that provide incentives and penalties to carry out enhancement and restoration of all or part of SNAs that are neglected to the point of causing significant negative impacts to the SNA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 20.2.2a because the rule should provide to reduce lack of communication and a comprehensive consultation process. Time and again one of the causes of issues with conservation efforts is the lack of communication. We think it's necessary to prioritise this communication prior to any restoration work being done so that any potential tensions, mistakes, trespasses, and omissions can be avoided.	Amend Policy 20.2.2a to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add that communication should be 'required' between landowners, Department of Conservation, mana whenua and other organisations that can assist in the management, protection, and restoration of Significant Natural Areas with Discretionary and Non-Complying activities. • Add that it is 'it is strongly encouraged that all communication follows a participatory approach or process rather than a consultative approach or process.'
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rules 20.3i-r because SNA owners or those who work or volunteer in SNAs should not pay to grapple with costly regulatory requirements to protect and enhance these sites. Plan Changes should not inhibit or prohibit the enhancement or restoration of SNAs by restoration groups, volunteers and property/landowners.	Amend Rules 20.3i-r to provide specific definitions of 'structure' and 'existing 'structures'. Any new structures or structures requiring amending and/or upgrading that will contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs should either have consent waivers or have stipulated standards that should be fulfilled to determine whether a consent would be required or not.
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Allowing the permitted activity of removing indigenous or exotic trees solely because of their age may be detrimental through removing potential habitat, such as nesting and roosting spaces.	Delete 'or age' from Rule 20.3 a.i. as a qualifying criterion for the removal of indigenous or exotic trees as a permitted activity.
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	There is an issue with limiting the amount of exotic vegetation or trees that can be removed in a calendar year to only 50m ² , in certain instances, especially large-scale restoration efforts, this would not be feasible since it would lead to very long-time scales and the probability of re-infestation from pest plants that could not be removed on account of this area limitation.	Amend Rules 20.5.6a.ii. to restrict the provision to "No more than 50m ² of <u>indigenous</u> vegetation or trees are removed per site per calendar year; and", thereby also removing the 50m ² amount limit for exotic vegetation or trees.
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 20.5.6b. because often replanting of an area that has had weeds removed does not always occur within a year and can be a process that can take up to 2 years, hence the increase in time required for replanting.	Amend Rule 20.5.6b. as follows: "The area cleared is planted with indigenous vegetation or trees within <u>24</u> months; and"

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments to Rule 20.5.6c because due to the extreme sensitivity and National Critical status of our Pekapeka-tou-roa, every step possible must be taken to protect them.	Amend Rules 20.5.6c and 20.5.6c.ii.1. as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to the definition of 'suitably qualified person' to 'suitably qualified person <u>endorsed by Mana Whenua</u>'. • Add procedural requirements to the provision, if felling is required and confirmed then it must follow the DOC Tree Felling Protocol and felling needs to be conducted the day after 5 nights of no bat activity.
Ellen Webb Go Eco	171.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 20.5.7A a. because plan changes should not inhibit or prohibit restoration activities and a new provision should be added to assist with access to areas that require restorative work.	Amend Rule 20.5.7A a. as follows: "The works are required to maintain an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure <u>or to contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs</u> , and;"
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 20.2.1 and Policy 20.2.1(c)(i) with amendments. The submitter recognises the potential tension caused by overly micromanaging and balancing the aspirations of landowners with protection of the environment. However, in some cases, such as if properties are not occupied but rather owned from overseas, some properties can end up becoming neglected to the detriment of the SNA that may be on their property.	Amend to add policies and rules that provide incentives and penalties to carry out enhancement and restoration of all or part of SNAs that are neglected to the point of causing significant negative impacts to the SNA.
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Policy 20.2.2a because the rule should provide to reduce lack of communication and a comprehensive consultation process. Time and again one of the causes of issues with conservation efforts is the lack of communication. We think it's necessary to prioritise this communication prior to any restoration work being done so that any potential tensions, mistakes, trespasses, and omissions can be avoided.	Amend Policy 20.2.2a to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add that communication should be 'required' between landowners, Department of Conservation, mana whenua and other organisations that can assist in the management, protection, and restoration of Significant Natural Areas with Discretionary and Non-Complying activities. • Add that it is 'it is strongly encouraged that all communication follows a participatory approach or process rather than a consultative approach or process.'

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rules 20.3i-r because SNA owners or those who work or volunteer in SNAs should not pay to grapple with costly regulatory requirements to protect and enhance these sites. Plan Changes should not inhibit or prohibit the enhancement or restoration of SNAs by restoration groups, volunteers and property/landowners.	Amend Rules 20.3i-r to provide specific definitions of 'structure' and 'existing structures'. Any new structures or structures requiring amending and/or upgrading that will contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs should either have consent waivers or have stipulated standards that should be fulfilled to determine whether a consent would be required or not.
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Allowing the permitted activity of removing indigenous or exotic trees solely because of their age may be detrimental through removing potential habitat, such as nesting and roosting spaces.	Delete 'or age' from Rule 20.3 a.i. as a qualifying criterion for the removal of indigenous or exotic trees as a permitted activity.
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	There is an issue with limiting the amount of exotic vegetation or trees that can be removed in a calendar year to only 50m ² , in certain instances, especially large-scale restoration efforts, this would not be feasible since it would lead to very long-time scales and the probability of re-infestation from pest plants that could not be removed on account of this area limitation.	Amend Rules 20.5.6a.ii. to restrict the provision to "No more than 50m ² of indigenous vegetation or trees are removed per site per calendar year; and", thereby also removing the 50m ² amount limit for exotic vegetation or trees.
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 20.5.6b. because often replanting of an area that has had weeds removed does not always occur within a year and can be a process that can take up to 2 years, hence the increase in time required for replanting.	Amend Rule 20.5.6b. as follows: "The area cleared is planted with indigenous vegetation or trees within <u>24</u> months; and"
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments to Rule 20.5.6c because due to the extreme sensitivity and National Critical status of our Pekapeka-tou-roa, every step possible must be taken to protect them.	Amend Rules 20.5.6c and 20.5.6c.ii.1. as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to the definition of 'suitably qualified person' to 'suitably qualified person endorsed by Mana Whenua'. • Add procedural requirements to the provision, if felling is required and confirmed then it must follow the DOC Tree Felling Protocol and felling needs to be conducted the day after 5 nights of no bat activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ellen Webb Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum	172.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The submitter seeks to amend Rule 20.5.7A a. because plan changes should not inhibit or prohibit restoration activities and a new provision should be added to assist with access to areas that require restorative work.	Amend Rule 20.5.7A a. as follows: “The works are required to maintain an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure <u>or to contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs, and;</u> ”
Chi Dong	173.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of state houses within the Historic Heritage Areas and considers the environment in state housing to be poorly managed and dirty. The submitter also concerns that the implication of Historic Heritage Area provisions impact their rights and interests without compensation.	Seeks a reasonable compensation method regarding Historic Heritage Area.
Mel Walker	174.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 94 Albert Street (H143) as a built heritage item in Schedule 8A : Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H143, 94 Albert Street.
Mel Walker	174.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the proposed Hamilton East HHA and considers that the provisions will make it too expensive for property owners to upgrade their homes and that, as a result, the entire area will be negatively impacted.	Remove the large expanse of Historical Heritage from the Hamilton East area encompassing Albert Street and only look for reserve well kept ‘built heritage’ where owners will not have to spend considerable money to make any improvements over time.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	175.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 3 Oxford Street as a built heritage item (H253) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to delete all reference to H253, 3 Oxford Street.
Sarah Josephine and Zoe Georgina Yzendoorn David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	175.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the Historic Heritage Area - HHA 23 - Oxford Street (West).	Delete the Historic Heritage Area, HHA 23 - Oxford Street (West) in its entirety.
Gillian Cockerell Ariana Aliifaalogo	176.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the standards within Rule 19.3.2 (a) concerning alterations and additions to buildings, because it creates unreasonable and unjustified burden and cost on property owners while having little clarity on the outcomes sought. The submitter notes the diverse range of housing in the Hamilton East Heritage Area.	Modify the activity status rules to allow for alterations and additions without resource consent where there is no or minimal impact on the heritage values.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gillian Cockerell Ariana Aliifaalogo	176.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rules 19.3.2 (a), (f) and (h), as well as Rule 19.4.3 (b) because these rules create an unreasonable and unjustified burden and cost on the property owner with no clarity on the outcome the rules are seeking to achieve for the Hamilton East Heritage Area which has such a diverse mix of building style and age, including mix of existing fence heights (particularly on Nixon Street and in the immediate vicinity of 6A Clifton Road).	Define the heritage values of the Hamilton East Heritage Area that require protection clearly.
Gillian Cockerell Ariana Aliifaalogo	176.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the standards within Rule 19.3.2 (f) concerning demolition of accessory buildings. They are considered to create unreasonable and unjustified burden and cost on property owners while having little clarity on the outcomes sought. The submitter notes the diverse range of housing in the Hamilton East Heritage Area.	Modify the activity status rules to allow for demolition of accessory buildings without resource consent where there is no or minimal impact on the heritage values.
Gillian Cockerell Ariana Aliifaalogo	176.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the standards within Rule 19.3.2 (h) and Standard 19.4.3 (b) concerning fences/walls forward of the front building line in the Hamilton East Heritage Area. They are considered to create unreasonable and unjustified burden and cost on property owners while having little clarity on the outcomes sought. The submitter notes the diverse range of housing in the Hamilton East Heritage Area, including mix of existing fence heights (particularly on Nixon Street and in the immediate vicinity of my property).	Review the fence rule and the associated standard to allow for a higher fence without the requirement for a resource consent.
Emma Young	177.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas, however, seeks amendments to provisions, because the new rules are excessively restrictive for the majority of Historic Heritage Areas. Protection of the heritage values could be achieved without placing unnecessary levels of cost onto home owners. The extra financial expenses, energy and time that these new restrictions would require in order to achieve it limit the ability for such renovations to occur.	Review the provisions to reduce restrictions and create a more reasonable rule framework.
Emma Young	177.2	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non- Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the assessment criteria E is also not specific enough to the Historic Heritage Areas. There are the same set of criteria for assessments relating to listed Heritage Buildings and Historic Heritage Areas. The heritage values are very different between these, as well as each individual Historic Heritage Area.	Separate the Assessment Criteria for Heritage Buildings and Historic Heritage Areas as well as provide specific criteria for each Historic Heritage Area.
Emma Young	177.3	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement of a Heritage Impact Assessment for every resource consent because it will result in a massive increase in expense for home owner. Particularly given the current rules require resource consent for even something as simple as a small shed on the rear of a front site.	Reduce the need for Heritage Impact Assessments.
Carl Eden	178.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area should include Fox Street from Cook Street to Fox Lane, in particular considers Fox Street is representative of the area with most houses built in the 1960s/1970s and the associated lots are in grid pattern. There is historical importance of Galloway Park frontage as Galloway Park as a redoubt part of the Grey St Ham East Markets and the fact that it is part of the original landscape of Hamilton East should be protected.	Includes the area from Galloway Street to Fox Street and Cook Street to Fox Lane as part of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Carl Eden	178.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area should include Fox Street from Cook Street to Fox Lane, in particular considers Fox Street is representative of the area with most houses built in the 1960s/1970s and the associated lots are in grid pattern. There is historical importance of Galloway Park frontage as Galloway Park as a redoubt part of the Grey St Ham East Markets and the fact that it is part of the original landscape of Hamilton East should be protected.	Protects historic significance of Galloway Parks through protecting Fox Street.
Carl Eden	178.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers the original special character zones of Hamilton East should all be included in the Historic Heritage Area as this is required to maintain the character of this area of Hamilton East.	Maintains the Special Character Zone of Hamilton East and changes the extent of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area to include the original boundary as per Operative District Plan - Volume 2 - Appendix 4.
Carl Eden	178.4	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that rear sites that are in the Historic Heritage Areas should be protected from overshadowing by adjacent lots in order to retain the character of the Historic Heritage Areas.	Protects rear lots within the Historic Heritage Areas from excessive shadowing by proposed Plan Change 12 changes.
Carl Eden	178.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers development of rear sites should not be overly restrictive as they cannot be seen from the street frontage, in particular for those that are not adjacent to street frontages.	Development of rear sites should not be overly restrictive and should not have the same restrictions in terms of setbacks, fencing and site coverage.
Emily Parsons	179.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 18 Myrtle Street as part of Myrtle Street and Te Aroha (West) Street Historic Heritage Area, as it had many of its original features removed. The submitter agrees the intention of historic preservation and agrees that there are some properties on Myrtle Street present example of early 1900's settlement architectural. The submitters considers the Myrtle Street and Te Aroha (West) Street Historic Heritage Area overlay could be more applicable to some properties or parts of the area, but not all properties as currently identified under Plan Change 9. The submitter also raises concerns regarding the ongoing maintenance costs and potential impacts on development potentials as a result of the implementation of Historic Heritage Area.	Exclude property at 18 Myrtle Street as part of Myrtle Street and Te Aroha (West) Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Emily Parsons	179.2	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 18 Myrtle Street as part of Myrtle Street and Te Aroha (West) Street Historic Heritage Area, as it had many of its original features removed. The submitter agrees the intention of historic preservation and agrees that there are some properties on Myrtle Street present example of early 1900's settlement architectural. The submitters considers the Myrtle Street and Te Aroha (West) Street Historic Heritage Area overlay could be more applicable to some properties or parts of the area, but not all properties as currently identified under Plan Change 9. The submitter also raises concerns regarding the ongoing maintenance costs and potential impacts on development potentials as a result of the implementation of Historic Heritage Area.	Remove any restrictions under Special Character Zone from the property at 18 Myrtle Street.
Jason Oliver	180.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change 9 Significant Natural Areas as notified because there has only been desktop research into the areas effected and no "earthruthing" had been undertaker, or consultation with property owners.	Seeks that voting on Significant Natural Areas is delayed until each affected property has been inspected, and property owners consulted.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jason Oliver	180.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change 9 Significant Natural Areas as notified because it will restrict the property owner's ability regarding the activities to be undertaken on two third of the property and will impose unnecessary financial costs.	Seeks financial compensation from Council if plan change is passed in its current form, due to the changes reduction in amenity value, and financial burden it puts on property owners.
David and Ruth Hodge	181.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter disagrees with the heritage assessment for part of Brookfield Street (west of Grey Street) in regards to street frontage treatments, lot size, dimensions and development density and opposes part of Brookfield Street (west of Grey Street) being excluded from Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9. The submitter notes the property at 26 Brookfield Street, along with other properties within the vicinity present the integrity of the heritage intact, have valued the heritage aspects of the street and have actively supported the wider heritage area through considerations during their home improvement process. The submitter also raises concerns on consistent application of different criteria for the identification of Historic Heritage Area.	Include part of Brookfield Street (West of Grey Street) as part of the Historic Heritage Area.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The extent of the proposed Claudelands Historic Heritage Area.	Supports the West Claudelands Historic Heritage Area as notified.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Consideration should be given to allow demolitions, where appropriate, but conditional on replacement architecture/urban design complementing the area.	Within the HHA planning process, consideration should be given to allow demolition, where appropriate, but conditional on replacement architecture/urban design complementing the zone's character. A high barrier to demolition is sought.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter conditionally supports the scheduling of 243 River Road on Schedule 8A - Built Heritage as a Historic, B category, subject to appropriate incentives (refer to Section 6.1 - 6.15 of the full submission) for all A and B classified properties in all HHA's throughout the city.	That 243 River Road is scheduled only if realistic incentives are provided by Council to support owners of scheduled built heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	In addition to the 14 scheduled built heritage items other dwellings within the Claudelands HHA extent as notified should be considered for scheduling in Appendix 8, Schedule 8A. The submitter's view that there are at least a minimum of 30 additional homes worthy of qualifying for heritage classification; this suggests a limited study has occurred for Claudelands.	That within the Claudelands HHA, further study of potential built heritage is undertaken.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.5	General	General	Support	That a suite of incentives are established by Council to encourage and enhance historic heritage in Hamilton.	That Council establish incentives to encourage and enhance historic heritage in Hamilton.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support	That greater emphasis is placed on the amenity value historic heritage provides to Hamilton.	The reinforcement of the amenity values that historic heritage provides to Hamilton, given that much of the city's heritage has been wrecked by poor quality developments.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.7	General	General	Oppose	Refer to Section 10 <i>Communications</i> of the full submission as attached. The submitters considers the communication process around Plan Change 9 has been "dreadful"; which they believe was designed to minimise stakeholder engagement, and woefully excluded a major stakeholder group, the individual property owners.	That the submitters dissatisfaction with the Council's communication process for Plan Change 9 is noted.
Gordon and Rita Chesterman	182.8	General	General	Oppose	Refer to section 11 <i>Property Rights</i> - the submitter states that property rights have been impacted through Plan Change 9 and there is a lack of incentive to promote heritage within private property.	A range of realistic incentives are provided to private property owners.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers McChou Property Limited	183.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 37 Rifle Range Road as part of Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 because the existing dwelling has been lawfully demolished and the site will be redeveloped with a new constructed building as health care facility through an approved resource consent. The submitter notes that the property at 37 Rifle Range Road sits in the middle of other properties on Rifle Range Road which appear intact and representative, however the submitter considers the demolition of property at 37 Rifle Range Road will have an impact on the consistency and heritage value of the 'area' as a whole.	Removes the property at 37 Rifle Range Road as part of Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Bad Penny Classic and Custom Services Ltd - Natalie Harrison	184.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas, however, seeks amendments to provisions, because the new rules are excessively restrictive for the majority of Historic Heritage Areas. Protection of the heritage values could be achieved without placing unnecessary levels of cost onto home owners. The extra financial expenses, energy and time that these new restrictions would require in order to achieve it limit the ability for such renovations to occur.	Review the provisions to reduce restrictions and create a more reasonable rule framework and be specific for each Historic Heritage Area. Use the current rules in the Special Character and Special Heritage Zones of the ODP as a good starting point.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bad Penny Classic and Custom Services Ltd - Natalie Harrison	184.2	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The submitter opposes the requirement of a Heritage Impact Assessment for every resource consent because it will result in a massive increase in expense for home owner. Particularly given the current rules require resource consent for even something as simple as a small shed on the rear of a front site.	Reduce the need for Heritage Impact Assessments.
Richard and Donna Falconer	185.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the extent of the proposed Hamilton East HHA, particularly as it relates to Firth St (between Naylor and Albert Streets) and considers that, by virtue of its scale and size, that the degree of accuracy of the assessment used to determine the value of the entire HHA area can be questioned and consequently, could be unreliable in terms of drawing meaningful conclusions and that an example of this is the assessment and impact of rear sites, which are not visible from the street. The submitter considers that the provisions, particularly the assessment needed for a resource consent and the discretion afforded to Council, are impractical and unreasonable, especially regarding rear sites, which are removed from the visual context of the older period houses and the street.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The removal of the Historic Heritage Area overlay and associated provisions from PC9. Failing this that: 2. All rear sites are removed from the Hamilton East HHA, unless it can be proved by Council that these sites have clear 'heritage' value. 3. The removal of any provisions requiring rear sites to obtain land use consent for new dwellings, with the exception of any associated rule non-compliances. 4. Any other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter
Richard and Donna Falconer	185.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the extent of the proposed Hamilton East HHA, particularly as it relates to Firth St (between Naylor and Albert Streets) and considers that, by virtue of its scale and size, that the degree of accuracy of the assessment used to determine the value of the entire HHA area can be questioned and consequently, could be unreliable in terms of drawing meaningful conclusions and that an example of this is the assessment and impact of rear sites, which are not visible from the street. The submitter considers that the provisions, particularly the assessment needed for a resource consent and the discretion afforded to Council, are impractical and unreasonable, especially regarding rear sites, which are removed from the visual context of the older period houses and the street.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The removal of the Historic Heritage Area overlay and associated provisions from PC9. Failing this that: 2. All rear sites are removed from the Hamilton East HHA, unless it can be proved by Council that these sites have clear 'heritage' value. 3. The removal of any provisions requiring rear sites to obtain land use consent for new dwellings, with the exception of any associated rule non-compliances. 4. Any other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter
Brad Edward and Samantha Coffey	186.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of notable tree T218.21 and its protected root zone at 11 Ingleton Terrace as these trees have been poorly maintained and they have caused extensive damaged to the driveway. The submitter also concerns the lack of consideration is given to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees, especially when Council does very little to no maintenance on the road or these trees.	Give considerations to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees and request council to have some responsibility for the damage caused by these trees.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Brad Edward and Samantha Coffey	186.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone of notable tree T218.19 as these trees have been poorly maintained and they have caused extensive damaged to the driveway. The submitter also concerns the lack of consideration is given to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees, especially when Council does very little to no maintenance on the road or these trees.	Give considerations to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees and request council to have some responsibility for the damage caused by these trees.
Brad Edward and Samantha Coffey	186.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification protected root zone of notable tree T218.20 as these trees have been poorly maintained and they have caused extensive damaged to the driveway. The submitter also concerns the lack of consideration is given to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees, especially when Council does very little to no maintenance on the road or these trees.	Give considerations to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees and request council to have some responsibility for the damage caused by these trees.
Brad Edward and Samantha Coffey	186.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of protected root zone of notable tree T218.16 as these trees have been poorly maintained and they have caused extensive damaged to the driveway. The submitter also concerns the lack of consideration is given to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees, especially when Council does very little to no maintenance on the road or these trees.	Give considerations to property owners who are expected to maintain properties around these trees and request council to have some responsibility for the damage caused by these trees.
The Fiona Bielby Family Trust - Thomas Bielby	187.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and assessment of Fairfield Road Historic Heritage Area because many properties within the area have been altered from their original design, many of the original state houses within the area have been removed and their sites have been redeveloped, and several original state houses also have variable frontage treatments and fences. The submitter also notes that many original houses that still within the area are in need of alteration and renovation to meet the healthy home standards. The submitter considers Fairfield Road is appropriate for urban development and intensification under National Policy Statement for Urban Development.	That Fairfield Road not be included as a Historic Heritage Area.
Huazhuo Lin	188.2	General	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports the general intention of Plan Change 9, however, there is an agreement signed by the co-owners and Hamilton City Council which for Council to purchase 2.8498 hectares of the property to be identified as 'Area 2 Potential Future Esplanade Reserve' for the purposes of walkway, gully and planting. The agreement is due to be settled on or around the 23 August 2022, after which time the submitter and other co-owners will no longer be the owners of the land identified in the agreement.	Confirmation that Hamilton City Council will own the area of land on the current property to which the SNA relates.
Huazhuo Lin	188.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNAs (F32) at 187A State Highway 26 because the SNAs are creating uncertainty for their future planning of the use of the land.	Remove SNAs (F32) from the property at 187A State Highway 26.
Huazhuo Lin	188.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNAs (F33) at 187A State Highway 26 because the SNAs are creating uncertainty for their future planning of the use of the land.	Remove SNA (F33) from the property at 187A State Highway 26.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Huazhuo Lin	188.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNAs (C41) at 187A State Highway 26 because the SNAs are creating uncertainty for their future planning of the use of the land.	Remove SNA (C41) from the property at 187A State Highway 26.
Katherine Elizabeth Hay	189.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 19.4.3b and considers all fences/walls should have to be see through because solid wooden fences totally change the feel of a neighbourhood. Maintain the visibility to the houses behind the walls is important for preserving the character of areas.	Amend Rule 19.4.3b so all fences /walls should have to be see through.
Katherine Elizabeth Hay	189.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the notified changes to Chapter 20 as it promotes increasing the extent of SNAs and indigenous biodiversity to meet the target of 10% (or exceed it!) of indigenous cover in the city.	No specific relief sought states in the submission.
Katherine Elizabeth Hay	189.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 19.4.3b and would like to see a requirement for all fences/walls to reduce in height near the egress from the property. Having 50% see-through helps but there are many young children using pavements, either walking or on scooters and because of their size it is hard from them to see a vehicle or for the driver to see them.	Seek a requirement for all fences/walls to reduce in height near the egress from the property.
Scott Osman	190.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter considers that the boundary identification and extent of the Fairfield Road Historic Heritage Area is significantly out of date as it does not reflect the 17 recently completed homes for Kainga Ora.	No specific relief sought states in the submission.
Scott Osman	190.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part regarding the protection of Graham Street Historic Heritage Area but disappoints that the southern end of MacFarlane Street is excluded. The submitter considers there are a number of significant properties in that area as well as some original size lots that would be prime for redevelopment.	No specific relief sought states in the submission.
Scott Osman	190.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	Seek clarification on whether renovation would be impacted by the Historic Heritage Area overlays and associated provisions.	
Haart Holdings Limited - John Kenel	191.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 16 Marama Street as Category B Built Heritage because the submitter has already obtained a Certificate of Compliance that allows the complete demolition/removal of the dwelling. The submitter also notes the site is currently zoned as Residential Intensification which provides for the highest residential densities outside of the central city, where high density compact infill development is promoted.	Removal of the Category B scheduling of the dwelling at 16 Marama Street (H242), in recognition that this house has been approved for demolition; and any additional or consequential changes.
Haart Holdings Limited - John Kenel	191.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of Marama Street Historic Heritage Area because the statement that the HHA 'is clearly representative of the early establishment of a service town heritage theme' is a generic one and the submitter has already obtained a Certificate of Compliance that allows the complete demolition/removal of the dwelling. The submitter also notes that two other properties, being 4 & 6 Marama Street, within the Marama Street Historic Heritage Area have been cleared of their dwellings and resource consents have been obtained for apartment developments. The submitter notes the site is currently zoned as Residential Intensification which provides for the highest residential densities outside of the central city, where high density compact infill development is promoted.	Deletion of the Marama Historic Heritage overlay from 16 Marama Street and adjoining sites, any other provisions that limit the ability of the submitter to develop their property in keeping with the existing Residential Intensification zoning; as well as any additional or consequential changes as is necessary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Carla Hodge	192.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter disagrees with the heritage assessment for part of Brookfield Street (west of Grey Street) in regards to street frontage treatments, lot size and dimensions and opposes part of Brookfield Street (west of Grey Street) being excluded from Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9. The submitter also raises concerns on consistent application of different criteria for the identification of Historic Heritage Area.	Include part of Brookfield Street (West of Grey Street) as part of the Historic Heritage Area as Brookfield Street is an area that has heritage values worthy of protection.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitters support the Purpose statement in Chapter 20.1 to protect, maintain, restore and enhance Significant Natural Areas, but seeks an amendment to specify the support and resources available to private landowners because landowners will not be able to achieve this policy due to a lack of resourcing, initiatives or technical knowledge. The submitters state that they remain 'stewards' of their property and will to the best of their ability will restore or enhance the area sustainably.	Seeks that Purpose 20.1 is amended to state the level of support and resources available to private property owners with SNAs to achieve the SNA policy to protect, maintain restore and enhance SNAs.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies 20.2.1 a. to f., j., k. and l. • in part Policy 20.2.1 g. but seeks an addition to the policy. • Policy 20.2.1 h. but requests amendments. • in part Policy 20.2.1 i. but requests amendments. 	Seeks that Policies 20.2.1 a. to f., k. and l. are retained as notified; Seeks the amendment of Policy 20.2.1 g. by adding a major consideration to 20.2.1c as hierarchical requirements are empathised and avoiding adverse effects prioritised; Seeks the amendment of Policy 20.2.1 h. by adding the use of 'Wilding trees'; Seeks the amendment of Policy 20.2.1 i. as follows: " Promote <u>Specifically</u> increasing the extent of Significant Natural Areas and indigenous biodiversity to meet a <u>the</u> target of 10% indigenous vegetation cover in the City <u>i.e. (approximately 1200 hectares @ 2022).</u>
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitters support Objective 20.2.2 and Policies 20.2.2 a. and b., but seek amendments to Policy 20.2.2 b. to ensure that there is a clear process for Council communicating with private landowners that have SNAs on their property.	Seeks that Objective 20.2.2 and Policies 20.2.2a be retained as notified. Seeks that Policy 20.2.2b be amended to require a clear process for Council to communicate with private landowners that have SNAs on their property.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rules 20.3 a. to r. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Seeks Rules 20.3 a. to r. are retained as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rules 20.3 a. to r. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Seeks Rules 20.3 a. to r. are retained as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitters support Rules 20.3 a. to r. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Seeks Rules 20.3 a. to r. are retained as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.4 Emergency Works to, or Removal of, an Indigenous Tree in a Significant Natural Area or a Notable Tree	Support in part	Supports Rule 20.5.4 and seeks that it be amended to clarify the process for this rule notification and requests inclusion of a definition of 'appropriately qualified arborist'.	Seeks that Rule 20.5.4 be amended to note clear process for the rule notification and include a definition of an appropriately qualified arborist.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.5. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Retain Rule 20.5.5 as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support	The submitters support Rule 20.5.6. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Retain Rule 20.5.6 as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitters supports Rule 20.5.7. The submitters remain 'stewards' of this property and all that embodies this area to the best of their abilities, until such time as they cannot undertake to protect, maintain, restore or enhanced these areas sustainably.	Retain Rule 20.5.7 as notified, provided that appropriate resources are allocated for meaningful application to achieve these requirements.
Kirsten and Gerard Craig and Kelly	193.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitters support Rule 20.6, noting that the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area mapping for sub-catchment 'Flood Hazard Modelling Areas' layer is shown as 'Electricity Transmission corridor' (i.e 'Blue crossed zone) instead, when layers are removed for viewing sub-layers.	Correct the error with the Waikato River and Gully Hazard Area mapping for sub-catchment 'Flood Hazard Modelling Areas' layer which is shown as 'Electricity Transmission corridor' (Blue crossed zone) in the sub-layer.
Michael Bart Oosterbaan	194.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of SNA (C40) over 24 Eton Drive as it covers the majority of the area with no land to grow trees for firewood or expand gardens, grow fruit trees or for buildings. The submitter also concerns the extent of the SNA is right up against the house onsite with no set back so will eventually be over shadowed by trees.	Seeks to have the SNA (C40) boundary set back further from the house at 24 Eton Drive.
Michael Bart Oosterbaan	194.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of SNA (C40) over 24 Eton Drive and suggests council to compensate for the loss of land as opportunities and plans the submitter had no longer exist once the land is designated an SNA. The submitter also notes that they have spent 22 years working in the gully clearing the exotics and replanting natives and restoration.	Seek compensation for the loss of land that Council designated as SNA (C40).
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter supports the protection of archaeological and cultural significance sites from residential and commercial development.	Adopt PC9 as notified.
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports the protection of built heritage from intense residential and commercial development, as long as these items are maintained to a suitable and safe standard.	Adopt PC9 as notified.
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports any change that prevents high-density residential development in heritage/historic suburbs such as Hamilton East and Claudelands.	Adopt PC9 as notified.
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the protection of significant natural areas from residential development.	Adopt PC9 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports the protection of significant trees - in areas such as Hamilton East and Claudelands - from removal for infrastructure or personal/corporate gain.	Adopt PC9 as notified.
Firth Street Media - Jeff Neems	195.6	General	General	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 in its entirety because it ensures Hamilton's heritage areas, cultural/archaeological sites and significant trees are protected. The submitter considers there is clearly a need for more housing and high-density residential developments can work well, and the need to be going up in the CBD, but not cramming more homes into heritage suburbs.	Adopt PC9 as notified.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The submitter supports in part the Built Heritage and Historic Heritage Areas components of Plan Change 9 that align with and generally uphold the Urban Design Protocol principles and imperatives. However, the submitter also has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring historic heritage is given the highest level of protection and are in line with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter best practice, • that new developments are sympathetic, and have strong heritage guidelines, • the number of heritage and character categories outlined in Chapters 5 and 19 – Special Heritage Zone, Historic Heritage Areas, Built Heritage etc are simplified and streamlined in order to facilitate clarity and ease of use, • the lack of consultation on proposed historic heritage areas, • lack of inclusion of post 1950s Modernist Waikato architecture and, specifically, nationally and regionally acknowledged Enduring Architecture in proposed historic heritage items schedule, • there is no proposed historic heritage area on central Frankton and the suburban commercial centre of Claudelands, • historic town planning in terms of street is not sufficiently identified with rules; and historic landscape and the work of prominent landscape architects has not been specifically reviewed, • proposed historic area should have a range of building types, and historic landscape should be included which includes streets, built landscape and plantings, • better identification of places that are historic heritage within the proposed areas and those that are non-heritage [non heritage as per WCC PDP definition in terms of demolition] is required, • Lack of integration of Plan Change 9 and 12 in terms of intensification and potential rules. It is noted that Plan Change 12 is notified a few days after Plan Change 9 submissions close, and property owners are not aware of the impact and implications, including proposed increased intensification and density and potential removal of existing character areas. 	No relief stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter, while stating support in part, raises concerns about the consultation undertaken for Plan Change 9, in particular for historic heritage areas has not been user-friendly.	That the effects of Plan Change 12 on proposed heritage areas is addressed within Plan Change 9 and there is further community consultation within the process of Plan Change 9.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.3	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that applying heritage status and Historic Heritage Areas will cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added compliance costs (additional heritage reports etc), • Restricted access to heritage fund monies given the increase in the number of listed structures and the limited amount available within the HCC heritage fund • Concerns over costs and consenting for buildings with heritage values that are important to the community requires a robust financial support system for owners. • Additional costs for owners of buildings within proposed HHA that are clearly not heritage additional costs for owners of buildings within proposed HHA that are clearly not heritage buildings • Land value decrease for those who have been in the process of intensification planning, and value decrease for those who have been in the process of intensification planning, thus rendering their sites/projects unsustainable, loss of value and loss of provision of unsustainable, loss of value and loss of provision of homes for Hamiltonians • Potential deferred maintenance and dereliction of private buildings due to overburden of costs associated with upkeep within the proposed Plan Change environment 	Increase the \$80,000 HCC Heritage Fund, and additional support to owners with reductions in compliance costs, rates relief and other means needs to be considered and implemented by Council.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.4	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a lack of integration between Plan Change 9 and 12 in terms of intensification and potential rules. • the relationship between the effects of Plan Change 9 and Plan Change 12 are not clearly articulated, and in parts confusing. This is particularly relevant when Plan Change 12 is only notified a few days after closing submissions. 	That the effects of Plan Change 12 on proposed heritage areas is addressed within Plan Change 9.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.5	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern over the unintended consequences of Plan Change 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of sufficient protection on Hamilton character areas or complete removal without owners and the community being fully aware; and • removal of character areas that are key to retaining an understanding of Hamilton’s identity. • Removal of the character zone is not clear and without a zone or overlay transition that includes character overlay to historic heritage Hamilton’s built heritage and historic suburbs will be a poorer urban environment. • The lack of transition between historic heritage [items and areas] to non-- heritage to ensure there is a gradual change within underlying residential zones and continuity of good urban design which respects old and new. 	Provide a transition to historic heritage items and areas to non-heritage to ensure there is a gradual change within underlying residential zones and continuity of good urban design.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procuta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture Bureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion in Appendix 8 Historic Heritage of significant buildings and structures designed by Waikato and Hamilton architects in the mid- and late 20th century, including but not limited to, significant residential and non-residential examples of Mid-Century Modernism. However, there remains a lack of inclusion of post 1950s Modernist Waikato architecture and, specifically, nationally and regionally acknowledged Enduring Architecture in proposed historic heritage items schedule. There are insufficient examples of post 1950s buildings within the proposed historic heritage items, yet archival documentation available.	Amend Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to incorporate known post 1950s architecture which is recognised regionally and nationally by NZ Institute of Architects Inc.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procuta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture Bureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter has the following concerns in relation to the methodology applied for the identification of Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 in its current for as notified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historic town planning in terms of street is not sufficiently identified with rules; and historic landscape and the work of prominent landscape architects has not been specifically reviewed. • proposed historic area should have a range of building types, and historic landscape should be included which includes streets, built landscape and plantings • better identification of places that are historic heritage within the proposed areas and those that are non-heritage [non heritage as per WCC PDP definition in terms of demolition] is required 	Amend the methodology used for the identification of Historic Heritage Areas by including a range of buildings types including non-residential buildings and design elements such as historic town planning, streets, and built and designed landscape within proposed historic areas which are historic suburb placeholders, with associated rules.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed Historic Heritage Areas, but seeks review of the historic heritage of Frankton's town centre for both individual and historic area inclusion.	Review historic heritage of Frankton's town centre for both individual and historic area inclusion.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part Schedule 8A: Built Heritage as notified; however seeks the addition of all the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings which includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NZIA National Enduring Awarded Deanwell School, Melville; • NZIA regional Enduring Architecture Awarded Former Angus Flood Griffiths Office [with mural] in Victoria Street and[with mural] in Victoria Street • Block Lecture Theatres --The University of Waikato Te Whare Wananga o Waikato (1978) by Smith, Grant and Associates. <p>The submitter agrees to provide a list of NZIA Enduring NZIA Architecture Awards as required.</p>	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include all the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings located in Hamilton.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed Historic Heritage Areas, but seeks a review of Claudelands for both individual and historic area inclusion.	Review the historic heritage of Claudelands for both individual and historic area inclusion.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.11	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the lack of inclusion of at least one historic heritage building within each proposed Historic Heritage Area as the methodology used under Plan Change 9 as notified.	The identification and inclusion of at least one historic heritage building within each proposed Historic Heritage Area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.12	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Policy 7.2.2d: <i>Heritage resources and heritage values are recognised and managed to maintain and enhance the sense of identity and wellbeing of the City's residents and the historical legibility of the Central City.</i>	No relief sought.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.13	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Policy 7.2.6i: <i>Developments within the historic heritage area are required to be sympathetic to the heritage values and be accompanied with a Heritage Impact Assessment.</i>	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.14	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the existing definitions for Special Heritage Zones and Historic Heritage Areas because there are inconsistencies between the definitions that need to be resolved to facilitate clarity and ease of use. Noting also that the definition of Historic Heritage Areas in Chapter 19 is more commensurate with character than historic heritage values.	Review of the definitions for Special Heritage Zones and Historic Heritage Areas to remove inconsistencies between the definitions.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.15	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the notified version of the Assessment Criteria for Historic Heritage Areas, however recommends they should be the same as for Historic Heritage Items [Buildings and Structures] for consistency in the plan, with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the RMA.	Amend 1.3 Assessment Criteria for Historic Heritage Areas so they align with the assessment criteria for Historic Heritage Items [Buildings and Structures].

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter agrees with the Plan Change's initiatives, policies and rules that align with and generally uphold the UDP principles and imperatives, supporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a plan change that seeks to identify and protect Hamilton’s historic heritage items and areas in principle • Support Heritage Design Guidelines by specialist consultants that include guidance on the range of heritage items and setting, and spaces in between which include historic landscape and streets and landscape design • ensuring historic heritage is given the highest level of protection and are in line with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter best practice 	That the work of Landscape Architects, whose work forms an integral part of the built environment, is reviewed and included into Chapter 19.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter generally agrees with the Plan Change's initiatives, policies and rules that align with and generally uphold the UDP principles and imperatives, and supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a plan change that seeks to identify and protect Hamilton’s historic heritage items and areas in principle • Support Heritage Design Guidelines by specialist consultants that include guidance on the range of heritage items and setting, and spaces in between which include historic landscape and streets and landscape design • ensuring historic heritage is given the highest level of protection and are in line with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter best practice 	Request appropriate rules, which retain heritage values of proposed historic items and areas, within their setting and in relation to any identified group values. And that the relationship of historic heritage [items and areas] to non-historic heritage be identified , and considered in terms of height, set back, and density to hold and not diminish heritage values.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.18	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	<p>Support is given to the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain, as notified H230 - Harris House, Roger Walker, 58A Lake Crescent, Appendix 8A: Built Heritage.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.19	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	<p>The submitter supports the built heritage scheduling of the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain, H284 - 1970s Dwelling - Roger Walker Design, 913 River Road, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procuta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture Bureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.20	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	<p>The submitter supports the built heritage scheduling given to the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain H286 - 1960s Town Houses - Roger Walker design, 120 Sandwich Road, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procuta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture Bureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.21	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The protection of the buildings designed by early Waikato architects.	Retain on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage all buildings designed by early Waikato architects.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.22	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports parts of Plan Change 9, but cannot support as proposed and in current form.	See relief on other related submission points.
Chow:Hill Architects Ltd - Brian Squair Mart in Swann, DLA Architects,Antanus Procu ta, PAUA Architects,John Sexton , John Sexton Architects,Evan Mayo, Architecture B ureau,Anthony Curl, FivePlusOne Architects,Ros Empson, Auburn Design,Peter Hunt, Arto Architects	196.23	General	General	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns on unintended consequence of Plan Change 9 in its current form may diminished perception of the value of heritage as the approach is not targeted well and is too broad brush. The submitter also requests that regarding the number of heritage and character categories outlined in Chapters 5 and 19 — Special Heritage Zone, Historic Heritage Areas, Built Heritage etc. to be simplified and streamlined in order to facilitate clarity and ease of use	The number of heritage and character categories outlined in Chapters 5 and 19 to be simplified and streamlined in order to facilitate clarity and ease of use
Queenwood Property - Curtis McCorquindale Pat & Barbara Chamberlain	197.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitters oppose to the SNA (C28) at 30 Rutherford Street (comprising Lot 1 & Lot 2 DPS 32280) because there are no indigenous plants, trees, or fauna that fall within the subject property, with the corner being a maintained, well planted corner of various species that have planted. The submitter also raises concerns over how this may affect future development of the site now that the property is identified as being under the Chartwell Medium Density Zone.	Remove the SNA (C28) from the corner of part of 30 Rutherford Street (Lot 1 DPS 32280).
Alan Tsai	198.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter partially supports the SNA (C87) over the property at Peackokes Road but suggests amendments to reduce the bat buffer and setback for urban development.	Reduce the bat buffer from 20m reduce to 5m as well as setback for urban development from 5m reduce to 2m.


Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Alan Tsai	198.2	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the contents of proposed Plan Change 9 apart from bat buffer setback and setback for urban development as it is all good and reasonable.	No specific relief sought states in the submission.
Niall Baker	199.1	General	General	Support	See relief sought on other submission points.	
Niall Baker	199.2	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle Purpose 7.1g. which provides the recognition of the heritage values of Victoria Street between Garden Place and Hood Street to enhance the sense of place in the central city.	See relief sought in relation to other submission points.
Niall Baker	199.3	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1.1 Precinct 1 – Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle 7.1g. which provides the recognition of the heritage values of Victoria Street between Garden Place and Hood Street to enhance the sense of place in the central city.	See relief sought in relation to other submission points.
Niall Baker	199.4	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports Policy 7.2.2d.	See relief sought in relation to other submission points.
Niall Baker	199.5	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 7.2.6i.	Seeks rule framework to support Policy 7.2.6i.
Niall Baker	199.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of significant historic heritage items but considers that a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage should be included in the District Plan.	Seeks the retention of historic heritage items as notified but also requests that a city wide review of Hamilton to identify further places/items that may meet the threshold for scheduling as heritage items.
Niall Baker	199.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in principle the concept of Historic Heritage Areas and the protection of them, however they question how the proposed areas were chosen for inclusion as a HHA, noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent seems to be based on single heritage assessment which was a street by street assessment which has limited description of the methodology applied. It is unclear how Fairview Downs was assessed and there is no underpinning historical research of the area. • The provisions overall do not appear to be supported by a specialist Heritage Landscape Assessment, in the submitters view insufficient addressing of the built landscape, sites, settings and curtilage. • The six criteria set out in Chapter 19 have been assessed on an equal basis with no weighting applied, meaning fencing having the same weighting as architecture and building typology which it should not. • The Hamilton City Historic Heritage Area Assessment uses assessment criteria which are primarily based on character elements. • Considers that the assessment is more commensurate with character than historic heritage values and considers that the Heritage Area Assessment should not be fully relied on, and a wider consideration of should include <i>Hamilton City Special Character Study 2020, Lifescapes, July 2020 and Hamilton City Review of Existing Character Areas, Lifescapes, March 2022</i> 	<p>Seeks that earlier heritage assessments by Lifescapes also be used to inform the plan change.</p> <p>Seek the ability to include mixed zones which include more than one type of building typologies.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Niall Baker	199.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter believes that the proposed controls do not sufficiently consider neighbouring developments, especially on the edge of HHA's which would have the potential to significantly detract from the heritage qualities of the area.	No specific relief requested.
Niall Baker	199.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a Fairview Downs HHA and the submission sets out the areas History, Assessment of the Area (applying the assessment criteria of <i>Hamilton City Historic Heritage Area Assessment, Richard Knott Limited, June 2022</i>). The submitter concludes that the Fairview Downs area has a "reassembly contiguous area of 1970's s that typifies the development patterns, site and street appearance, and architecture of large scale private residential construction companies from the mid-1960s and 1970s."	Seeks the inclusion of a Fairview Downs HHA which includes Sadler Street, Alderson Road, Betley and Raymond Streets.
Niall Baker	199.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers HHA boundaries should be based on streets rather than lot boundaries.	Seeks that HHA boundaries are based on streets and not lot boundaries.
Niall Baker	199.11	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter considers that the definition of HHA should be amended.	Seeks the amendment of the Historic Heritage Area definition is revised to be consistent with assessment criteria for historic heritage resources and sufficiently distinct from meaning of character.
Niall Baker	199.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers to reduce complexity of the District Plan that all provisions relating to HHA should be included in Chapter 19	Seeks the revision of Chapter 19 to include all HHA related information, including, but not limited to, the information requirements and assessments criteria.
Niall Baker	199.13	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non- Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter considers that the assessment criteria for HHA's should be the same as for Historic Heritage Items to ensure consistency in the plan and with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the RMA.	Seeks the revision of HHA assessment criteria so they are same as for historic heritage items (buildings and structures).
Niall Baker	199.14	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter requests that the 'extent of place' for each item is determined and mapped because this would assist with understanding the setting and curtilage for each place and inclusion of any historic heritage within the site.	Seeks the "extent of place" for each scheduled item is determined, mapped, and included within Appendix 8 for each site.
Emily and Michael Auton and Pingram	200.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.2.3 because they are very restrictive to owners, irrespective of the scale and location of the works on buildings within a property and should be rewritten to enable some works as a permitted activity. The submitter considers that the rules seem to require resource consent for other structures such as pergolas and carports, and provided that landowners comply with standard front yard and height rules, it seems excessive to prevent landowners from providing shelter and shade as a permitted activity, particularly as these are not heritage buildings.	Seek to amend the rules to provide for landowners to maintain and repair their properties as a permitted activity, undertake alterations as a permitted activity up to a certain scale e.g. in the rear or side of buildings provided they use similar materials, and enable structures such as pergolas, carports and decks as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Emily and Michael Auton and Pingram	200.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter considers that the specific standards (Rule 19.4.3) are very restrictive and that requiring consent for a 1.8m fence and requiring all fences to be built in materials that use the same material, colour, texture and form as the existing dwelling onsite is excessive, costly, not reflecting the reality of fencing that exists within the HHA, and could result in perverse outcomes.	Seek that the rules around fencing at both 1.2m and 1.8m be rewritten as a permitted activity rule, and that reference to materials, colour, texture and form needing to be the same as the existing building be deleted.
Emily and Michael Auton and Pingram	200.3	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed provisions for HHA's and considers that requiring a heritage expert input on a case by case basis is excessive, costly and not an effective or efficient use of resources. The submitter also considers there is little guidance in the provisions about what Council would deem appropriate in terms of design other than similar colour and materials for any alterations, additions, fencing, redevelopment.	Provide greater guidance is provided to landowners requiring consent about what outcomes are being sought via a heritage impact assessment, particularly as it relates to the individual property not just the streetscape. Addition of assessment specific to each Historic Heritage Assessment that clearly articulates what are the characteristics that landowners need to be assessed against.
Emily and Michael Auton and Pingram	200.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the activity status provisions for demolition and relocation because it seems unnecessary when the matters of discretion will relate to the historical values and character arising from removal, and considers should be amended to be an Restricted Discretionary Activity, in the same manner as the other rules in the Historic Heritage Area.	Seek that the discretionary activity demolition rule be changed to Restricted Discretionary Activity as the scope of the demolition would be linked solely to the Historic Heritage Area objectives, policies and assessment criteria.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	Objective 19.2.3 and its policies are supported, however the operative policy 19.2.3a has been erroneously deleted, also resulting in incorrect cross-referencing to the policies in 19.2.3 and Appendix 1.2E [1.2.3E].	Amend the policies in 19.2.3 to reinstate policy 19.2.3.a. to address the Demolition of buildings and structures in Schedule 8A; and Renummer the policies related to Objective 19.2.3; and Make consequential amendments to numbering to ensure alignment with the correct policies elsewhere in the district plan.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	As notified, the application of Rule 19.3.1a may be confusing to plan users. The submitter considers the rule should be reviewed to remove any potential confusion and provide clarity as to the intent and the anticipated outcomes. The noncompliance with Rule 19.3.1.a. automatically becomes a Restricted Discretionary Activity (Rule 1.1.8)	Amend the rule framework for Rule 19.3.1a to provide greater clarity.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.3.1b as notified As notified, however its application. may be confusing to plan users. The submitter considers the rule should be reviewed to remove any potential confusion and provide clarity as to the intent and the anticipated outcomes.	Amend Rule 19.3.1.b to provide greater clarity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter mentions the present rule framework may cause unintended plan outcomes. The definition for Additions and Alterations may suffice in general situations however, for Built Heritage the definition does not reflect the heritage values and the types of additions/alterations anticipated. How will such attachments as dishes, antenna, solar panels and air-conditioning units be managed.	<p>The submitter suggests a definition for Alterations and Additions in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage. i.e.</p> <p>Alterations and Additions (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage): Means any work to existing heritage buildings or structures in Schedule 8A which involves the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Alteration or removal of walls, windows, roofs or exterior features; or b. Structural additions increasing the floor area of the building or structure. c. Network Utility structures (e.g., satellite dishes, antenna, aerials, solar panels). d. Replacement of windows, cladding or roofing that is not considered to be Maintenance or repair of buildings and structures (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage).
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	Rule 19.3.1h is supported in part. The present rule framework may cause unintended plan outcomes. The submitter considers that while the existing definition for Alterations and Additions is relevant in defining these activities for general situations; for Built Heritage the definition does not reflect the heritage values and the types of additions/alterations anticipated; how to manage such attachments as dishes, antenna, solar panels and air-conditioning units.	<p>Add a definition for Alterations and Additions in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage; such as:</p> <p>Alterations and Additions (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage): Means any work to existing heritage buildings or structures in Schedule 8A which involves the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Alteration or removal of walls, windows, roofs or exterior features; or b. Structural additions increasing the floor area of the building or structure. c. Network Utility structures (e.g., satellite dishes, antenna, aerials, solar panels). d. Replacement of windows, cladding or roofing that is not considered to be Maintenance or repair of buildings and structures (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.6	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter mentions the present rule framework may cause unintended plan outcomes. The definition for Additions and Alterations may suffice in general situations however, for Built Heritage the definition does not reflect the heritage values and the types of additions/alterations anticipated. How to manage such attachments as dishes, antenna, solar panels and air-conditioning units.	Add a definition for Alterations and Additions in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage; such as: Alterations and Additions (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage): Means any work to existing heritage buildings or structures in Schedule 8A which involves the: a. Alteration or removal of walls, windows, roofs or exterior features; or b. Structural additions increasing the floor area of the building or structure. c. Network Utility structures (e.g., satellite dishes, antenna, aerials, solar panels). d. Replacement of windows, cladding or roofing that is not considered to be Maintenance or repair of buildings and structures (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage).
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter acknowledges that utility additions may hinder the heritage of a building/structure however, modern living requirements of occupants needs to be taken into consideration.	The submitter suggests that an additional rule is inserted into Rule 19.3.1 that allows the addition of network utility structures (e.g. dish, antenna, solar panels or air conditioning units) to the exterior of any heritage building or structure when these structures are located to the rear, and not visible for the public realm.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter acknowledges that utility additions may hinder the heritage of a building/structure however, modern living requirements of occupants needs to be taken into consideration.	The submitter suggests that an additional rule is inserted into Rule 19.3.1 that allows the addition of network utility structures (e.g. dish, antenna, solar panels or air conditioning units) to the exterior of any heritage building or structure when these structures are located to the rear, and not visible for the public realm.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.9	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter acknowledges that utility additions may hinder the heritage of a building/structure however, modern living requirements of occupants needs to be taken into consideration.	The submitter suggests that an additional rule is inserted into Rule 19.3.1 that allows the addition of network utility structures (e.g. dish, antenna, solar panels or air conditioning units) to the exterior of any heritage building or structure when these structures are located to the rear, and not visible for the public realm.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter noticed that H136 is shown on the planning maps but due to a typographical error it was deleted from the schedule.	The submitter suggests reinstating the detail for H136 – Hospital Band Rotunda in Schedule 8A: 
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		<p>The submitter mentions that the present rule framework may cause unintended plan outcomes when considering consent requirements for 'alterations' and 'additions' to existing buildings within an HHA on front, corner and through sites. The definition for Additions and Alterations may suffice in general situations however for Built Heritage, the definition does not reflect the heritage values and the acceptable changes as a result of additions/alterations to buildings within an HHA.</p> <p>Clarity is needed to establish what would be classified as 'alterations'. i.e. would building maintenance be regarded as alteration?</p> <p>Clarity over if additions to the back/rear of the existing buildings would require a resource consent? On this basis, there is benefit in providing further direction through the standards that relate to Rule 20.3.2a.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests that further consideration of the rule framework is undertaken to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Less restrictions and greater clarity in relation to alterations/additions to buildings, including where these alternations/additions are not visible from the public realm. Greater clarity on when an assessment of heritage values is required to protect the specific heritage values as identified for the HHA. Amendments to the relevant objectives and policies consistent with above approach.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.12	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	<p>The submitter mentions that the present rule framework may cause unintended plan outcomes when considering consent requirements for 'alterations' and 'additions' to existing buildings within an HHA on front, corner and through sites. The definition for Additions and Alterations may suffice in general situations however for Built Heritage, the definition does not reflect the heritage values and the acceptable changes as a result of additions/alterations to buildings within an HHA.</p> <p>Clarity is needed to establish what would be classified as 'alterations'. i.e. would building maintenance be regarded as alteration?</p> <p>Clarity over if additions to the back/rear of the existing buildings would require a resource consent? On this basis, there is benefit in providing further direction through the standards that relate to Rule 20.3.2a.</p>	<p>That further consideration of the rule framework is undertaken to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Less restrictions and greater clarity in relation to alterations/additions to buildings, including where these alternations/additions are not visible from the public realm. Greater clarity on when an assessment of heritage values is required to protect the specific heritage values as identified for the HHA. Amendments to the relevant objectives and policies consistent with above approach.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests further protection of heritage values and features by retaining the provision managing the location of additions, alterations or new buildings on sites, either 'forward of the front building line' or 'forward of the rear building line' found in Special Character Zones.	The submitter suggests provide a rule framework that: a. Identifies where alterations, additions and new buildings can be located within the individual sites without a resource consent; b. Determine whether there should be one rule framework for all HHAs or that the rule framework should address the individual HHA heritage values; c. Provide specific assessment criteria relevant to each HHA; d. Ensure information requirements as part of a resource consent process are commensurate with the nature and scale of the application; e. Ensure consequential amendments to objectives and policies to reflect amended rule framework.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.14	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control	Support in part	The submitter suggests further protection of heritage values and features by retaining the provision managing the location of additions, alterations or new buildings on sites, either 'forward of the front building line' or 'forward of the rear building line' found in Special Character Zoned areas.	The submitter suggests providing a rule framework that: a. Identifies where alterations, additions and new buildings can be located within the individual sites without a resource consent; b. Determine whether there should be one rule framework for all HHAs or that the rule framework should address the individual HHA heritage values; c. Provide specific assessment criteria relevant to each HHA; d. Ensure information requirements as part of a resource consent process are commensurate with the nature and scale of the application; e. Ensure consequential amendments to objectives and policies to reflect amended rule framework.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests differentiating 'modern' buildings and those of the era the HHA is being recognised for; or have discretion over. This will have benefit added to the existing HHA assessment.	The submitter suggests that greater clarity is provided with regards to the individual HHA areas as to the building features and heritage values to be protected for proposed works within each HHA. This may be achieved through definitions, standards or the introduction of an activity status.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests differentiating 'modern' buildings and those of the era the HHA is being recognised for; or have discretion over. This will have benefit added to the existing HHA assessment.	That greater clarity is provided with regards to the individual HHA areas as to the building features and heritage values to be protected for proposed works within each HHA. This may be achieved through definitions, standards or the introduction of an activity status.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.17	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter suggests differentiating 'modern' buildings and those of the era the HHA is being recognised for; or have discretion over. This will have benefit added to the existing HHA assessment.	That greater clarity is provided with regards to the individual HHA areas as to the building features and heritage values to be protected for proposed works within each HHA. This may be achieved through definitions, standards or the introduction of an activity status.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests a definition of a curtilage wall within HHAs is needed in order for said feature not to be captured under the existing definition of 'fence' as the wall is an important feature that distinguishes HHAs from other areas. The rule framework will ensure protection and good plan administration.	The submitter suggests that a rule framework and definition is developed and applied for curtilage walls in the HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter suggests a definition of a curtilage wall within HHAs is needed in order for said feature not to be captured under the existing definition of 'fence' as the wall is an important feature that distinguishes HHAs from other areas. The rule framework will ensure protection and good plan administration.	The submitter suggests that a rule framework and definition is developed and applied for curtilage walls in HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.20	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter suggests a definition of a curtilage wall within HHAs is needed in order for said feature not to be captured under the existing definition of 'fence' as the wall is an important feature that distinguishes HHAs from other areas. The rule framework will ensure protection and good plan administration.	That a rule framework and definition is developed and applied for curtilage walls in HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.21	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter has mentioned that Rule 19.3.2.f (regarding demolishing of an existing detached accessory building on front, corner and through sites within proposed HHA) does not distinguish between accessory buildings that reflects heritage values (older) and those that do not (recent). Some buildings may need removal to regain heritage values of the HHA.	Rule amendments which clarify and efficiently address: a. How to manage the demolition of accessory buildings within an HHA; b. Whether the rule should apply to all front, corner and through sites under the context of protection of HHAs values; c. Are there certain accessory building typologies within individual HHAs that need to be protected.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter mentions that fence/wall heights aligns with standards for Special Character Zones in the ODP but is not fully reflective of the differences between the 32 HHAs. Further investigation is needed to identify options of aligning fencing/wall rules (height and materials) to the heritage values and features of each HHA; and in some circumstances introducing a consenting framework where fencing is not aligned with the heritage values of an HHA.	The submitter suggests rule amendments which clarify and efficiently address: a. The appropriateness of the existing fencing/wall rule framework applied to HHAs; b. Consideration of providing specific fencing/wall rules for each HHA; and c. If appropriate a revised rule framework.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter mentions that fence/wall heights aligns with standards for Special Character Zones in the ODP but is not fully reflective of the differences between the 32 HHAs. Further investigation is needed to identify options of aligning fencing/wall rules (height and materials) to the heritage values and features of each HHA; and in some circumstances introducing a consenting framework where fencing is not aligned with the heritage values of an HHA.	The submitter suggests rule amendments which clarify and efficiently address: a. The appropriateness of the existing fencing/wall rule framework applied to HHAs; b. Consideration of providing specific fencing/wall rules for each HHA; and c. If appropriate a revised rule framework.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.24	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Under PC 9, fencing/walls requires to be uniform with existing dwelling with regard to material, colour, texture, etc. The rule requiring Council's discretion to determine if proposed fencing can comply with this standard may produce inconsistency and confusion as to the plan administration of this standard. The submitter mentions further investigation is needed to identify options of aligning fencing and wall rules (height and materials) to the heritage values and features of each HHA; and in some circumstances introducing a consenting framework where fencing is not aligned with the heritage values of an HHA.	The submitter suggests Rule amendments which clarify and efficiently address: a. The appropriateness of the existing fencing/wall rule framework applied to HHAs; b. Consideration of providing specific fencing/wall rules for each HHA; and c. If appropriate a revised rule framework.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.25	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	Under PC 9, fencing/walls requires to be uniform with existing dwelling with regard to material, colour, texture, etc. The rule requiring Council's discretion to determine if proposed fencing can comply with this standard may produce inconsistency and confusion as to the plan administration of this standard. The submitter mentions further investigation is needed to identify options of aligning fencing and wall rules (height and materials) to the heritage values and features of each HHA; and in some circumstances introducing a consenting framework where fencing is not aligned with the heritage values of an HHA.	The submitter suggests Rule amendments which clarify and efficiently address: a. The appropriateness of the existing fencing/wall rule framework applied to HHAs; b. Consideration of providing specific fencing/wall rules for each HHA; and c. If appropriate a revised rule framework.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.26	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests further assessment would be needed to determine 19.3.2.j should exclude rear sites and/or have limited or no visibility from street or public realm.	The submitter suggests that further investigation is undertaken to determine if the RD status for New Buildings should apply to all sites within proposed HHAs or should be permitted within certain circumstances, and if so, make the necessary rule changes and amendments.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.27	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>As notified Rules 19.3.2.k, 19.3.2.l. and 19.3.2.m. only reference relocation of buildings within, off and onto a site in an HHA. However, as written these rules cause a level of confusion as to whether the activity is relocation or removal within a site in an HHA. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan, and to avoid misinterpretation of provisions, it would be beneficial to refine the wording of these provisions and/or be consolidated with other provisions.</p> <p>These rules also do not distinguish between what typology would be acceptable to be relocated into an HHA.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That Rules 19.3.2.k., 19.3.2.l., and 19.3.2.m. are either simplified or consolidated to provide clarity on what is being controlled when assessing the relocation onto a site in an HHA; b. That additional assessment criteria relating to the matters of discretion to be considered with regard to the removal off site, relocation within a site or the introduction of a new building through its relocation onto a site in an HHA; c. A definition specifically for relocation in the HHAs is formulated to provide clarity on the expected typology and age anticipated within the HHAs (e.g. the type of building relocated onto HHA – modern vs similar era to those existing within the HHA); d. That the definition for Relocated building is updated to reference HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.28	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>As notified Rules 19.3.2.k, 19.3.2.l. and 19.3.2.m. only reference relocation of buildings within, off and onto a site in an HHA. However, as written these rules cause a level of confusion as to whether the activity is relocation or removal within a site in an HHA. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan, and to avoid misinterpretation of provisions, it would be beneficial to refine the wording of these provisions and/or be consolidated with other provisions.</p> <p>These rules also do not distinguish between what typology would be acceptable to be relocated into an HHA.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That Rules 19.3.2.k., 19.3.2.l., and 19.3.2.m. are either simplified or consolidated to provide clarity on what is being controlled when assessing the relocation onto a site in an HHA; b. That additional assessment criteria relating to the matters of discretion to be considered with regard to the removal off site, relocation within a site or the introduction of a new building through its relocation onto a site in an HHA; c. A definition specifically for relocation in the HHAs is formulated to provide clarity on the expected typology and age anticipated within the HHAs (e.g. the type of building relocated onto HHA – modern vs similar era to those existing within the HHA); d. That the definition for Relocated building is updated to reference HHAs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.29	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>As notified Rules 19.3.2.k, 19.3.2.l. and 19.3.2.m. only reference relocation of buildings within, off and onto a site in an HHA. However, as written these rules cause a level of confusion as to whether the activity is relocation or removal within a site in an HHA. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan, and to avoid misinterpretation of provisions, it would be beneficial to refine the wording of these provisions and/or be consolidated with other provisions.</p> <p>These rules also do not distinguish between what typology would be acceptable to be relocated into an HHA.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That Rules 19.3.2.k., 19.3.2.l., and 19.3.2.m. are either simplified or consolidated to provide clarity on what is being controlled when assessing the relocation onto a site in an HHA; b. That additional assessment criteria relating to the matters of discretion to be considered with regard to the removal off site, relocation within a site or the introduction of a new building through its relocation onto a site in an HHA; c. A definition specifically for relocation in the HHAs is formulated to provide clarity on the expected typology and age anticipated within the HHAs (e.g. the type of building relocated onto HHA – modern vs similar era to those existing within the HHA); d. That the definition for Relocated building is updated to reference HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.30	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	<p>As notified Rules 19.3.2.k, 19.3.2.l. and 19.3.2.m. only reference relocation of buildings within, off and onto a site in an HHA. However, as written these rules cause a level of confusion as to whether the activity is relocation or removal within a site in an HHA. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan, and to avoid misinterpretation of provisions, it would be beneficial to refine the wording of these provisions and/or be consolidated with other provisions.</p> <p>These rules also do not distinguish between what typology would be acceptable to be relocated into an HHA.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That Rules 19.3.2.k., 19.3.2.l., and 19.3.2.m. are either simplified or consolidated to provide clarity on what is being controlled when assessing the relocation onto a site in an HHA; b. That additional assessment criteria relating to the matters of discretion to be considered with regard to the removal off site, relocation within a site or the introduction of a new building through its relocation onto a site in an HHA; c. A definition specifically for relocation in the HHAs is formulated to provide clarity on the expected typology and age anticipated within the HHAs (e.g. the type of building relocated onto HHA – modern vs similar era to those existing within the HHA); d. That the definition for Relocated building is updated to reference HHAs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.31	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support in part	<p>As notified Rules 19.3.2.k, 19.3.2.l. and 19.3.2.m. only reference relocation of buildings within, off and onto a site in an HHA. However, as written these rules cause a level of confusion as to whether the activity is relocation or removal within a site in an HHA. To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Plan, and to avoid misinterpretation of provisions, it would be beneficial to refine the wording of these provisions and/or be consolidated with other provisions.</p> <p>These rules also do not distinguish between what typology would be acceptable to be relocated into an HHA.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That Rules 19.3.2.k., 19.3.2.l., and 19.3.2.m. are either simplified or consolidated to provide clarity on what is being controlled when assessing the relocation onto a site in an HHA; b. That additional assessment criteria relating to the matters of discretion to be considered with regard to the removal off site, relocation within a site or the introduction of a new building through its relocation onto a site in an HHA; c. A definition specifically for relocation in the HHAs is formulated to provide clarity on the expected typology and age anticipated within the HHAs (e.g. the type of building relocated onto HHA – modern vs similar era to those existing within the HHA); d. That the definition for Relocated building is updated to reference HHAs.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.32	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support in part	<p>RE: Appendix 1.3 E: Heritage Values and Special Character assessment criteria, The submitter mentions the need to review existing assessment criteria to ensure greater clarity on the matters of discretion to be considered when assessing a resource consent within an HHA as it would give direction/clarity between the matters specifically relating to Built Heritage items and those relating to specific HHA heritage values; how to address modern buildings and the retention of identified HHA features.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests specific assessment criteria that address the specific and general matters of each HHA is introduced into Appendix 1.3 E.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.33	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>The submitter suggests that greater clarity is needed with the wording of Rule 19.3.3 regarding what the intent of the rule is in relation to 'site' and 'extent'.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests revisiting the wording of Rule 19.3.3 to remove any confusion and improve plan administration.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.34	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		<p>The submitter has noticed alignment differences between some of the indicative archaeological & cultural site extents on the planning maps and the legal descriptions in Schedule 8B & 8C and the indicative extents shown on the planning maps.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. That the mapping and specific legal descriptions for all archaeological and cultural sites are compared; and b. If there are differences, further research is undertaken to determine the correct extents; c. Update Schedules 8B and 8C and the indicative notations on the planning maps.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.35	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter mentions there are alignment differences between some of the indicative archaeological & cultural site extents on the planning maps and the legal descriptions in Schedule 8B & 8C and the indicative extents shown on the planning maps.	The submitter suggests: a. That the mapping and specific legal descriptions for all archaeological and cultural sites are compared; and b. If there are differences, further research is undertaken to determine the correct extents; c. Update Schedules 8B and 8C and the indicative notations on the planning maps.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.36	Planning Maps	General	Support in part	The submitter mentions there are alignment differences between some of the indicative archaeological & cultural site extents on the planning maps and the legal descriptions in Schedule 8B & 8C and the indicative extents shown on the planning maps.	The submitter suggests: a. That the mapping and specific legal descriptions for all archaeological and cultural sites are compared; and b. If there are differences, further research is undertaken to determine the correct extents; c. Update Schedules 8B and 8C and the indicative notations on the planning maps.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.37	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9.	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.38	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9.	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.39	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.40	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.41	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9.	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.42	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.43	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support		The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.44	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter acknowledges that these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, but are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9.	The submitter suggests: Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 11 Koromatua - Urupaa A 28 Te Moutere o Koipikau Paa A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa A 117 Mangakookoea Paa A 120 Matakanohi Paa A121 Urupaa A 122 Te Toka O Arurei Urupaa A123 Hau O Te Atua Urupaa
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.45	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural sites are now, as a result of PC9 subject to resource consent requirements. While through the drafting of PC9 the referencing of Schedule 8C was included in statements about activities requiring resource consent throughout the district plan – it is apparent there remain some outstanding areas where the text needs to be amended to include reference to Schedule 8C to ensure consistent plan administration.	The submitter suggests: Add reference to Schedule 8C wherever there is a statement such as: Any activity requiring a resource consent relating to Schedule 8A or 8B or 8C sites (refer Volume 2, Appendix 8)

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.46	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter flags Rule 20.3.s. Emergency works to, or removal of a Notable Tree (Permitted activity if the tree is an imminent risk to public health or safety and property or a network utility) while a similar rule for SNA Rule 20.3.a uses the terms 'unacceptable risk to public health, safety or property'. Alignment to similar provisions is needed with consistent terminology used.	That there is alignment of terminology used regarding the type of risk assessment to be determined to permit the removal of either a notable tree or SNA trees for safety reasons.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.47	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter flags the wording of Rule 20.3.t, potential to cause confusion and unintended planning interpretation as it implithere is only the need to engage an arborist to works relating to Rule 20.3.t.v. Guidance of a qualified works arborist is required for all works in Rule 20.3.t. Further clarification is also required to assist with good plan administration to state that all works under Rule 20.3.t. are to be undertaken by hand-held non-mechanical means.	The submitter suggests: That Rule 20.3.t. be reworded to state: Minor pruning and maintenance, using hand-held non-mechanical tools, of a Notable Tree, carried out by or under the guidance of a qualified works arborist: i.....
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.48	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter flags the notified wording of Rule 20.3.w. may cause confusion and unintended planning interpretation as to why the 'Planting of trees' within the Protected Root zone must be managed through a RD consent.	The submitter suggests: That further clarification, either within Rule 20.3.w. or as a set of definitions be provided regarding: a. The reasons for limiting the planting of trees within the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree; b. Clarity of where other trees can be planted in proximity to a Notable Tree; c. The difference between the Protected Root zone and the 'dripline' of a notable tree; and d. What is considered a 'tree'.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.49	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter flags the notified wording of Rule 20.3.w. may cause confusion and unintended planning interpretation as to why the 'Planting of trees' within the Protected Root zone must be managed through a RD consent.	The submitter suggests: That further clarification, either within Rule 20.3.w. or as a set of definitions be provided regarding: a. The reasons for limiting the planting of trees within the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree; b. Clarity of where other trees can be planted in proximity to a Notable Tree; c. The difference between the Protected Root zone and the 'dripline' of a notable tree; and d. What is considered a 'tree'.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.50	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1.1 STEM Method of Evaluation	Support in part	The submitter mentions: Given there is now a STEM score sheet for each tree, this additional clarity/explanation would be of benefit to the processing planner if the score sheet is included as part of appendix 9.	The submitter suggests that Appendix 9 be amended to include the STEM score sheet criteria.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.51	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter mentions that PC 9 identifies notable trees on council reserves and road corridors and that three trees were identified as potentially notable but are not scheduled through PC9. The trees are listed in Schedule 9D and appear on the planning maps. There is an error and these three trees should be deleted from the district plan.	The submitter suggests: Remove all reference to T138, T139 and T140 from Schedule 9D and the notation of these trees be deleted from the planning maps.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.52	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter mentions that there are a number of rules relating to private and public tracks, and depending on the nature of the proposed works – maintenance, upgrading or new construction there are different expectations. Council considers further consideration of the anticipated outcomes for these rules should be undertaken to remove any potential confusion. As part of this further work being sought, Council would recommend greater clarity be provided on how works to existing tracks and the construction of new tracks should be specifically undertaken in the two SNA areas (cSNA and fSNA).	The submitter suggests: That further clarification, in Rule 20.3. and any consequential changes as required be provided regarding: a. The use of the terms ‘public’ and ‘private’ walkways, cycleways or tracks; b. The activity status for tracks in the cSNA and the fSNA; c. What is considered an ‘upgrade’ of existing tracks; d. Whether provision for ‘walking access track’ used for restoration projects is necessary and the appropriate rule framework. e. The provision of definitions for a ‘private track’, ‘public tracks’, and ‘walkways and cycleways’ in the context of an SNA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.53	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter mentions the notified version of PC9 places the majority of controls being applied to SNAs in Chapter 20. However, there are also specific rules relating to sites adjoining a SNA in Chapter 25.2. Presently, there is no clear linkage provided in Chapter 20 to refer the plan user to Chapter 25.2 when considering the ‘fringe’ areas of SNAs. This could be problematic, as such Council wishes to ensure there is a clear link for ease of plan administration.	The submitter suggests: Add a new activity status for earthworks and vegetation removal in the SNA Fringe areas to Rule 20.3 to refer Plan Users to Chapter 25.2 (specifically Rules 25.2.3j., 25.2.3.k. and Rule 25.2.4.3).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.54	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>SNA Rule 20.3.a and Notable Tree Rule 20.3.s have similar intentions however, terminology used differs. Different terms for the same anticipated outcome. Consistency is needed to avoid confusion.</p> <p><i>SNA: There is an unacceptable risk to public health, safety or property</i></p> <p><i>Notable Trees: the tree is an imminent risk to public health or safety and property or a network utility.</i></p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>That there is appropriate alignment of terminology used regarding the type of risk assessment to be determined to permit the removal of either a notable tree or SNA trees for safety reasons.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.55	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter mentions that removal of pest species relies on Rule 20.3.b which permits removal or management of pest species, including pest control; and the definition for ‘pest control’ while acknowledging Rule 20.3.a. and Rule 20.5.1 does not presently address the removal of pest species. There is the potential for confusion and poor plan outcomes on what vegetation can be removed/pruned to ensure the value of the specific SNA is retained.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees, and pest species, and where necessary, rule changes.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.56	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter mentions that removal of pest species relies on Rule 20.3.b which permits removal or management of pest species, including pest control; and the definition for ‘pest control’ while acknowledging Rule 20.3.a. and Rule 20.5.1 does not presently address the removal of pest species. There is the potential for confusion and poor plan outcomes on what vegetation can be removed/pruned to ensure the value of the specific SNA is retained.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees, and pest species, and where necessary, rule changes.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.57	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Support in part	<p>The submitter mentions that removal of pest species relies on Rule 20.3.b which permits removal or management of pest species, including pest control; and the definition for ‘pest control’ while acknowledging Rule 20.3.a. and Rule 20.5.1 does not presently address the removal of pest species. There is the potential for confusion and poor plan outcomes on what vegetation can be removed/pruned to ensure the value of the specific SNA is retained.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees, and pest species, and where necessary, rule changes.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.58	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	<p>The submitter mentions that removal of pest species relies on Rule 20.3.b which permits removal or management of pest species, including pest control; and the definition for ‘pest control’ while acknowledging Rule 20.3.a. and Rule 20.5.1 does not presently address the removal of pest species. There is the potential for confusion and poor plan outcomes on what vegetation can be removed/pruned to ensure the value of the specific SNA is retained.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees, and pest species, and where necessary, rule changes.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.59	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>RE: Rule 20.3.e</p> <p>cSNA: P</p> <p>fSNA: RD</p> <p>The rule does not provide guidance for the same works if undertaken in the fSNA. The submitter wishes to revisit this rule to provide further clarity regarding anticipated thresholds for works in the fSNA.</p>	The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees in both the cSNA and fSNA when restoration works are proposed, and where necessary, rule changes.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.60	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	<p>RE: Rule 20.3.e</p> <p>cSNA: P</p> <p>fSNA: RD</p> <p>The rule does not provide guidance for the same works if undertaken in the fSNA. The submitter wishes to revisit this rule to provide further clarity regarding anticipated thresholds for works in the fSNA.</p>	The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees in both the cSNA and fSNA when restoration works are proposed, and where necessary, rule changes.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.61	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support in part	<p>RE: Rule 20.3.e</p> <p>cSNA: P</p> <p>fSNA: RD</p> <p>The rule does not provide guidance for the same works if undertaken in the fSNA. The submitter wishes to revisit this rule to provide further clarity regarding anticipated thresholds for works in the fSNA.</p>	The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine the thresholds and acceptable methods for the management of indigenous and exotic vegetation or trees in both the cSNA and fSNA when restoration works are proposed, and where necessary, rule changes.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.62	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter flags the gap with how Park furniture should be managed in SNA's, there is no specific activity status for Park furniture therefore defaults to non-complying activity. The ODPs definition includes a mix of structures from a bench seat and rubbish bins through to band rotundas and skate bowls which may not be suitable in specific SNA's.	The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine how park furniture should be managed within both the cSNA and fSNA.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.63	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support in part	The submitter flags the gap with how Park furniture should be managed in SNA's, there is no specific activity status for Park furniture therefore defaults to non-complying activity. The ODPs definition includes a mix of structures from a bench seat and rubbish bins through to band rotundas and skate bowls which may not be suitable in specific SNA's.	The submitter suggests that further work is undertaken to determine how park furniture should be managed within both the cSNA and fSNA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.64	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support	<p>The submitter mentions: The purpose of the SNA is for the protection of indigenous biodiversity, to achieve greater vegetative coverage and, retention of mature indigenous trees throughout the city. Council considers it is necessary to provide greater direction on the management of canopy cover that sets out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The acceptable thresholds to manage works to the overall canopy of a SNA; and b. That vegetation removal excludes removal of mature indigenous trees from restoration and infrastructure operations. 	The submitter suggests that Rule 20.5.6 is redrafted to ensure adequate management and protection of the canopy of a SNA, and what is acceptable area of vegetation removal.
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.65	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways		<p>The submitter identified an editorial error:</p> <p>The wording of the rule should state 'or' instead of 'and' between 20.5.7.a. and 20.5.7.b. This is an editorial error picked up after notification. The original wording of this rule was intended to be 'or' to ensure there was not a limitation of the works to the maintenance of only 'an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure'.</p> <p>There is also misalignment between reinstatement required under 20.5.6 and lack of a reinstatement requirement under 20.5.7. Council suggest that any area of vegetation cleared is reinstated with indigenous vegetation.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>Delete the word 'and' and replace with the word 'or' between Rules 20.5.7a. and 20.5.7.b.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.66	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	<p>The submitter identifies an editorial error:</p> <p>The wording of the rule should state 'or' instead of 'and' between 20.5.7.a. and 20.5.7.b. This is an editorial error picked up after notification. The original wording of this rule was intended to be 'or' to ensure there was not a limitation of the works to the maintenance of only 'an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure'.</p> <p>There is also misalignment between reinstatement required under 20.5.6 and lack of a reinstatement requirement under 20.5.7. Council suggest that any area of vegetation cleared is reinstated with indigenous vegetation.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>Amended Rule 20.5.7 to add a requirement to reinstate the area by planting indigenous vegetation or trees within 12 months of completion of the works.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.67	Planning Maps	General	Support	<p>The submitter mentions:</p> <p>In determining the extent of the SNA boundaries the methodology was applied at a 'desktop' level and through site assessments undertaken in response to pre-notification consultation. However, because it was not practical to check all of the individual SNA sites and specific features within each of the identified SNA there may be instances where the extent of a SNA site encroaches into parts of properties that do not have ecological value (such as gardens or lawns under tree canopy). Council wishes to ensure any potential of this could be addressed through the preparation of the s.42a report, and corrected SNA extents shown on the planning maps.</p> <p>Council is also aware of very minor mapping errors where the GIS line work has encroached over property boundaries that is only apparent when viewed at a small scale. Council wishes to rectify this to ensure the extent of SNA does not extend into properties in error.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>a. That if it is identified that there are differences, or mapping errors, further research is undertaken to determine the correct extents of the SNAs; and</p> <p>b. An updated set of GIS shapefiles for SNA extents is developed and applied to the planning maps.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.68	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter mentions there is a typographical error and at the time of entering the definition for Reconstruction (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage) the definition for Rear Lane was deleted. This should not have occurred.</p>	<p>Reinstate the definition for Rear Lane :</p> <p>Rear Lane: Means a private way whose function is to primarily serve as a rear access to front sites or sites fronting a public reserve. This definition applies in the Rotokauri North Structure Plan area only.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.69	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter mentions that in 2018 a resource consent was granted for the demolition of the Municipal Baths (H88). The demolition works have now been completed. Therefore reference to the Baths in the district plan should be removed.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests the remove the reference to H88 in both Schedule 8A and the notation on the Planning Maps.</p>
Hamilton City Council - Mark Davey	201.70	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>While these sites are already scheduled in the Operative District Plan, they are not identified as recorded NZAA sites and no inventory record was prepared during the preparation of Plan Change 9.</p>	<p>The submitter suggests:</p> <p>Consider the need to add specific inventory records for each of the following sites: A 114 Te Wehenga - Urupaa</p>
Graham Cox	202.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the identification and implementation of Riro Street Historic Heritage Area in particular the associated provisions and controls proposed. The submitter particularly concerns on the potential impacts on property rights and the additional costs and processes required as a result of provisions and controls proposed.</p>	<p>Remove Riro Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Debora Brouwer	203.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter raises concerns over the explicit exclusion of some iconic buildings within the Hamilton East district and Hamilton East shopping environs; and the "inconsistent" listing of items, and to promote the full protection of like buildings in order to preserve the charm of the buildings that make up the charm of Hamilton East. The submitter seeks several buildings and structures to be included as historic/cultural Assets and be provided the protection so that they are retained and not destroyed.	Seek to add the following buildings and structures in Parana Park to Appendix 8A Built Heritage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) The Pebble Stone artwork - from John Botica - depicting our native fauna and flora. • b) The recently (3-4 years ago) installed Bronzed War Horse Sculpture • c) Care Takers Cottage
Debora Brouwer	203.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 19.2.3a and quotes that "we're protecting Historic Heritage Areas (HHA), built heritage, Significant Natural Areas (SNA) and archaeological sites, including those recently identified in Plan Change 9. HHAs (where identified) will replace the special character zones that are currently listed in our District Plan". However the submitter notes that a greater number of the villas in Nixon St, Albert St, Galloway St, Wellington St and Firth St, with similar frontages (single bay, double bay) villas within the Historic Heritage Area have not been included in the schedule.	Seek all of the original villas within Hamilton East be scheduled and protected as Built Heritage in Appendix 8A .
Debora Brouwer	203.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the objective and the identification of Historic Heritage Areas as to preserve what remaining heritage we have of the early settlements. However the submitter raises concerns on the type of buildings being erected so that development as a whole is sympathetic to, and respects the neighbourhood's special qualities; as well as not contributing to the degradation of the community of Hamilton East.	Seeks assurances that houses within the Historic Heritage Areas cannot be demolished and have their sections cut/spliced up to accommodate multi storey dwellings that will crowd the single storey dwellings and also take away from the "styling" of said Historic Heritage Areas, in particularly that the section sizes will not be cut up into 150sqm sizes.
Debora Brouwer	203.4	General	General	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns that Plan Change 9 should take consideration of Plan Change 12 for intensification development into account and opposes that, in particular, the demarcation on Cook Street for intensification starts past the soldiers houses and up towards 1 Cook Street. The submitter considers these bungalows and soldiers houses – were important contributions to the first and oldest suburb being established in Hamilton post the World War 2. The submitter also recommends large area now vacated from the Hamilton East Side Tavern and the Liquorland be considered for intensification for high rise apartments as is being built in 1 Cook Street and the Anzac Parade high rise apartments.	Consider the demarcation on Cook Street for intensification and the area now vacated from the Hamilton East Side Tavern and the Liquorland for high rise apartments.
Debora Brouwer	203.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 19.2.3a, and wants Council to give consideration to the complete exclusion of any builds of multi storey, multi-dwelling on the zones in Hamilton East HHA designated areas (Cook St, Wellington St, Naylor St, Albert St and Firth St) so that single dwellings are not over crowded, and blocked out. The submitter considers it otherwise makes the HHA zoning impotent to its intent of protecting the physical and visual character of the sites.	Seek complete exclusion of any builds of multi storey, multi-dwelling on the zones in Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area designated areas (Cook St, Wellington St, Naylor St, Albert St and Firth St) .

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Debora Brouwer	203.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the objective and the identification of Historic Heritage Areas as to preserve what remaining heritage we have of the early settlements. However the submitter raises concerns on the type of buildings being erected so that development as a whole is sympathetic to, and respects the neighbourhood's special qualities; as well as not contributing to the degradation of the community of Hamilton East. The submitter also notes that consent for any building needs to be sympathetic and compatible to the areas so that the Historic Heritage Area is protected, maintained and enhanced, and any degradation is minimised.	Seeks Styling Guides are established for the Historic Heritage Areas and that is consistent with the Criteria that has been used to assess and determine that a property is of Historic Heritage Nature. Consent for any building (renovation or replacement if the building cannot be saved) needs to be sympathetic and compatible to the areas.
Debora Brouwer	203.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the identification and objective of establishing the Historic Heritage Area to to preserve what remaining heritage we have of the early settlements, and to protect the features of the residential houses that have been listed in 8A/8B. However the submitter suggests to include additional villas and residential buildings that are of similar build and nature to those already listed, which are needed to be preserved for the charm they bring to the Hamilton Community.	Seek to include the following properties as part of the Historic Heritage Area - HHA12 - Hamilton East: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Cook Street - Soldier Houses • All houses of sympathetic styling to the Villa and later California Bungalows with set back houses on the following streets (from Nixon Street through to Dey Street): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Wellington Street ◦ Nixon Street ◦ Albert Street ◦ Firth Street ◦ Naylor Street
Debora Brouwer	203.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the identification and objective of establishing the Historic Heritage Area to to preserve what remaining heritage we have of the early settlements, and to protect the features of the residential houses that have been listed in 8A/8B. However the submitter suggests to include additional villas and residential buildings that are of similar build and nature to those already listed, which are needed to be preserved for the charm they bring to the Hamilton Community. The submitter also notes there is an inconsistent approach to the inclusion/exclusion of houses that are noted as Historical Heritage Houses in Appendix 8A/8B.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include the following properties as built heritage items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Cook Street - Soldier Houses • All houses of sympathetic styling to the Villa and later California Bungalows with set back houses on the following streets (from Nixon Street through to Dey Street): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Wellington Street ◦ Nixon Street ◦ Albert Street ◦ Firth Street ◦ Naylor Street
Debora Brouwer	203.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter raises concerns over the explicit exclusion of some iconic buildings within the Hamilton East district and Hamilton East shopping environs; and the "inconsistent" listing of items, and to promote the full protection of like buildings in order to preserve the charm of the buildings that make up the charm of Hamilton East. The submitter seeks several buildings and structures to be included as historic/cultural Assets and be provided the protection so that they are retained and not destroyed.	Seek to add the previous Plunket Building in Hamilton East Steele Park to Appendix 8A Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Debora Brouwer	203.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter raises concerns over the explicit exclusion of some iconic buildings within the Hamilton East district and Hamilton East shopping environs; and the "inconsistent" listing of items, and to promote the full protection of like buildings in order to preserve the charm of the buildings that make up the charm of Hamilton East. The submitter seeks several buildings and structures to be included as historic/cultural Assets and be provided the protection so that they are retained and not destroyed.	Seek to add the Hydro buildings and shops at Hayes Common to Appendix 8A Built Heritage.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Anne and Mark Lovegrove - 47 Norton Road Frankton Hamilton	204.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 47 Norton Road as a built heritage item (H251) on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H251, 47 Norton Road; including removing the notation on the planning maps. or, in the alternative: Delete all rules that restrict activities that can be done to and on Built Heritage.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Anne and Mark Lovegrove - 47 Norton Road Frankton Hamilton	204.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T244 and its protected root zone at 47 Norton Road due to the following reasons as stated by the submitter; "(a) The tree is not native (Red Oak). (b) There is already infrastructure over the area (drainage and tarsal)."	That the Protected Root zone area is reduced and does not encroach into the Property. In the alternative: Delete all rules that restrict activities that can be done within the Protected Root Zone T244.
Terra Consultants - Kirsty Moran PFS Property Investments Limited	205.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the properties at 155, 157 and 175 Riverlea Road within the overlay of archaeological site A176. The Archaeological Site Inventory sheet states that archaeological features identified on the site have been assumed to be destroyed by industrial development. This assumption was confirmed in 2018. The submitter considers that the resource consenting requirements of PC9, in addition to the requirements to gain an Archaeological Authority from HNZPT, are onerous, unnecessary and cost prohibitive for future development.	Amend A176 so that it does not cover the properties at 155, 157 and 175 Riverlea Road; and Amend to make any consequential amendments.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret University Of Waikato	206.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	Opposes the scheduling of the 'B Block' building on the University's Hamilton campus	The removal of the H314 - B Block from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Matthew Grant (Architect, NZIA) - Sam Shears	207.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	Submitter supports other submission(s) prepared by other Architects from NZIA in relation to the Built Heritage and Historic Heritage Areas. The submitter seeks appropriate objectives, polices and rules retaining heritage values of items and areas that do not diminish their heritage value.	Request appropriate objectives, policies and rules which retain heritage values of proposed historic items and areas, within their setting and in relation to any identified group values. And that the relationship of historic heritage [items and areas] to non-historic heritage be identified, and considered in terms of height, setback, and density to hold and not diminish heritage values.
Matthew Grant (Architect, NZIA) - Sam Shears	207.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter considers the Plan Change 9 process to have been rushed without appropriate consideration of impacts from Plan Change 12. Plan Change 12 would have been better to be resolved prior to or at least at the same time as Plan Change 9.	To align final notified decisions of Plan Change 9 with Plan Change 12 to enable appropriate consideration of both historic heritage and enabling housing supply.
Matthew Grant (Architect, NZIA) - Sam Shears	207.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	Submitter supports other submission(s) prepared by other Architects from NZIA in relation to the Built Heritage and Historic Heritage Areas. The submitter seeks appropriate objectives, polices and rules retaining heritage values of items and areas that do not diminish their heritage value.	Request appropriate objectives, policies and rules which retain heritage values of proposed historic items and areas, within their setting and in relation to any identified group values. And that the relationship of historic heritage [items and areas] to non-historic heritage be identified, and considered in terms of height, setback, and density to hold and not diminish heritage values.
Alexandria Till and Jonathan Manning	208.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C68) at 5 Anglesea Street because: (i) the area adjoining the property has outgrown and penetrated the submitters property; (ii) the area adjoining the property has not been properly maintained by council and is now encroaching the mentioned property; (iii) there is no funding available to landowners to help maintain the area or apply for a resource consent.	Remove the SNA (C68) from the property at 5 Anglesea Street.
C.C. and H.R. Tanner and Stott	209.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitters partially support the intention of SNAs. There are, however, some concerns as the proposed SNA area (C46) delineated comes close to the house onsite and encompasses approximately 80% of their land. Therefore, it could have a substantial influence on the owners rights and responsibilities, as well as resource consent requirements regarding use of the land.	Seek to reconsider and consult with regarding the extent of the SNA (C46) and associated provisions over 33 Bettina Road.
C.C. and H.R. Tanner and Stott	209.2	General	General	Support in part	The submitters partially support the intention of SNAs. There are, however, some concerns as the implication of the proposed SNA area (C46) could have a substantial influence on the owners rights and responsibilities, as well as resource consent requirements regarding use of the land.	Seeks some sorts of compensations, in particular rates relief and funding for on-going restoration and maintenance of the designated SNAs and possible additional hurdles and costs associated with additional consenting requirements, due to the restrictions imposed by the SNA (C46) over 33 Bettina Road.
TDDJ Limited - Frank	210.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the designation of additional 1051 trees on public property as Notable Trees because it is considered that it will introduce unnecessary additional high additional transaction costs, increase the cost of residential property development and limit how a site can be developed.	Deletion of PC9 proposed Notable Trees within Council controlled property, including road reserves, and such other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
TDDJ Limited - Frank	210.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the designation of additional 1051 trees on public property as Notable Trees because it is considered that it will introduce unnecessary additional high additional transaction costs, increase the cost of residential property development and limit how a site can be developed.	Removal of proposed Notable Trees (T234.10) adjacent to 70 and 70A Mardon Road from the proposed schedule of notable tree; and other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
TDDJ Limited - Frank	210.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the designation of additional 1051 trees on public property as Notable Trees because it is considered that it will introduce unnecessary additional high additional transaction costs, increase the cost of residential property development and limit how a site can be developed.	Removal of proposed Notable Trees (T234.11) adjacent to 70 and 70A Mardon Road from the proposed schedule of notable tree; and other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
TDDJ Limited - Frank	210.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the designation of additional 1051 trees on public property as Notable Trees because it is considered that it will introduce unnecessary additional high additional transaction costs, increase the cost of residential property development and limit how a site can be developed.	Removal of proposed Notable Trees (T234.12) adjacent to 70 and 70A Mardon Road from the proposed schedule of notable tree; and other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.
Susie Evans	211.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter seeks the scheduling of their property at 72 Wellington Street as a built heritage item and be listed on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is an excellent candidate for 'souveniring' Hamilton's architectural past • It is a visually striking yet unusual home that has architectural details for a character home in the Hamilton East/Claudelands area. • drawn into the wonderful world of the transitional villa/early wooden bungalow and its mix of both building styles. • The house has had very few owners since its construction in 1923 and represents an excellent example of its architectural time. 	The scheduling of 72 Wellington Street as a built heritage item on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Susie Evans	211.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed Historic Heritage Areas within Hamilton, and is relieved that the Council is looking to restrict inappropriate development within these areas and maintain some connections with the past. If we look back over Hamilton's post 1870s history there appears to have been little regard for preserving and celebrating, always looking forward. Hamilton is now maturing into a modern city with respect for the past while looking ahead.	Retain the Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Susie Evans	211.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the Historic Heritage Areas and that the Council is looking to restrict inappropriate development within these areas and maintain some connections with the past. If we look back over Hamilton's post 1870s history there appears to have been little regard for preserving and celebrating, always looking forward. Hamilton is now maturing into a modern city with respect for the past while looking ahead. The submitter is also "delighted to see that 1960s and 1970s architecture is also recognised for its heritage value".	Retain the Historic Heritage Area; and continue to review the 1960s and 1970s architecture for posterity.
Susie Evans	211.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the rules for Historic Heritage Areas and the need to consult with the Council regarding changes to fencing and externally visible renovations, etc. Stating that while "that doesn't seem particularly onerous if the Council make the contact process and resource consenting streamlined with a 'go to' HHA team"; noting also that "the degree of discord may also be mitigated by how well you communicate with the HHAs regarding things such as resource consents".	Retain the provisions for Historic Heritage Areas with support being provided by Council to owners (e.g. the contact process and resource consenting streamlined with a 'go to' HHA team; communicate with the HHAs owners regarding things such as resource consents).
Susie Evans	211.5	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the rules for Historic Heritage Areas and the need to consult with the Council regarding changes to fencing and externally visible renovations, etc. Stating whether there will be supports and incentives in relation to associate rules for HHAs " Will there be reduced resource consent fees for HHAs for items such as fences that wouldn't typically require a Hamilton City property owner to seek such permission?".	Retain the provisions for Historic Heritage Areas with support and incentives being provided by Council to owners (e.g. reduced resource consent fees).
Susie Evans	211.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports Historic Heritage Areas and seeks additional support through the provision of resources along garden planting styles, fence styles and best colours to paint houses within the HHAs by era and architecture style to best suit properties.	That Council have available some resources around garden planting styles, fence styles and best colours to paint homes within the HHAs by era and architecture style to best suit these properties.
Susie Evans	211.7	4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	4.3.1 Activity Status Table – General Residential Zone, Residential Intensification Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter opposes the proximity of new high density to the Hamilton East HHA; and asks if there "was a way for the Council to ensure that nay new high density, multi storey development (Plan Change 12) occurring around the Steele Park block perimeter and approaching the HHA was in keeping and sympathetic with the existing pre 1940s architecture. This include ensuring that rooflines were a similar pitch and weatherboards were the primary material".	For Council to work with design schools, architects and high quality and proven developers to develop a design protocol for these high-density developers to avoid ringfencing an HHA and then allow development of completely unsympathetic builds right next to them
Susie Evans	211.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the rules relating to rear sites in Historic Heritage Areas, however seeks to ensure that planning rules are such that any rear development does not affect the street façade, because if "this isn't managed carefully then it'll destroy the visual of the HHA"	That planning rules for rear development does not affect the street facades in Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Susie Evans	211.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports the scheduling of notable trees; and placing "greater recognition of trees within the city".	No relief stated.
Sam Shears	212.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter makes a submission regarding the general timing of Plan Change 9 and Built Heritage and it supports other submissions prepared by other Architects from NZIA.	No specific relief sought as states in the submission.
Sam Shears	212.2	General	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the Plan Change 9 process to have been rushed without appropriate consideration of impacts from Plan Change 12. Plan Change 12 would have been better to be resolved prior to or at least at the same time as Plan Change 9.	To align final notified decisions of Plan Change 9 with Plan Change 12 to enable appropriate consideration of both historic heritage and enabling housing supply.
Sam Shears	212.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter is in support of other submissions made by any other property owners and planning/ other consultants that seek clarification to extent of newly identified bulk Significant Natural Areas located within private properties have been correctly identified.	Seek clarification that Hamilton City Council GIS maps have correctly identified newly created Significant Natural Areas within private property land.
Ahmad Musa	213.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area over 4 Marire Avenue and the surrounding area, because the submitter considers the assessment provided uses generic terms to describe the perceived heritage of the area and confuses character with heritage.	Remove Historic Heritage Area overlay from area which don't meet the criteria for historical heritage and are, at best, areas of special character.
Ahmad Musa	213.2	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area over 4 Marire Avenue and the surrounding area, because the submitter considers the assessment provided uses generic terms to describe the perceived heritage of the area and confuses character with heritage.	Revise the definition of historic heritage area to be consistent with assessment criteria for historic heritage resources and sufficiently distinct from meaning of character.
Ahmad Musa	213.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and introduction of Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area over 4 Marire Avenue and the surrounding area, because the submitter considers the assessment provided uses generic terms to describe the perceived heritage of the area and confuses character with heritage.	Seek for further and more detailed assessment before determining heritage value.
Shirley Nichols	214.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the recognition and identification of Lamont St, Freemont St, Egmont St Historic Heritage Area as to protect heritage elements of the city's development against intensification. The submitter however raises concerns regarding confusions what is and what is not allowed or provided for within Historic Heritage Areas, in particular relating to intensification developments.	Seeks better clarifications on what activities are allowed and provided for within Historic Heritage Areas, in particular relating to intensification requirements under Plan Change 12.
Carl Peter de Leeuw	215.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and inclusion of Marama Street Historic Heritage Area because the properties within such area have been redeveloped with infill developments, and the houses within the areas have been altered and/or demolished. The submitter states " <i>Of the 10 properties affected/included in the HHA: 2x have been bulldozed; 7x added and altered, of which at least 4x have been heavily altered.</i> "	Remove Marama Street Historic Heritage Area from Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Carl Peter de Leeuw	215.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 18 Marama Street as part of the Marama Street Historic Heritage Area because the property does not present physical and visual consistencies with the other properties within the Marama Street Historic Heritage Area. Particularly, the submitter states " <i>the position on site with front yard being half that of the others; bulk of the existing buildings and structures out-scaling the other properties within the HHA</i> ". The submitter also notes the property has been heavily altered and added to, including with substantial alterations in the 70's and 80's for internal reconfiguration, lowering of ceilings, removal of fireplaces, external and façade alterations, extension of the property over 2 storeys, additional and separate inhabited portion, block garage to front.	Remove property at 18 Marama Street from Marama Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Carl Peter de Leeuw	215.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 238 Victoria Street as part of Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, because the building onsite does not share representative features such as plaster or brick elevations to the frontage. It fails consistency criterion (a), c, f, g as identified in the Historic Heritage Area section of Appendix 2 of the s32 Report, and therefore does not achieve an overall score of 5 to 7 to be recommended for inclusion. The submitter also notes that the identified Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area runs through the middle of the property (and the building) including only half of it.	No specific relief sought states in the submission.
Carl Peter de Leeuw	215.4	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the lack of consultation or notification of inclusion of properties at 18 Marama Street and 238 Victoria Street as part of the identified Historic Heritage Areas.	Not specifically states.
Carl Peter de Leeuw	215.5	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion and implementation of Marama Street Historic Heritage Area and the inclusion of property at 18 Marama Street as part of this area under Plan Change 9. In particular the area is rightly part of the Residential Intensification Zone and has been for several decades including the 23 years of present ownership. It is appropriate that this urban area is allowed to intensify to support the future development of the city centre and city, including aspirations for more residential properties as part of a vibrant 20minute city.	Remove Marama Street Historic Heritage Area and remove property at 18 Marama Street from Marama Street Historic Heritage Area.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers	216.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w. ii. as it does not provide for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as driveways or footpaths. The submitter considers the requirement of resource consent for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces is onerous where management of adverse effects could be achieved through a more specific rule to manage adverse effects.	Amend Rule 20.3.w ii. to exclude maintenance and replacement of impervious surface, for example: "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as...
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers	216.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 b. - d. as these standards are too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites. The submitter considers this rule will be difficult to monitor and show compliance with.	Delete Rule 20.5.3 b. - d.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers	216.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (vii) as the wording does not provide for existing situations whereas the materials, vehicles, plant or equipment is/are within the Protected Root Zone.	Amend Rule 20.3w viii) Include wording that permits existing storage of materials, vehicles, plant and equipment.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Body Corporate BC81026 - Dominic Worthington	218.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter opposes to exotic trees in the central business area and particularly at the end of Commerce street Frankton because the trees are deciduous and every autumn shed their leaves and block the gutters of our building located at 247 Commerce Street	All the exotic species of trees the entire length of Commerce street Frankton village, but in particular the corner of commerce and high streets that are natives of India need to be removed.
Warwick Douglas Costain Hutchinson	219.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C56) at 68 Te Manatu Drive as the SNA area should be defined by property boundary.	Remove SNA (C56) from the property at 68 Te Manatu Drive.
Jeffrey Paul McQuoid	220.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C83) on the property at 2 Roach Street because the area does not seem to meet the four criteria for significant natural areas (i.e. representativeness, diversity and pattern, rarity and distinctiveness, and ecological context). There is no representative of any native vegetation that once existed in the area and, therefore, a desktop assessment may not properly assess the current situation. Furthermore, the current SNA position is right below retaining walls that are built to hold up decking.	Reassess the boundary of the SNA (C83) on the property at 2 Roach Street as per attachment. If council wish to have the land in the gully below the submitter's house then they are more than welcome to purchase the property.
Michael John and Julia Mary Griffin	222.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	There is no basis for this plan change on our property [SNA (C40) at 170 State Highway 26]. There are no native trees in this area the area concerned is covered in gorse and black berry and full of rats and possums. This property represents our life time savings and your proposed plan change will effectively reduce the value of our asset.	No plan change to our property [170 State Highway 26].
Heather Frances Honnibal	223.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter agrees with Historic Heritage Area in general but does not consider the property at 37 Matai Street has historic values because the property has been altered both internally and externally. The submitter also raises concerns in regarding to infill developments occurring within the area.	Oppose to have historic order to be placed on property at 37 Matai Street but agrees with Historic Heritage Area in general.
Heather Frances Honnibal	223.2	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter agrees with Historic Heritage Area in general but does not consider the property at 37 Matai Street has historic values because the property has been altered both internally and externally. The submitter wants to retain ability of subdivide the property and establish an ancillary residential unit (granny flat) at the rear of the property at 37 Matai Street in the future.	Seeks ability to subdivide the property and establish an ancillary residential unit (granny flat) in the future without the requirement for a resource consent.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Stuart Chattell	224.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 for historic heritage, and mentions the need to protect the inner city older suburbs and housing as more and more of these areas are changing and having cheap housing put in.	Green light this change [Retain Plan Change 9 for historic heritage as notified]
Richardson Partnership Trust - Wayne Leslie Richardson	225.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the trees across the road on Council land; they are very large, root systems or failing to trim or remove limbs will cause damage to surrounding property's, or cars parked on street, water pipes or other such services. [Refer to Appendix 9, Schedule 9D - Notable Trees, T285, opposite 324 Tristram Street]	No resource consent required for any work or actions on private property.
Natalie Jayne Smith	226.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T136.4 and its protected root zone within 7 Claude Street.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T136.4 from Schedule 9D - Notable Trees.
Tegan and Clint McIntyre and Prior	227.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan Change the submission relates to are as follows: 1. The boundary and scope of the Hayes Paddock and Graham Street HHAs 2. Rule 19.3.2(a) The submitter supports the identification and recognition of Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area and Graham Street Historic Heritage under Plan Change 9. The submitter however considers the extent of Graham Street Historic Heritage Area should be reviewed to include a larger area to join the boundary and extent of Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area. The submitter considers the streets between two historic heritage areas present the same or similar historic values of Hamilton's early development and 1940's -1950's. The lower ends of Naylor and Brookfield serve as key gateways into the Hayes Paddock Area and these streets will support both Graham Street Historic Heritage Area and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area.	Reviews the boundaries and extents of Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area and Graham Street Area, in particular to expand Graham Street Historic Heritage Area to join the boundary with Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area.
Tegan and Clint McIntyre and Prior	227.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The specific provisions of the Proposed Plan Change the submission relates to are as follows: 1. The boundary and scope of the Hayes Paddock and Graham Street HHAs 2. Rule 19.3.2(a) The submitter supports the identification and recognition of Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area and Graham Street Historic Heritage under Plan Change 9. The submitter however considers the extent of Graham Street Historic Heritage Area should be reviewed to include a larger area to join the boundary and extent of Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area. The submitter considers the streets between two historic heritage areas present the same or similar historic values of Hamilton's early development and 1940's -1950's. The lower ends of Naylor and Brookfield serve as key gateways into the Hayes Paddock Area and these streets will support both Graham Street Historic Heritage Area and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area.	No relief stated for Rule 19.3.2a.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Callum McDougal	228.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	The submitter opposes scheduling of trees on Wellington Street (between Grey and McFarlane St) as notable trees. By the council's own metric very few of the trees reach the minimum 130 STEM points to be considered notable and the rest barely scrape through with the further lowered goal of 120 points. While the trees make the street a nice place to live, they do not meet the criteria of notability. The proposal to require consent for any work within the trees' protected root zones is a transparent play to obstruct development in an area the council recently designated as "residential intensification zone" in the district plan review.	REMOVE T320 Wellington Street trees from list of trees to be scheduled as notable trees under Plan Change 9.
Ross Terence Brazier	229.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Root Zone of the notable tree T315.2: 1. The relevant notable trees to be protected by the proposed root zone all appear to be growing in Von Tempsky Street. 2. My property at 3 Von Tempsky Street is a 'pan handle' shape. The bulk of my property faces River Road at the far end and is separated from Von Tempsky Street by the presence of 4 flats. 3. Accordingly, it appears that my property has been captured in Council records simply because of the 3 metre wide access to my property from Von Tempsky Street at the end of the R.O.W. 4. In my opinion, there is absolutely no risk that work on my property will in any way affect the protected notable trees. 5. The recording of the protected root zone will serve no practical use whatsoever and will simply create the cost and inconvenience of another compliance issue for any future development of my property.	By Council not recording the protected root zone on its records for my property at 3 Von Tempsky Street, Hamilton.
Estelle Joy Haeata	230.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes any change to the use of our property. We have managed our gully for 47 and a half years and are proud of it. We don't need anyone's help. [Note: the gully at 27 Dermont Street is overlaid by the SNA: cSNA (C39)]	As there are no native trees on our property I would like and exemption from Plan Change 9.
Kathrine and Daniel Roberts and Delbourgo	231.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitters opposes Plan Change 9: SNA: We have purchased and own the land that the proposed plan seeks to acquire for a SNA [cSNA, C54 at 17 McInnes Place, Queenwood]. The plan envisages the council requisitioning about 80% of our land, with no discussion, negotiation or proper inspection of our land. The trees in the section have been planted by various owners, with no assistance whatsoever by the council. We have tended this land for over a decade with no assistance from the council whatsoever. The population of native birds (including tuis) has increased significantly during the time in which we have lived here due to us investing in planting native trees - again the council has not paid a penny towards this. The last thing our native animals need is whole bunch of council workers disrupting their lives!	We completely oppose the council appropriating/requisitioning land that has been purchased and belongs to us as the owners.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kathrine and Daniel Roberts and Delbourgo	231.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Council appropriate/requisition land and trees that have been purchased and owned by them.	To not appropriate land and/or trees that belong to the owners and "that the land remains our land, for us to continue to care for and protect as we have done for over a decade".
Elizabeth Franklin	232.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C18) at 842 River Road because "My property does not have any significant native plants or trees on it. The creek at the rear boundary of my property is a not a pleasant or biodiverse waterway. It is a muddy polluted drain of poor water quality. There is nothing of natural significance to protect on my property and as such I oppose the amendment of the plan as it relates to my property."	Not to declare a Significant Natural Area [cSNA (C18)] on my property at 842 River Road, Hamilton.
Rachel Tordoff	233.1	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the removal of heritage status on her street [Mason Avenue, Hamilton East].	The submitter prefers the way thing are (suggests no changes to her street).
Grace and Andrew Reid and Crosthwaite	234.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the proposed Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage Area (HHA13): The submitter opposes the changes and considers that the provisions will "make it much harder (mentally, physically and practically) for owners to undertake renovations. With these rules in place, my concern is that many homeowners will put getting consent in the "too hard basket" and not actually get the council sign off required resulting in a large number of unconsented works in the area, when in actual fact the works completed enhance the homes. If these works were being done in any other area of Hamilton, it would be okay to do them without the sign off so what makes it different here?"	That the proposed changes do not come into effect for Hayes Paddock and the old set of guidelines for Hayes Paddock remain.
Grace and Andrew Reid and Crosthwaite	234.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA, the submitter opposes the changes and considers that the provisions will make it much harder for owners to undertake renovations: "With these rules in place, my concern is that many homeowners will put getting consent in the "too hard basket" and not actually get the council sign off required resulting in a large number of unconsented works in the area, when in actual fact the works completed enhance the homes. If these works were being done in any other area of Hamilton, it would be okay to do them without the sign off so what makes it different here?"	While no specific relief sought for Rule 19.3.2a. - the submitter seeks that the proposed changes do not come into effect for Hayes Paddock and the old set of guidelines for Hayes Paddock remain.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Grace and Andrew Reid and Crosthwaite	234.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA, the submitter opposes the changes and considers that the provisions will make it much harder for owners to undertake renovations: "With these rules in place, my concern is that many homeowners will put getting consent in the "too hard basket" and not actually get the council sign off required resulting in a large number of unconsented works in the area, when in actual fact the works completed enhance the homes. If these works were being done in any other area of Hamilton, it would be okay to do them without the sign off so what makes it different here?"	While no specific relief sought for Rule 19.3.2j. - the submitter seeks that the proposed changes do not come into effect for Hayes Paddock and the old set of guidelines for Hayes Paddock remain.
Melinda Ch'ng	235.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage Area [as notified] and seeks amendment "to the plan to exclude rear sites which does not have direct street frontage. this should particularly apply to larger rear site where intensification would be beneficial for urbanisation and where most of that areas rear rear sites have already been developed. By including my property now is discriminating and will affect the value of my property".	Amend Plan Change 9 HHA to exclude rear properties in areas where rear sites are already largely developed.
Melinda Ch'ng	235.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter partly supports the introduction of HHA's, but would like the provisions to exclude all rear sites and particularly larger rear sites where intensification would be beneficial and considers that the provisions, as notified, may affect the value of their property.	The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 - Historic Heritage Area [as notified] and seeks amendment "to the plan to exclude rear sites which does not have direct street frontage. this should particularly apply to larger rear site where intensification would be beneficial for urbanisation and where most of that areas rear rear sites have already been developed. By including my property now is discriminating and will affect the value of my property".
Robinson Family Trust - Christine Helen Robinson	236.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.2 (Oak tree) backing onto the 12 and 10 Opoia Road due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is located on the steep bank and impossible to maintain this large tree. • The significant overhanging/falling of branches and tree falling poses risks to people and properties. • Loss of light and dampness for the rear sides of properties. [Noting: T253.2 is identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees].	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.2 from Schedule 9D and advise to replace with suitable native trees.
Robinson Family Trust - Christine Helen Robinson	236.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T253.3 (Oak tree) backing onto the 12 and 14 Opoia Road due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is located on the steep bank and impossible to maintain this large tree. • The significant overhanging/falling of branches and tree falling poses risks to people and properties. • Loss of light and dampness for the rear sides of properties. (Noting: T253.3 is identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees).	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.3 from Schedule 9D and advise to replace with suitable native trees.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jason Mackenzie	237.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the size of the root protection zone and the size of a tree which is on a neighbouring private property because it has a significant impact to the submitter's property.</p> <p>The submitter states:</p> <p>"I have a total of 3 protected trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] impacting my property, 2 of which are planted 2-3m from my boundary, one of the trees RPZ is approx 8m into my property and it is only part-way through its growth cycle at 22m in height - it could double in size yet. There is no road or berm on a roadside to absorb some of the meterage of the RPZ, the trees are planted extremely close to my boundary so we are impacted significantly with the RPZ.</p> <p>When purchasing a property it is expected that the payment for the land would result in you having control over the property. It appears trees are able to be planted on your boundary line then when they reach an age of significance and able to be protected the neighbors are expected to loose control of what they can do with their own properties. If the impact to neighbours was only 1-2m inside their boundaries it would be more acceptable - however 8m and growing is completely unreasonable. There should be a cap to any RPZ which is impacting a private property so owners are not disadvantaged with these new rules. If these rules had applied to this property when we purchased it - we would have had second thoughts, our property will be less desirable.</p> <p>Notable trees which are in gully's and council owned land are a perfect position for these trees where they have the room to grow and are not impacting personal property."</p>	<p>1. If the RPZ goes ahead will there be a capped maximum impact to private properties that are being impacted, or will the owners loose more control as the neighbouring trees grow?</p> <p>2. As the trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] that are impacting our property are on private land, will the council have any control over the maintenance of these trees which are overhanging our property and do not appear to be thinned out on a regular basis? If not, what responsibility do those who have protected the trees have for those who are affected?</p>
Jason Mackenzie	237.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the size of the root protection zone and the size of a tree [T50.9, 13 Sexton Road] which is on a neighbouring private property because it has a significant impact to the submitter's property.</p> <p>The submitter states:</p> <p>"I have a total of 3 protected trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] impacting my property, 2 of which are planted 2-3m from my boundary, one of the trees RPZ is approx 8m into my property and it is only part-way through its growth cycle at 22m in height - it could double in size yet. There is no road or berm on a roadside to absorb some of the meterage of the RPZ, the trees are planted extremely close to my boundary so we are impacted significantly with the RPZ.</p> <p>When purchasing a property it is expected that the payment for the land would result in you having control over the property. It appears trees are able to be planted on your boundary line then when they reach an age of significance and able to be protected the neighbors are expected to loose control of what they can do with their own properties. If the impact to neighbours was only 1-2m inside their boundaries it would be more acceptable - however 8m and growing is completely unreasonable. There should be a cap to any RPZ which is impacting a private property so owners are not disadvantaged with these new rules. If these rules had applied to this property when we purchased it - we would have had second thoughts, our property will be less desirable.</p> <p>Notable trees which are in gully's and council owned land are a perfect position for these trees where they have the room to grow and are not impacting personal property."</p>	<p>1. If the RPZ goes ahead will there be a capped maximum impact to private properties that are being impacted, or will the owners loose more control as the neighbouring trees grow?</p> <p>2. As the trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] that are impacting our property are on private land, will the council have any control over the maintenance of these trees which are overhanging our property and do not appear to be thinned out on a regular basis? If not, what responsibility do those who have protected the trees have for those who are affected?</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jason Mackenzie	237.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the size of the root protection zone and the size of a tree [T50.5, 13 Sexton Road] which is on a neighbouring private property because it has a significant impact to the submitter's property.</p> <p>The submitter states: "I have a total of 3 protected trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] impacting my property, 2 of which are planted 2-3m from my boundary, one of the trees RPZ is approx 8m into my property and it is only part-way through its growth cycle at 22m in height - it could double in size yet. There is no road or berm on a roadside to absorb some of the meterage of the RPZ, the trees are planted extremely close to my boundary so we are impacted significantly with the RPZ.</p> <p>When purchasing a property it is expected that the payment for the land would result in you having control over the property. It appears trees are able to be planted on your boundary line then when they reach an age of significance and able to be protected the neighbors are expected to loose control of what they can do with their own properties. If the impact to neighbours was only 1-2m inside their boundaries it would be more acceptable - however 8m and growing is completely unreasonable. There should be a cap to any RPZ which is impacting a private property so owners are not disadvantaged with these new rules. If these rules had applied to this property when we purchased it - we would have had second thoughts, our property will be less desirable.</p> <p>Notable trees which are in gully's and council owned land are a perfect position for these trees where they have the room to grow and are not impacting personal property."</p>	<p>1. If the RPZ goes ahead will there be a capped maximum impact to private properties that are being impacted, or will the owners loose more control as the neighbouring trees grow?</p> <p>2. As the trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] that are impacting our property are on private land, will the council have any control over the maintenance of these trees which are overhanging our property and do not appear to be thinned out on a regular basis? If not, what responsibility do those who have protected the trees have for those who are affected?</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jason Mackenzie	237.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the size of the root protection zone and the size of a tree [T50.6, 13 Sexton Road] which is on a neighbouring private property because it has a significant impact to the submitter's property.</p> <p>The submitter states: "I have a total of 3 protected trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] impacting my property, 2 of which are planted 2-3m from my boundary, one of the trees RPZ is approx 8m into my property and it is only part-way through its growth cycle at 22m in height - it could double in size yet. There is no road or berm on a roadside to absorb some of the meterage of the RPZ, the trees are planted extremely close to my boundary so we are impacted significantly with the RPZ.</p> <p>When purchasing a property it is expected that the payment for the land would result in you having control over the property. It appears trees are able to be planted on your boundary line then when they reach an age of significance and able to be protected the neighbors are expected to loose control of what they can do with their own properties. If the impact to neighbours was only 1-2m inside their boundaries it would be more acceptable - however 8m and growing is completely unreasonable. There should be a cap to any RPZ which is impacting a private property so owners are not disadvantaged with these new rules. If these rules had applied to this property when we purchased it - we would have had second thoughts, our property will be less desirable.</p> <p>Notable trees which are in gully's and council owned land are a perfect position for these trees where they have the room to grow and are not impacting personal property."</p>	<p>1. If the RPZ goes ahead will there be a capped maximum impact to private properties that are being impacted, or will the owners loose more control as the neighbouring trees grow?</p> <p>2. As the trees [listed as T50.5, T50.6 & T50.9 in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees] that are impacting our property are on private land, will the council have any control over the maintenance of these trees which are overhanging our property and do not appear to be thinned out on a regular basis? If not, what responsibility do those who have protected the trees have for those who are affected?</p>
QAian Ao	238.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes ("strongly against") having such large areas of the Hamilton East as a Historic Heritage Area, stating: "Understanding we want to hold some historical characteristics and keep a special flavour of Hamilton but this plan is just making no sense in doing any of that. Specially for the Hamilton East area. Although it is the first area Hamilton started, we need to look ahead, to the future, not simply rein fencing the place, apply all sorts of restrictions without any real supports.</p> <p>The council has spent huge effort and tax payers' money in development of the city area and Hamilton East is the heart suppose to pump blood, but this HHA with such large area is just further poisoning it.</p> <p>It only makes sense to label a couple of blocks with well-maintained properties in historical styles as HHA and provide them extra funding to help with the maintenance. However, what this plan suggests is the opposite: it will further driving away the good money and interest to keep the place lively and improving."</p>	Reduce the scale and extent of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area (HHA12), "Instead, a way smaller areas (a few blocks, 20-30 houses in total) is adequate".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
QAian Ao	238.2	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes ("strongly against") having such large areas of the Hamilton East as a Historic Heritage Area, stating:</p> <p>"Understanding we want to hold some historical characteristics and keep a special flavour of Hamilton but this plan is just making no sense in doing any of that. Specially for the Hamilton East area. Although it is the first area Hamilton started, we need to look ahead, to the future, not simply rein fencing the place, apply all sorts of restrictions without any real supports.</p> <p>The council has spent huge effort and tax payers' money in development of the city area and Hamilton East is the heart suppose to pump blood, but this HHA with such large area is just further poisoning it.</p> <p>It only makes sense to label a couple of blocks with well-maintained properties in historical styles as HHA and provide them extra funding to help with the maintenance. However, what this plan suggests is the opposite: it will further driving away the good money and interest to keep the place lively and improving."</p>	Funding should be provided to the HHA property owners to help with maintenance.
QAian Ao	238.3	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes ("strongly against") having such large areas of the Hamilton East as a Historic Heritage Area, stating:</p> <p>"Understanding we want to hold some historical characteristics and keep a special flavour of Hamilton but this plan is just making no sense in doing any of that. Specially for the Hamilton East area. Although it is the first area Hamilton started, we need to look ahead, to the future, not simply rein fencing the place, apply all sorts of restrictions without any real supports.</p> <p>The council has spent huge effort and tax payers' money in development of the city area and Hamilton East is the heart suppose to pump blood, but this HHA with such large area is just further poisoning it.</p> <p>It only makes sense to label a couple of blocks with well-maintained properties in historical styles as HHA and provide them extra funding to help with the maintenance. However, what this plan suggests is the opposite: it will further driving away the good money and interest to keep the place lively and improving."</p>	Council should also put more public effort in lifting the area from turning into a dump.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Josh McKee	239.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		<p>Hayes Paddock - [Note: submitter states Policy, however 19.3.2a and 19.3.2j are rules for Historic Heritage Areas]</p> <p>There are certain policies (Policy 19.3.2a, Policy 19.3.2j) which we are opposed to as stated above. These policies we fear will make the ability to grow and maintain our community so much harder.</p> <p>Specifically referring to Policy 19.3.2a, this calls for resource consent on top of the required building consent for any alterations or additions to a street-facing house in the Historic Heritage Area. I believe that this will be a massive deterrence to up keeping these beautiful homes. I will personally have trouble forking out the required money for the added resource consent. Therefore, things which require serious attention and renovation in my home may have to be left to rot and further degrade. With mine and many other houses in this area built in the 1950's, many of the interior and exterior features are badly outdated and will require renovations. We would love to up-keep the character and charm of our property but with more and more added cost's we fear it is a bridge too far to cross.</p>	Seek the heritage area policies and rules be left as they were.
Josh McKee	239.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>[Note: submitter states Policy, however 19.3.2a and 19.3.2j are rules for Historic Heritage Areas]</p> <p>As first home buyers, me and my partner have absolutely loved finding our home in the heart of Hayes Paddock. We love the heritage and character imbedded in the community, this is something we are not wanting to change. However, there are certain policies (Policy 19.3.2a, Policy 19.3.2j) which we are opposed to as stated above. These policies we fear will make the ability to grow and maintain our community so much harder.</p> <p>Rule 19.3.2j. This impacts us with relation to any new buildings such as garages, sheds or various other structures we may decide to add to our property. I believe this to be problematic again due to the additional cost's. Basically, these changes mean we are unable to do any work on our property (renovations or extensions, new buildings) without planning permission. renovating and up-keeping our beautiful heritage home is something we were extremely excited for. However, these proposals mean this has just got more complicated and even more expensive with consultants and council fees.</p>	Seeks the historic heritage area policies and rules be left as they were.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Dean MacMillan	240.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HHA zone [Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12] for the section of Brookfield Street, between Fox Street to Dey Street. Stating that "the section of Brookfield Street, between Fox Street and Dey Street, is a majority of newer houses, with two to three houses being representative of older homes. This does not fit with preserving an area of historic representation. This section of Brookfield Street should be removed from the HHA proposal."	Remove the section of Brookfield Street, between Fox Street and Dey Street from the proposed Hamilton East HHA.
Dean MacMillan	240.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		Regarding the introduction of HHA's, the submitter considers that the proposal in its current form will not increase investment or encourage rejuvenation and considers that older homes are not suitable for modern-day living, and need additions and renovations to make them healthy, safe and suitable for modern living and that the additional restrictions will not support this and that the provisions will curtail individual property rights and will adversely affect the resale value of properties in these areas.	Ensure that the consent process for improvements to properties in the HHA zone be keep consistent across the city to ensure that and that property owners are not disadvantaged by being in the HHA zone.
Dean MacMillan	240.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the HCC Historic Heritage Area Assessment for 103 Brookfield Street, stating: "Restriction of urban rejuvenation and investment will result in urban decay and slowly result in urban ghettos as the homeowners move away to invest elsewhere, the homes become rentals and become further run down due to no investment, this cycle of decay worsens over time as the lack of new investment results in more and more homeowners moving away and converting rental housing or selling at a loss, with growing crime and worsening health of remaining residents, as homes are no longer invested in. Older homes of the era covered by the HHA are widely accepted as not suitable for modern-day living, and needing additions, and renovation to make them healthy, safe and suitable for modern living. This proposal in its current form will not support this. If there is a desire to preserve historical housing it is better to do this digitally and by the purchase of exceptional examples for preservation."	103 Brookfield Street is removed for the HHA zoning [Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12].
The Commercial Hotel Accomodation Ltd - Ramada Hotel - Avtar Singh Giarn	241.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes archaeological and cultural sites.	No specific relief sought.
The Commercial Hotel Accomodation Ltd - Ramada Hotel - Avtar Singh Giarn	241.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the specific provisions for Built Heritage.	No relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Commercial Hotel Accomodation Ltd - Ramada Hotel - Avtar Singh Giarn	241.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the specific provisions for Historic Heritage Areas.	No relief sought.
Soe Naing	242.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction and implementation of Fairfield Road Historic Heritage Area [HHA 9] because of the potential impacts on property values, development potentials as well as additional resource consent requirement and the associated costs.	Remove the introduction of Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9.
Jane and Steve Bland	243.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarity concerning Rule 19.3.2 (a) and what is and is not captured within the rule. If the intention of this rule is to restrict internal alterations (which is not clear), that seems to be imposing an unreasonable level of control. Heritage homes require works to remediate and bring up to modern standard. Imposing controls on all alterations, which appears to be the intent of 19.3.2 (a) does not encourage homeowners to undertake these works.	Amend Rule 19.3.2 (a) to restrict out-of-character external alterations or additions to the front of houses only (not rear of houses or internal works).
Jane and Steve Bland	243.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarity concerning Rule 19.3.2 (j) which restricts 'new buildings' without clarifying a size/function of said buildings. If restricting minor buildings such as small garden sheds, this is an unreasonable level of control.	Amend or remove Rule 19.3.2 (j) to restrict out-of-character buildings to the front of existing buildings, but not to restrict buildings to the rear of buildings or buildings under a certain size (such as small garden sheds).
Maggie (Margaret) Robson	244.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in full the principals in relation to the Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 as it is important to retain housing now that will enable future generations to understand their heritage and maintain a living history of Hamilton.	Seeks inclusion of area of Brookfield Street between Grey Street and MacFarlane Street as part of the Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9.
Maggie (Margaret) Robson	244.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in full the principals in relation to the Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 as it is important to retain housing now that will enable future generations to understand their heritage and maintain a living history of Hamilton.	Seeks inclusion of area of Naylor Street between Grey Street and MacFarlane Street as part of the Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9.
Catherine Mary Kaa	245.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter is requesting the gully to be cleaned.	Follow up regarding the outcome.
Catherine Mary Kaa	245.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to restrictions to maintain or cut down trees in the gully behind 5 Chamberlain Place Chartwell.	Remove trees from the gully behind 5 Chamberlain Place Chartwell.
Catherine Mary Kaa	245.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the trees in the park at Chamberlain Place because they block sun from units and elderly are blocked from what is happening around them.	Remove the trees in the park at Chamberlain Place.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>Objective 19.2.1</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent of the policies and objectives but has concerns that the proposed rules do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. For example, demolition of a Ranked B building or structure should be a Non-complying activity, not discretionary and the exceptions should be tightened. The same applies to removal of a heritage building.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>Objective 19.2.4:</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent of the PC9 provisions (particularly policies and objectives 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules 19.3 to 19.6) but are concerned that they do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage and for proposed subdivision and density rules, consider it difficult to conclude that development will align with the protection of the historic heritage areas.</p> <p>Further, are unclear as to the impact of PC12 on the rules under Chapters 5 and 23 as subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas.</p> <p>Further that without knowing the specific objectives, policies and rules of PC12, that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones and in summary, that there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.3	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General	Support	<p>Subdivision rules under chapter 23 and density and height rules under Chapter 5.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	<p>That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.4	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support in part	<p>Density and height rules under Chapter 5.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	<p>Objective 19.2.2</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent of the policies and objectives but has concerns that the proposed rules do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. For example, demolition of a Ranked B building or structure should be a Non-complying activity, not discretionary and the exceptions should be tightened. The same applies to removal of a heritage building.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>Objective 19.2.3</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent of the policies and objectives but has concerns that the proposed rules do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. For example, demolition of a Ranked B building or structure should be a Non-complying activity, not discretionary and the exceptions should be tightened. The same applies to removal of a heritage building.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>Rule 19.3.1</p> <p>The submitter supports the intent of the policies and objectives but has concerns that the proposed rules do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. For example, demolition of a Ranked B building or structure should be a Non-complying activity, not discretionary and the exceptions should be tightened. The same applies to removal of a heritage building.</p>	<p>That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.</p>
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>Objective 19.2.5:</p> <p>The policies and objectives identified under 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules under 19.3 to 19.6 relating to protection of historic heritage areas.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	<p>That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for heritage buildings and structures with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying for the Hamilton East Villas, Hayes Paddock and Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage areas.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>Rule 19.3.2:</p> <p>The policies and objectives identified under 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules under 19.3 to 19.6 relating to protection of historic heritage areas.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	<p>That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	<p>Rule 19.4.3:</p> <p>The policies and objectives identified under 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules under 19.3 to 19.6 relating to protection of historic heritage areas.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	<p>That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.5 Controlled Activities: Matters of Control	Support in part	<p>The policies and objectives identified under 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules under 19.3 to 19.6 relating to protection of historic heritage areas.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density) development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jonathan and Rachel Caldwell	246.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The policies and objectives identified under 19.2.4 to 19.2.5 and rules under 19.3 to 19.6 relating to protection of historic heritage areas.</p> <p>We support the intent of the policies and objectives under Chapter 19 but have concern that the rules under Chapter 19 do not go far enough to provide the intended protection, enhancement and maintenance of heritage. It is also difficult to conclude how subdivision and density rules etc for development will align with protection of the historic heritage areas as we are unclear how Plan Change 12 might impact these subdivision and density and height rules that are currently specified under Chapters 5 and 23. There is currently too much uncertainty regarding the impact on heritage without seeing Plan Change 12.</p> <p>Subdivision and development of sites with non-heritage buildings within a historic heritage zone still need to be undertaken in a manner that avoids, mitigates or remedies adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the heritage character and value of these areas. Otherwise we will end up with a few sparsely scattered houses across the zone surrounded by totally un-sympathetic developments of high intensity with the original heritage character of the area smothered, disconnected and or completely lost.</p> <p>Without knowing yet what the specific objectives, policies and rules will be under the yet to be notified Plan Change 12, it is of concern to us that heritage protection in the heritage zones may not be sufficiently controlled if medium or high density intensification is allowed to occur in these zones.</p> <p>In summary, there is not enough specificity or control to prevent the loss and cumulative erosion of heritage within Historic Heritage Areas.</p>	That proposed rules, conditions and exceptions are strengthened for historic heritage zones with intensification (medium and high density)development identified as non-complying and a single story limit for development of new residential buildings in the Hamilton East Villas and Hayes Paddock Historic Heritage zones as is proposed for the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage zone.
Domus Sacarium Ltd - Natasha Middleton	247.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 53 Claude Street as a built heritage item (H176) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H176, 53 Claude Street.
Yuewen and Mingli Lin and Liang	248.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 70 Grey Street as part of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 because the property is of a rear site and it was constructed fairly recently. The submitter disagrees the property shows the same architectural characteristics of other heritage properties and it does not demonstrate any significant history values. The submitter however understands Grey Street itself can be considered an area that reflects Hamilton's unique identity.	Seeks to remove property at 70 Grey Street from Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jenny, Bernice and Devon Screech	249.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the exclusion of properties at 358, 362, 362A, 368, 370 and 370A River Road as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA 8) under Plan Change 9, because these properties show the same or similar level of physical and visual consistency as some other properties that are within the Claudelands Historic Heritage Area. The submitter thereby considers these properties also present a significant period of Hamilton's evolution and history. The submitter also considers the inclusion of these properties as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area will protect the existing vista and ensure that redevelopment is properly controlled so that the character and amenity of the area is protected.	Seeks inclusion of properties at 358, 362, 362A, 368, 370 and 370A River Road as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA 8).
Jenny, Bernice and Devon Screech	249.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns potential intensive developments without the requirement of resource consent within the area as a result of the properties at 358, 362, 362A, 368, 370 and 370A River Road being excluded as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.	Seeks inclusion of properties at 358, 362, 362A, 368, 370 and 370A River Road as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA 8).
Jenny, Bernice and Devon Screech	249.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter while acknowledging that the 362A River Road neighbourhood includes rear section properties stated that "this should not influence their exclusion from the HHA. Some of the properties are visible form certain points along River Road and the neighbourhood is also visible from points on the west side of the river. The original topography has been retained and the area includes a mix of properties that tell a story and provide an example of development undertaken in a way that has been sympathetic to the landscape and environment. The inclusion of the entire 362A River Road neighbourhood in the HHA area will protect the existing vista and ensure that redevelopment is properly controlled so that the character and amenity of the area is protected".	Seeks inclusion of properties at 358, 362, 362A, 368, 370 and 370A River Road as part of Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA 8).
Green Box Collection - Jynel McHardie	250.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the inclusion of property at 135 Galloway Street as part of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area because it is a rear section, however the submitter supports the properties fronting road frontages to be preserved their heritage characteristics.	Remove property at 135 Galloway Street from Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Chris Yu	251.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments to Rule 20.3.n, stating: "I own the land, and it should be a discretionary activity to allow for placement and/or construction of any new building and structures in the cSNA. Understand the need for protection, so I proposed 5 meters buffer zone inside envelope or footprint in a Significant Natural Area, which is a good balance of enhancement and protection. For example, the building of the retaining walls as they will retain any sediment and provide strengthening to the top of the gully inside envelope or footprint of a Significant Natural Area and would also reduce erosion.	Amend Rule 20.3 n. to provide a 5 metre buffer zone inside the SNA to allow for building infrastructure such as buildings and retaining walls.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chris Yu	251.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3q, stating: "I own the land, and it should be a discretionary activity to allow for placement and/or construction of any new building and structures in the cSNA. Understand the need for protection, so I proposed 5 meters buffer zone inside envelope or footprint in a Significant Natural Area, which is a good balance of enhancement and protection. For example, the building of the retaining walls as they will retain any sediment and provide strengthening to the top of the gully inside envelope or footprint of a Significant Natural Area and would also reduce erosion".	Amend Rule 20.3 q. to provide a 5 metre buffer zone inside the SNA to allow for building infrastructure such as buildings and retaining walls.
Gary Bell	252.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes 11 Frances Street being scheduled a built heritage item (H200) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage because it unfairly places council restrictions on these properties compared to our neighbours in the same street	Remove H200, 11 Frances Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Fiberygoodness - Susan Jane Brown	253.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	[Note: T253.2 is identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees]. The submitter opposes the scheduling of the Notable Tree T253.2 (Specifically Oak Tree on River Road) and its protected root zone at 10 Opoia Road, and seeks the planting of smaller native New Zealand trees. They would like to be relieved of the safety concern we feel whenever we have long periods of rain and wind, and we would like to be able to have a drier environment and enjoy more sunshine for a longer time during the day.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.2 from Schedule 9D and to remove them entirely and replace them with smaller native New Zealand trees
Fiberygoodness - Susan Jane Brown	253.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	[Note: T253.3 is identified at 12A Opoia Road in Schedule 9D - Notable Trees]. The submitter opposes the scheduling of the Notable Tree T253.3 (Specifically Oak Tree on River Road) and its protected root zone at 10 Opoia Road, and seeks the planting of smaller native New Zealand trees. They would like to be relieved of the safety concern we feel whenever we have long periods of rain and wind, and we would like to be able to have a drier environment and enjoy more sunshine for a longer time during the day.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T253.3 from Schedule 9D and to remove them entirely and replace them with smaller native New Zealand trees
Benjamin Smith	254.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Augusta, Casper and Roseburg Streets Historic Heritage Area (HHA4), because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will not result in any positive impact to the neighbourhood and wider city. • It is more likely to lead to the area deteriorating. • The proposed HHA will also have a significant negative effect on property values and existing property owners rights in this area. 	Remove the entire Augusta, Casper and Roseburg Streets Historic Heritage Area (HHA4) from the proposal. Or, At the very least, exclude the "existing property owners at the time of the rule change" from being subjected to the restrictions, real costs, and opportunity costs that come from this HHA change (i.e. the additional circumstances that would now require Resource Consent).
Gerard Kelly	255.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter is generally supportive of the Plan Change as notified but request that a definition of qualified arborist is added.	Add definition of Qualified Arborist as a person who has studied and achieved a nationally recognised qualification to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority standards for Arboriculture, and has practical experience in the care and maintenance of trees.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gerard Kelly	255.2	4.9 Rules – Specific Standards – Large Lot Residential Zone	4.9.1 Effluent Disposal	Support	The submitter supports Rule 4.9.1 a viii, specifically Protected Root zone of a notable tree because root zones need protection for mature trees as drainage changes and root damage from poor pruning practices causes significant damage to trees and can lead to slow or immediate decline.	Support Rule 4.9.1 a viii.
Gerard Kelly	255.3	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Chapter 5 Special Character Zones - Tree planting and removal - Tree removal in the Temple entrance area because the modernist landscape planting with indigenous trees is unique and valued characteristic of the area.	Amend Rule 5.3.3 with Implementation of 'Notable' trees definition instead of 'Significant' trees.
Gerard Kelly	255.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.2.3 noting that the 'notable' trees also compile the character and significance of Historical and architectural landmarks in past times Maaori utilised trees for many reasons and many existing trees have historical and cultural significance that must be recognised.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.5	Chapter 15 Open Space Zones	15.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Chapter 15.3 note 6 because the rules in Chapter 20 apply instead of the Chapter 15 rules when the removal, planting, pruning and maintenance of vegetation or trees is located in a Significant Natural Area or relates to a Notable Tree.	No specified.
Gerard Kelly	255.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports Rules 20.2.1 a- e, 20.2.1g-k, support with note Rule 20.2.1f because some 'notable ' trees comprise the character and significance of historical and architectural landmarks. e.g Miropiko Pa is named in association with a miro tree that marked a specific area and support with note Rule 20.2.1l could be enhanced because it will require significant investment in resources to achieve the 10% indigenous vegetation cover, specifically 1100 hectares.	Amend rules 20.2.1f and 20.2.1k.
Gerard Kelly	255.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.4.1 Activities within or affecting the Peat Lakes, Wetlands and Peat Lake Catchments	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 20.4	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gerard Kelly	255.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.5.1 however amendments are requested.	Amend Rule 20.5.1: - Maximum amount of foliage to be removed per tree per calendar year - 10% - Maximum thickness (cross-section) of any branch or root that may be cut - 25mm OR For Significant Trees identified in Schedule 9D only: Confirmation of the necessity for the works shall be provided to Council: Before any works are undertaken, and the works shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified person (e.g. an arborist).
Gerard Kelly	255.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.2 Pruning and Maintenance of Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.5.2 however amendments are needed to adjust some parameters.	Amend Rule 20.5.2 c. Maximum thickness (cross-section at point of severance) of any branch that may be cut to retain the natural shape, form and branch habitat of the tree is retained. 25mm e. Maximum thickness (cross-section at point of severance) of any root that may be cut. 25mm
Gerard Kelly	255.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.3 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.4 Emergency Works to, or Removal of, an Indigenous Tree in a Significant Natural Area or a Notable Tree		The submitter supports Rule 20.5.4	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.5 as notified.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gerard Kelly	255.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.6 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.7 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.6 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.17	Chapter 26 Designations	General	Support	The submitter supports Chapter 26 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.18	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports Volume 2, Appendix 1.1 as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.19	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for protected tree as notified.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.20	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports definition of pruning, trimming and maintenance of a notable tree as notified.	No specific relief sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gerard Kelly	255.21	1.3 Assessment Criteria	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Assessment Criteria D11-D13.	No specific relief sought.
Gerard Kelly	255.22	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports Appendix 9 as notified however a note should be added for further clarity.	Add note: Trees that meet the S.T.E.M criteria and a score of greater than 110 points as consistent with other Local Authorities in the Waikato Region e.g. Waipa District Council Protected Trees, are to be included in the Notable tree register and notified. This is to mitigate long delays in having notable trees listed for private properties specifically where there is a lag time between listing and requests for information e.g. Land Information Memorandums or other works requiring consents i.e. earthworks within root zones.
Gerard Kelly	255.23	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	General	Support	The submitter supports the Appendix 9 Schedule 9D Notable Trees.	Adopt all listings of Notable trees as assessed and added to Appendix 9 Schedule 9D Notable Trees.
Gerard Kelly	255.24	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter is generally supportive of the Plan Change as notified but there should be no cost to tangata whenua and private landowners for the protection of notable trees.	Hamilton City Council to provide resources to achieve the objectives of this aspect of the District Plan as required by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Te Tauākī Kaupapa here ā-Rohe).
Anthony Endres	256.1	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter seeks the addition of a definition of "customary" because activities do not require resource consents but at present the term in the Plan is implicitly exclusive. The term 'customary' needs to be carefully defined to make it inclusive for SNA owners, both Maori and non-Maori	Add a definition of "customary" to the District Plan definitions and revise exclusivist language around customary activities on SNA's.
Anthony Endres	256.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the wording of explanation under Objective 20.2.1 as both Maori and non-Maori has the potential to develop connections to the land and indigenous flora and those original Maori connections need necessarily be tied to the authority of mana whenua.	Seeks the amendment of the language used in the provisions and sections of the Plan relating to customary activities.
Anthony Endres	256.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Amend language used in the provisions and sections of the Plan relating to customary activities.	Seeks the amendment of the language used in the provisions and sections of the Plan relating to customary activities.
Anthony Endres	256.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Amend language used in the provisions and sections of the Plan relating to customary activities.	Seeks the amendment of the language used in the provisions and sections of the Plan relating to customary activities.
Anthony Endres	256.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that all activities conducted by Maori and non-Maori that have demonstrable customary links should be exempt from resource consent requirements	Activities that have demonstrable customary links should be exempt from resource consent requirements.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Anthony Endres	256.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement of resource consent for activities involving emergency works on structures such as fencing that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security.	Seeks that provisions are amended to provide emergency works on buildings and structures that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security as a permitted activity, these amendments could possibly be achieved though an addition to 20.3e.
Anthony Endres	256.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement of resource consent for activities involving emergency works on structures such as fencing that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security.	Seeks that provisions are amended to provide emergency works on buildings and structures that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security as a permitted activity, these amendments could possibly be achieved though an addition to 20.3e.
Anthony Endres	256.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement of resource consent for activities involving emergency works on structures such as fencing that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security.	Seeks that provisions are amended to provide emergency works on buildings and structures that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security as a permitted activity, these amendments could possibly be achieved though an addition to 20.3e.
Anthony Endres	256.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement of resource consent for activities involving emergency works on structures such as fencing that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security.	Seeks that provisions are amended to provide emergency works on buildings and structures that are built primarily (but not only for) protection of privacy, private property and personal security as a permitted activity, these amendments could possibly be achieved though an addition to 20.3e.
Anthony Endres	256.10	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter considers that a clearer definition of 'structure' and 'existing structures' (used in 20.3 g. iii. and iv.) is required for structures specifically built for restoration purposes in SNA's rather than relying on 'existing' to avoid resource consent requirements.	Seeks the inclusion of a definition of 'structure' and 'existing structure' within SNA's to provide clarity.
Anthony Endres	256.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current provisions because they consider that any structures specifically built for restoration purposes should be excluded from recourse consent requirements.	Seeks the amendment of the relevant provisions relating to structures to provide for structures specifically built for restoration purposes as permitted activities.
Anthony Endres	256.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter considers that a clearer definition of 'existing footprint' as used in Table 20.3 is required and an operational threshold specified that applies when a new structure in a SNA exceeds the footprint, so restorers know the threshold should they alter the existing footprint.	Seeks amendment of provisions to provide clarity on the definition of 'existing footprint' and provision of the operational threshold.
Anthony Endres	256.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter states that the 'communication' and 'information' provisions around SNA governance in Policy 20.2.2a require strengthening.	seeks 'communication' and 'information' of Policy 20.2.2a are strengthened.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Anthony Endres	256.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General		The submitter considers that a dispute resolution process when there is a difference in interpretation between council and landowners over District Plan rule because the current process does not allow for this resulting in the SNA restorers having to agree with HCC's interpretation.	Seeks the inclusion of a dispute resolution process within the District Plan to resolve differences in interpretation between council and landowners over District Plan rule interpretation.
Anthony Endres	256.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with the 'consenting pathways' and considers that a permit system should be formulated to allow genuine SNA-owner restorers the opportunity to undertake restoration activities without having to comply strictly with SNA related District Plan provisions.	Seeks an easier consent pathway (permit system) for SNA owner restorers within the District Plan provisions.
Anthony Endres	256.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that the rating valuation does not take into account private owners with SNA's on their properties. A\	Seeks the revision of rating valuation assessment to reflect areas of SNA on private property.
Anthony Endres	256.17	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		The submitter considers that the proposed changes do not remedy existing deficiencies in the Operative District Plan	No specific relief sought.
Anthony Endres	256.18	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter considers that Operative District Plan provisions 20.3g., 20.3g.i., 20.g.iii., 20.3g.iv., and 20.g.vii. do not remedy deficiencies in the Operative District Plan. [PLANNER NOTE: APPEARS TO BE AN INCORRECT REFERENCE TO PROVISIONS THAT DON'T EXIST BUT THE REST OF THE SUBMISSION POINT ADDRESS THE ISSUES IDENTIFIED AGAINST THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS]	No specific relief provided.
Place's Mill Limited - Robyn Ivy Place	257.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 166 River Road as a built heritage item (H279) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H279, 166 River Road.
Judith Anne Harkness	258.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 118 Albert Street as a built heritage item (H145) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by deleting all reference to H145, 118 Albert Street.
Nigel and Barbara Corkill	259.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Lake Rotorua walkway being classified as a SNA (C31)	Remove Lake Rotorua walkway as a SNA (C31).
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes Appendix 9C - as no SNA exists the classifications are meaningless [SNA (C18) at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell]	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1a because Schedule in Appendix 9C is incorrect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1b because maps are incorrect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1c because no ecosystem will be lost, as none exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA 18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1d because there will be no adverse effects as no SNA exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1e because no SNA exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1f because maps are inaccurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1m because it shouldn't apply to private property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. <p>[Note: there is no policy 20.2.1m in Plan Change 9 as notified]</p>	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1j because it should only apply on public land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1k (i) & (ii) because it should only be applicable on public land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.3.o because earthworks for retaining and drainage should be permitted.</p>	<p>Amend provision to permit earthworks for retaining and drainage.</p> <p>That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.</p>
Roger Wayne Wilhelmsen	260.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to provisions 20.2.1a because new buildings and structures should be permitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 5 and 7 Opal Place have always been fenced off at their boundaries within the gully. Their contours permit easy assess to all their boundaries. • Numbers 9, 11, 10 Opal Place have never had boundary fences within the gully. A near vertical bank of some 8m (illegible) across those properties prevents assess to those parts of their lands. • The 7 Opal Place area contains no indigenous vegetation or habitat. It is covered with grass, agapanthas and a tree fern. The canopy shown in the aerial view is almost entirely borrowed from 5 and 9 Opal Place. 	<p>Amend Rule 20.3q to permit new buildings or structures.</p> <p>That the property at 7 Opal Place, Chartwell have the proposed SNA [cSNA, C18] covenant removed - to be treated the same as 5 Opal Place.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Vanessa Fernandes	261.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitters, owners of the property at 50 Sare Crescent, Fairfield oppose the Sare Crescent Historic Heritage Area (HHA25) stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sare Crescent has no history and the area comprises of old houses. • We are investors and would consider building or renovating in the future. • would like to know why is Sare Crescent considered as historic. • There has been some re developments on the street and what makes them different to our house. • Why are some houses targeted and some not. 	[Sare Crescent Historic Heritage Area, HHA25] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of 50 Sare Crescent, Fairfield from Plan Change 9. • Allowing the owner to build or remove in keeping with existing Residential Rules. • Consistency between all the houses in Sare Crescent.
Vanessa Fernandes	261.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitters, owners of the property at 50 Sare Crescent, Fairfield oppose the Sare Crescent Historic Heritage Area (HHA25) stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sare Crescent has no history and the area comprises of old houses. • We are investors and would consider building or renovating in the future. • would like to know why is Sare Crescent considered as historic. • There has been some re developments on the street and what makes them different to our house. • Why are some houses targeted and some not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of 50 Sare Crescent, Fairfield from Plan Change 9. • Allowing the owner to build or remove in keeping with existing Residential Rules. • Consistency between all the houses in Sare Crescent.
Robert de Leeuw	262.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified provisions relating to control of trees and vegetation in SNAs because it affects the owners ability to retain line of site/views, particularly when the trees have been planted by the owner over a long period.	Seeks the requirement for resource consent to control trees/shrubs and vegetation is removed.
Xiao Cui Zhou	263.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the notified Plan Change 9 amendments which relate to SNA's, including requiring resource consent to maintain their property because trees border the gully and prevents alterations to the dwelling. These changes will potentially affect their ability and value of the property should they wish to sell. Changes to the District Plan should not be made to suit Council's staff ideology. The submitter considers that there has been no consideration given the the potential financial effects on the property owner.	No specific relief requested.
Rosemarie van der Poel	264.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter opposes to the part of the SNA (C46) at 11 Balloch Street.	Remove the SNA (C46) from the property at 11 Balloch Street.
Melanie Gow	265.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the property at 25 Acacia Crescent to be identified and included as part of Acacia Crescent Historic Heritage Area (HHA1) under Plan Change 9.	Removed 25 Acacia Crescent from the Acacia Crescent Historic Heritage Area (HHA1).
Keryn Drummond Campbell & Shirley Johnstone Trust	266.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone for the notable tree T227.2 within the boundary of 27 and 29 Liverpool Street, because if the submitter wished to develop their property, the development would be impacted by restrictions in the Proposed Plan Change 9.	Remove the Protected Root Zone of the notable tree T227.2 from within the boundary of 27 and 29 Liverpool Street.
Keryn Drummond Campbell & Shirley Johnstone Trust	266.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone for the notable tree T227.4 within the boundary of 27 and 29 Liverpool Street, because if the submitter wished to develop their property, the development would be impacted by restrictions in the Proposed Plan Change 9.	Remove the Protected Root Zone of the notable tree T227.4 from within the boundary of 27 and 29 Liverpool Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
BSM Trust - Brad Steven Martin	267.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the protected root zone notable tree because it is an unreasonable that a HCC owned and managed tree on HCC land would require landowners to obtain a resource consent to carry out any development work on this part of the property.	Delete the notifiable tree requirement.
BSM Trust - Brad Steven Martin	267.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the protected root zone, for the notable tree T289.24, within the boundary of 23 Stanley Street.	Delete the notifiable tree requirement.
AGM INTERNATIONAL GROUP - ASSESSCO GENERAL and MARINE - Timothy H. Smithson	268.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C28) at 7 Fleming Place and Rule 20.3.1 and Policy 19.3a. The property extends into a considerable section of the watershed gully. Private property rights stand before provisions Council is considering. All vegetation within the property is under the control of the property owners and will remain so given the owners have paid for, and nurtured, it and will continue to do so.	That Council abandon its directions regarding the SNA. Council could buy back the gully section of the property by way of a new property title.
Damian May	269.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter purchased the property because of the natural environment, beautiful gully, streams and bird life but we have to maintain it which means pruning and cutting out trees where needed. The gully area was originally farmland and all of the trees were planted by us and previous owners over the last 40 years for example the 30 plus Kahikatea within the flood plane or the Punga, ferns, Rimu and Kauri surrounding the areas. The plan covers over 50% of our section and amongst all the native trees there are plenty that aren't eg Redwoods and Elms and Maple. Our section and location of our home is very different to those that own a gully section where our home is located at the bottom of the gully, all of our streams are maintained as well and used to be full of eels until we had HCC undertake some repairs to the eroding banks which in turn killed all the eels in the stream. I think it is completely unfair and directly oppose the change to enforce consents for digging near or cutting of the trees we have purchased and planted ourselves.</p> <p>[this submission is assumed to relate to 17a McInnes Place, overlaid by C54 cSNA]</p>	<p>Homeowners to be able to prune and cut trees without consent</p> <p>Homeowners to dig around root zone of trees without consent</p> <p>When HCC undertake repairs to eroding streams they need to protect the native fish/eels.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Damian May	269.2	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter purchased the property because of the natural environment, beautiful gully, streams and bird life but we have to maintain it which means pruning and cutting out trees where needed. The gully area was originally farmland and all of the trees were planted by us and previous owners over the last 40 years for example the 30 plus Kahikatea within the flood plane or the Punga, ferns, Rimu and Kauri surrounding the areas. The plan covers over 50% of our section and amongst all the native trees there are plenty that aren't eg Redwoods and Elms and Maple. Our section and location of our home is very different to those that own a gully section where our home is located at the bottom of the gully, all of our streams are maintained as well and used to be full of eels until we had HCC undertake some repairs to the eroding banks which in turn killed all the eels in the stream. I think it is completely unfair and directly oppose the change to enforce consents for digging near or cutting of the trees we have purchased and planted ourselves.</p> <p>[this submission is assumed to relate to 17a McInnes Place, overlaid by C54 cSNA]</p>	<p>Homeowners to be able to prune and cut trees without consent</p> <p>Homeowners to dig around root zone of trees without consent</p> <p>When HCC undertake repairs to eroding streams they need to protect the native fish/eels.</p>
The Landscape Design Studio Ltd - Mary Lee Burton	270.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General		The submitter partially supports the SNAs as long as they are on public land.	Remove SNAs from private properties.
The Landscape Design Studio Ltd - Mary Lee Burton	270.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter partially supports the SNAs as long as they are on public land.	Remove SNAs from private properties.
The Landscape Design Studio Ltd - Mary Lee Burton	270.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C18) on the property at 736A River Road Chartwell because the landowner has been taking care of the gully and neither want or need the council to inflict restrictions of any form on their private land.	Remove SNA (C18) from the property at 736A River Road Chartwell.
The Landscape Design Studio Ltd - Mary Lee Burton	270.4	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1 Significant Tree Assessment Valuation Method and Criteria	Support in part	The submitter partially supports SNAs as long as they are on public land, but the submitter is happy to have notable trees on both public and private land.	Identify and protect notable trees on private and public land.
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion of our property at 45 Palliser Drive, Huntington, Hamilton from the SNA.	That the property at 45 Palliser Drive continue to be excluded from the SNA proposed for the adjacent gully.
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.2	Planning Maps	General	Support	The submitter supports the exclusion of our property at 45 Palliser Drive, Huntington, Hamilton from the SNA.	That the property at 45 Palliser Drive continue to be excluded from the SNA proposed for the adjacent gully.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA in the gully system backing onto properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court Huntington for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting in the gully has been undertaken and managed by landowners without any input from the Council and there is no reason why this could not continue. • Some trees planted on neighbouring properties will be inappropriate in the long term being too big for the locations that they have been planted in and landowners should be able to trim or replace these trees. • There is sufficient protection provided through the SNA's on the major gully systems in public ownership in the area. • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only. 	<p>The removal of the SNA from the gully within and adjacent to properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court.</p> <p>Alternatively, if retained, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the local significance classification of the gully SNA be retained. • Retain rules 20.3 a and b • Change the activity status of Rule 20.3 f to permitted (removal of exotic trees) • Allow greater flexibility for property maintenance in a new rule (for activities such as fences, drains, tree trimming, tracking and the like as a permitted activity) • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only.
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA in the gully system backing onto properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court Huntington for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting in the gully has been undertaken and managed by landowners without any input from the Council and there is no reason why this could not continue. • Some trees planted on neighbouring properties will be inappropriate in the long term being too big for the locations that they have been planted in and landowners should be able to trim or replace these trees. • There is sufficient protection provided through the SNA's on the major gully systems in public ownership in the area. • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only. 	<p>The removal of the SNA from the gully within and adjacent to properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court.</p> <p>Alternatively, if retained, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the local significance classification of the gully SNA be retained. • Retain rules 20.3 a and b • Change the activity status of Rule 20.3 f to permitted (removal of exotic trees) • Allow greater flexibility for property maintenance in a new rule (for activities such as fences, drains, tree trimming, tracking and the like as a permitted activity) • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA in the gully system backing onto properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court Huntington for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting in the gully has been undertaken and managed by landowners without any input from the Council and there is no reason why this could not continue. • Some trees planted on neighbouring properties will be inappropriate in the long term being too big for the locations that they have been planted in and landowners should be able to trim or replace these trees. • There is sufficient protection provided through the SNA's on the major gully systems in public ownership in the area. • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only. 	<p>The removal of the SNA from the gully within and adjacent to properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court.</p> <p>Alternatively, if retained, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the local significance classification of the gully SNA be retained. • Retain rules 20.3 a and b • Change the activity status of Rule 20.3 f to permitted (removal of exotic trees) • Allow greater flexibility for property maintenance in a new rule (for activities such as fences, drains, tree trimming, tracking and the like as a permitted activity) • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only.
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA in the gully system backing onto properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court Huntington for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting in the gully has been undertaken and managed by landowners without any input from the Council and there is no reason why this could not continue. • Some trees planted on neighbouring properties will be inappropriate in the long term being too big for the locations that they have been planted in and landowners should be able to trim or replace these trees. • There is sufficient protection provided through the SNA's on the major gully systems in public ownership in the area. • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only. 	<p>The removal of the SNA from the gully within and adjacent to properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court.</p> <p>Alternatively, if retained, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the local significance classification of the gully SNA be retained. • Retain rules 20.3 a and b • Change the activity status of Rule 20.3 f to permitted (removal of exotic trees) • Allow greater flexibility for property maintenance in a new rule (for activities such as fences, drains, tree trimming, tracking and the like as a permitted activity) • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Stephen George and Erin Teresa Colson	271.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA in the gully system backing onto properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court Huntington for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The planting in the gully has been undertaken and managed by landowners without any input from the Council and there is no reason why this could not continue. • Some trees planted on neighbouring properties will be inappropriate in the long term being too big for the locations that they have been planted in and landowners should be able to trim or replace these trees. • There is sufficient protection provided through the SNA's on the major gully systems in public ownership in the area. • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only. 	<p>The removal of the SNA from the gully within and adjacent to properties located in Palliser Drive and Winslow Court.</p> <p>Alternatively, if retained, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the local significance classification of the gully SNA be retained. • Retain rules 20.3 a and b • Change the activity status of Rule 20.3 f to permitted (removal of exotic trees) • Allow greater flexibility for property maintenance in a new rule (for activities such as fences, drains, tree trimming, tracking and the like as a permitted activity) • The LA4 report at page 30 Figure 6 notes that the gully is of local significance only.
Prudence Porteous	272.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks the protection of their street because high density will ruin the family friendly environment of the quiet street.	<p>Reassess our street. NO HIGH RISE</p> <p>[Masons Avenue - for Built Heritage and Historic Heritage Area]</p>
Prudence Porteous	272.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter seeks the protection of trees, because they really enjoy our trees, a haven for the multitude of Tui that live here [Masons Avenue].	Protect the trees.
Prudence Porteous	272.3	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Plan Change 9 as notified.	Reassess Masons Avenue.
Prudence Porteous	272.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Significant Natural Areas.</p> <p>[It is assumed the SNA associated with Masons Avenue - f62 - Seely's Gully]</p>	<p>Reassess Significant Natural Areas</p> <p>[It is assumed the SNA associated with Masons Avenue - f62 - Seely's Gully]</p>
Mark Brotherston	273.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter does not support the inclusion of their property [10 Rembrandt Terrace, Huntington] in an area noted as an SNA [being cSNA, C35 - Mangaiti Gully - upstream], stating:</p> <p>"Whilst we are happy for the council to include the gully areas for the SNA (Outside the boundaries of our property/valuation number) we do not wish to have the council include our property in a listed SNA, that defines what activities can and can't be done on our property".</p>	Remove private land owners from the identified SNA areas. (Schedule 9C, Chapter 20). Including our property - valuation number 0429-210-41

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Mark Brotherston	273.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter does not support the inclusion of their property [10 Rembrandt Terrace, Huntington] in an area noted as an SNA [being fSNA, F43 - Puketaha Astelia Gully], stating: "Whilst we are happy for the council to include the gully areas for the SNA (Outside the boundaries of our property/valuation number) we do not wish to have the council include our property in a listed SNA, that defines what activities can and can't be done on our property".	Remove private land owners from the identified SNA areas. (Schedule 9C, Chapter 20). Including our property - valuation number 0429-210-41
Mark Brotherston	273.3	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 4.4.6 (f) building setback from Gully Hazard Area; and any changes to setback provisions or the inclusion of a "Gully Hazard" on private property.	Do not introduce setback rules from areas noted as Gully Hazard and remove any reference to Gully Hazard Area on private property.
Mark Brotherston	273.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter does not support the inclusion of their property [10 Rembrandt Terrace, Huntington] in an area noted as an SNA [being cSNA-C35 and fSNA-F43], stating: "Whilst we are happy for the council to include the gully areas for the SNA (Outside the boundaries of our property/valuation number) we do not wish to have the council include our property in a listed SNA, that defines what activities can and can't be done on our property".	Ensure land owners have full entitlement to all activities, without the need to seek permitted activity or consent from council as part of the SNA proposal.
Jun Zhou	274.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C39) at 58 Urlich Avenue.	Remove the SNA (C39) from the property at 58 Urlich Avenue.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Contract Bridge Club Inc - The Secretary, Waikato Contract Bridge Club Inc	275.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the change to a Heritage Area [Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12], stating:</p> <p>"for us, would potentially decrease the future value of the site. Specifically, the application of the Heritage area would place restrictions on any potential purchaser which would devalue the land. We are, like many clubs, are declining in membership and can realistically see, in the foreseeable future, that we may need to sell this property and re-establish the club at a smaller venue. The value realised from the sale of the property would determine if the re-establishment was feasible or if the club would be forced to close."</p> <p>"We note the existing building is a place of assembly (used as bridge club and by other community groups) and is of a different character to the surrounding street frontages."</p>	56 Brookfield Street is not included as part of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12.
Carol Ann Irving	276.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes H.C.C. Plan 9 Heritage Protection Listing on my property, stating:</p> <p>"If in the future I wish to market it and H.C.C. have applied restrictions it would effect the value, due to its land size and the potential to develop it."</p>	<p>Seeks clarifications on their abilities to be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change the house inside & out. • build onto house adding extra floor area. • subdivide the land and remove the house to develop the land. • repair any existing damage to the building. • Neighbours ability to object if more buildings are built on the property.
Rebecca Shaw Andrew King - King Family Trust	277.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		<p>As per the submission, in general, the submitter considers that the criteria used to identify the Hamilton East HHA, does not provide sufficient justification as to why the building and the wider area is now within a heritage area and further consider that the proposed listing is 'unfounded' and lacking depth in its justification. Further that, the features in the area do not correlate to historic values and that the proposed HHA is better suited to remaining as a character environment as per the existing rule framework and further that the proposed HHA is not appropriate considering the locality relative to other centre and facilities and that the provisions are an infringement on individual property rights.</p>	No specific relief listed.
Rebecca Shaw Andrew King - King Family Trust	277.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of 24 Grey Street within the proposed Hamilton East HHA and disagree with the reasoning used and consider that there is considerable variability within the area and that although the characteristics of the building and the wider urban form exhibit some special qualities that these are not necessarily 'heritage' values.</p>	Remove 24 Grey Street from the proposed Hamilton East HHA
Rebecca Shaw Andrew King - King Family Trust	277.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that the proposed discretionary activity status for for demolition of a dwelling on a front, corner or through site located within a HHA is too and considers that a permitted status with additional measures for new builds would be an improved outcome.</p>	Change the activity status for demolition of a dwelling on a front, corner or through site located within a HHA from discretionary to permitted.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Rebecca Shaw Andrew King - King Family Trust	277.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter considers that the proposed RD activity status for new buildings within a HHA is too restrictive allowing a large scope of discretion to Council which is unnecessary for the potential environmental effects in question.	Alter the proposed activity status for new buildings within a HHA from Restricted Discretionary to Controlled.
Patricia Mary Morgan	279.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	[SNA (C39) at 76 Urlich Avenue]. I don't understand why my gardening is classed as a S.N.A. I have been doing my gardens on my land for 50 years without any attention from city council or others. Why now is it classes as a S.N.A.? I also planted every large trees. This is my small piece of PARADISE!! Not the city councils. NOW I UNDERSTAND its about housing, not S.N.A. and the government saying to put more houses on each pieces of land, and the council is literally defying the government over the issue!!!	No relief sought.
Irena Dudek	280.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter objects to their property being included in the District Plan as "Historical Heritage Area", because, "the house was built in 1963. Many other houses and apartments in Cook Street have been constructed recently also"; and "I believe this classification will restrict future use of the legal owner's property, so it needs to be rejected". [Cook Street is within the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12]	Reject the Historic Heritage Area classification. [Cook Street is within the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12]
Kaylexcare Ltd - Paul Webster	281.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 198 Nixon Street in Hamilton East included within this Historic Heritage Area (HHA12). The property is considered of low architectural value and uninhabitable.	Remove 198 Nixon Street from being listed as part of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12.
Kaylexcare Ltd - Paul Webster	281.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 194 Nixon Street in Hamilton East as a Historic Heritage Area (HHA12). This property houses elderly stage II residents and stage III dementia care residents and is believed to be of no design significance to warrant it being within a HHA.	Remove 194 Nixon Street from being listed as part of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12.
David -	282.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna but oppose the extent of SNA's on private land where it prevents landowners from achieving long-term goals.	No relief stated
David -	282.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the need for ecological corridors which provide connectivity and ecological buffering but oppose the extent to which SNA are placed on private land.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 22 Taniwha Street.
David -	282.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the extent of SNA (C83) on 22 Taniwha Street because the proposed SNA extends too far into the property resulting in an existing cross-leased section being covered by SNA restricting the use of the property to accommodate a dwelling.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 22 Taniwha Street as per diagram in the submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David -	282.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	20.1(b): Supports protection of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna but opposes SNA on private land to such an extent that it prevents landowners from achieving their goals. 20.1 c(ii) Supports a corridor that provides connectivity and ecological buffering but opposes the restrictions it places on landowners. 20.1f(iii) Agrees that costs fall to landowners, but the proposed SNA severely restricts what landowners can do. Restrictions such as 20.3q, 20.5.1, 20.5.4, 20.5.5 and 20.5.6 would prevent the submitter from continuing to carry out maintenance and develop the area as planned. Opposes the extent of the SNA on 22 Taniwha Street because part of the area (Area C) is covered by ornamental gardens, tropical gardens, edible gardens (including vegetable gardens and fruit trees), terracing, steps, retaining seats and paths.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 22 Taniwha Street as per diagram in the submission.
David -	282.6	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extension of the SNA (C83) on 22 Taniwha Street because it would result in not being able to prune large branches of fruit trees or continue to plant vegetables and fruit trees.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 22 Taniwha Street as per diagram in the submission.
David -	282.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The public accessing private gullies leads to theft of private property.	Amend 20.2.1k to insert the following: <u>iii. Private land is not to be crossed by public paths, walkways or cycleways and</u> <u>iv. Council to fence any Council land also called Natural Open Space that borders Private property in consultation with the property owner.</u>
David -	282.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to provision 20.2.1k because it is disheartening when people leave litter/rubbish on private gullies.	Amend 20.2.1k to insert: <u>v. Clearing of rubbish/litter, abandoned lime scooters left by people using the walkways/cycleways will be done by _____?</u> (This needs to be clarified).
David -	282.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about how to protect the public and residents' safety and discourage antisocial behaviour.	Amend 20.2.1k to include: <u>vi. Walkways in gullies to be closed at night.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David -	282.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	There needs to be effective communication and collaboration between council and landowners, as well as realistic council financial assistance and practical help to achieve positive outcomes for both council and private land owners, as well as the proposed SNA. HCC should be an active partner in communication between the parties identified through, for example, an SNA liaison person which Central Government could fund.	Amend 20.2.2a to insert "Hamilton City Council" as follows: "Encourage communication between landowners, Department of Conservation, iwi, <u>Hamilton City Council</u> and other organisations that can assist in the management, protection and restoration of Significant Natural Areas."
David -	282.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports SNA but practical assistance, and funding, rates relief and/or free plants provided for SNA restoration on private properties are needed.	Provide practical assistance, funding, rates relief and/or free plants for SNA restoration on private properties.
Sharon Elizabeth Robinson	283.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rules 19.3.2a & 19.3.2j. for HHAs, stating: "I have lived in my home at 37 Jellicoe Drive for almost 10 years. The previous rules allowed me to adjust my home, whilst preserving the historic garden city design value, to suit my changing requirements spatially. Thriving communities grow together. The change for the special character rules to the proposed HHA rules hinders the ability for me to change the internal and extension (behind the building line) of my small home to suit my changing need. I would like to see the rules amended to reflect the special character rules previously installed. While I understand the need to protect and preserve our heritage architecture, that reasonable provisions are made to allow these buildings (homes in HHA) to be upgraded and to healthier homes standards, embrace sustainable energy productions (such as PV panels to roofs) and be altered without a costly resource consent process (fees from council and consultants)."	Reinstatement of interior alterations (specifically noted) as a permitted activity. Reinstatement of extensions and alterations to the rear of the building as a permitted activity (as noted in the special character rules). Reinstatement of new dwellings as a permitted activity such as garage, shed etc as long as they are behind the rear building line or not attached to the dwelling. Reinstatement of the permitted activity to change the rear façade of existing dwelling (eg. installing French doors etc) to allow more modern open plan living to these old fashioned spaces.
Sharon Elizabeth Robinson	283.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rules 19.3.2a and 19.3.2j. for HHAs, stating: "I have lived in my home at 37 Jellicoe Drive for almost 10 years. The previous rules allowed me to adjust my home, whilst preserving the historic garden city design value, to suit my changing requirements spatially. Thriving communities grow together. The change for the special character rules to the proposed HHA rules hinders the ability for me to change the internal and extension (behind the building line) of my small home to suit my changing need. I would like to see the rules amended to reflect the special character rules previously installed. While I understand the need to protect and preserve our heritage architecture, that reasonable provisions are made to allow these buildings (homes in HHA) to be upgraded and to healthier homes standards, embrace sustainable energy productions (such as PV panels to roofs) and be altered without a costly resource consent process (fees from council and consultants)."	Reinstatement of interior alterations (specifically noted) as a permitted activity. Reinstatement of extensions and alterations to the rear of the building as a permitted activity (as noted in the special character rules). Reinstatement of new dwellings as a permitted activity such as garage, shed etc as long as they are behind the rear building line or not attached to the dwelling. Reinstatement of the permitted activity to change the rear façade of existing dwelling (eg. installing French doors etc) to allow more modern open plan living to these old fashioned spaces.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Rachel Challis	284.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the identification and inclusion of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12 under Plan Change 9, including the property at 177 Galloway Street, because the subsequent provisions and controls in relation to Historic Heritage Areas will restrict and control future developments within the area and will retain the established trees within the area; and "the character of Galloway street with no three storey buildings road side or in back sections, is important to retain as are the many significant established trees in the area which give our city and our neighbourhood a green feel. We live next door to peachgrove kindergarten and the parking for that is already gery hazardous and difficult without adding additional vehicles from higher density housing which would likely occur in place of single dwellings around the kindy if we were not in a historical heritage area".	Retain, as notified the Historic Heritage Area [HHA12], if this means properties in this HHA will NOT be able to be "knock down and build x 3 apartments , 3 storeys high as is planned in other areas of the city".
Sam Le Heron	285.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and in relation to activity status rules 19.3.2a) and 19.3.2b), the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend Rule 19.3.2a) and 19.3.2b) as follows: a. Alterations and additions to an existing building on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding rear of the rear building line of front sites and heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage) – Restricted Discretionary b. Alterations and additions to an existing building on a rear site, or rear of the rear building line of a front site within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage) - Permitted
Sam Le Heron	285.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and in relation to Chapter 19, specifically Purpose statement 19.1J), K), L), M) and N); objectives and associated policies for 19.2.1, 19.2.4 and 19.2.5, while the submitter generally supports the provisions, the submitter the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions to the rear of the rear building line and considers that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Seeks consequential amendments to Purpose 19.1 J), K), L), M) and N), to clarify the exclusion of rear yards for front sites from Rule 19.3.2a within Hayes Paddock and consequential amendments to 19.6.
Sam Le Heron	285.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and provisions within Chapter 19, specifically Purpose statement 19.1J), K), L), M) and N); objectives and associated policies for 19.2.1, 19.2.4 and 19.2.5, the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend Objective 19.2.1 and associated policies, Objective 19.2.4 and associated Policies, and Objective 19.2.5 and associated Policies to reflect the exclusion of rear yards, as defined in Figure 4-2.
Sam Le Heron	285.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Regarding the proposed Hayes Paddock HHA and related objectives and associated policies for 19.2.1, 19.2.4 and 19.2.5, Information Requirement 1.2.2.8, the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend Objective 19.2.1 and associated policies, Objective 19.2.4 and associated Policies, and Objective 19.2.5 and associated Policies to reflect the exclusion of rear yards, as defined in Figure 4-2

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sam Le Heron	285.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and in relation to Objective 19.2.1 and associated policies, Objective 19.2.4 and associated Policies, and Objective 19.2.5 and associated Policies, the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend objective 19.2.1 and associated policies, Objective 19.2.4 and associated Policies, and Objective 19.2.5 and associated Policies to reflect the exclusion of rear yards, as defined in Figure 4-2
Sam Le Heron	285.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA, the submitter supports the provisions generally as notified and seeks consequential amendments to 19.6ix on the basis that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and considers that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend Purpose 19.1 J), K), L), M) and N), to clarify the exclusion of rear yards for front sites from Rule 19.3.2a within Hayes Paddock and consequential amendments to 19.6ix.
Sam Le Heron	285.7	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non- Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and specifically Appendix 1.3.3 Assessment Criteria, the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend Assessment Criterion 1.3.3 E3(d) to reflect the exclusion of rear yards within Hayes Paddock for front sites, as per 19.3.2a.
Sam Le Heron	285.8	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	In reference to the Hayes Paddock HHA and in relation to Appendix 1.2 Information Requirements, specifically 1.2.2.8 Historic Heritage Areas, the submitter is opposed to the fact that the provisions would now require a Restricted Discretionary Activity resource consent for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line and consider that this change has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or the Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Amend the Information Requirement 1.2.2.8 to clarify who prepares an HIA, including the evaluation process for this
Sam Le Heron	285.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	Previously a resource consent from Council for alterations and additions rear of the rear building line, which is well understood, and in my opinion largely justified by the existing provisions and attributes of Hayes Paddock. The extension to the provisions to include rear yards requiring consent in Hayes Paddock has not been suitably justified by the S32 Evaluation Report or Mr Knott's Historic Heritage Assessment Report.	Insertion and retention of the existing rear building line for Hayes Paddock as identified in Figure 4-2 Hayes Paddock, Appendix 4 Special Character Zones of the ODP.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Mark and Sara Paris - 27 Keswick Crescent	286.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes 27 Keswick Crescent being included in the SNA (cSNA, C35 - Mangaiti Gully - upstream).	Remove the SNA (C35) from the property at 27 Keswick Crescent. <u>In the alternative:</u> Delete all rules that restrict activities that can be done to and in SNAs.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David -	287.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna but oppose the extent of SNA's on private land where it prevents landowners from achieving long-term goals.	No relief stated
David -	287.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the extent to which the SNA is placed on private land, and the restrictions it places on the use of land. The proposed SNA extends too far into the submitter's property and seeks to have it removed from the area of fruit trees and lawn areas which are obscured by tree canopy. SNAs on private land involve increased costs for permission and consent to do necessary work, loss of existing property rights, loss of property value, as well as the cost of buying, planting and maintaining indigenous vegetation and removal of pest plants and animals.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 13 Wha Street as per diagram in the submission.
David -	287.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the extent of the SNA (C83) at 13 Wha Street because (i) the proposed SNA include areas of lawn, edible gardens (vegetable gardens and fruit trees) ornamental gardens, (ii) aerial photos do not show these as they have been obscured by tree canopy and/or the type of vegetation has not been identified accurately.	Reduce the extent of SNA on 13 Wha Street as per diagram in the submission.
David -	287.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support in part	20.1(b): Supports protection of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna but opposes SNA on private land to such an extent that it prevents landowners from achieving their goals. 20.1 c(ii) Supports a corridor that provides connectivity and ecological buffering but opposes the restrictions it places on landowners. 20.1f(iii) Agrees that costs fall to landowners, but the proposed SNA severely restricts what landowners can do. Restrictions such as 20.5.1, 20.5.4, 20.5.5 and 20.5.6 would prevent the submitter from continuing to carry out maintenance and develop the area as planned.	No specific relief sought.
David -	287.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		The submitter partially supports provision 20.2.2a because there needs to be effective communication and collaboration between council and landowners, as well as realistic council financial assistance and practical help to achieve positive outcomes for both council and private land owners, as well as the proposed SNA. HCC should be an active partner in communication between the parties identified through, for example, an SNA liaison person which Central Government could fund.	Amend 20.2.2a to insert "Hamilton City Council" as follows: "Encourage communication between landowners, Department of Conservation, iwi, <u>Hamilton City Council</u> and other organisations that can assist in the management, protection and restoration of Significant Natural Areas."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David -	287.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The public accessing private gullies leads to theft of private property.	Amend 20.2.1k to insert the following: <u>iii. Private land is not to be crossed by public paths, walkways or cycleways and</u> <u>iv. Council to fence any Council land also called Natural Open Space that borders Private property in consultation with the property owner.</u>
David -	287.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter partially supports provision 20.2.1k because it is disheartening when people leave litter/rubbish on private gullies.	Amend 20.2.1k to insert: <u>v. Clearing of rubbish/litter, abandoned lime scooters left by people using the walkways/cycleways will be done by _____?</u> (This needs to be clarified).
David -	287.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter partially supports provision 20.2.1k however there are concerns about how to protect public and residents' safety and discourage antisocial behaviour.	Amend 20.2.1k to include: <u>vi. Walkways in gullies to be closed at night.</u>
David -	287.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports SNA but practical assistance, and funding, rates relief and/or free plants provided for SNA restoration on private properties are needed.	Provide funding, rates relief and/or free plants for SNA restoration on private properties.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
G.J. Gardner Homes - Lawrence Lee Marcus Feisst	288.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2d Demolition of existing curtilage wall because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current recent development in the area has improved the overall number of dwellings in an area close to schooling, transport routes and major amenity centres including parks, shopping and <2km to the Hamilton CBD. Examples of recent development in the area are as follows 129-135 Forest Lake Road 1-3/7 Rata Street 14A-B Hinau Street and 1A-1B Lafferty Street 22-30 Hinau Street 171 Rimu Street • The age of certain dwellings built in the area is not conducive to providing accommodation that attains Healthy Homes standards whether for tenants or homeowners. New housing in the area will be in line with current NZ3604 standards and in the near future updated H1 calculations ensuring new homeowners or tenants in the area are provided with housing that meets current and upcoming standards and a more enjoyable, healthier home. • The cost involved in renovating and updating current housing outweighs the opportunity to provide a larger number of newer housing to our growing population. With future Hamilton growth sectors such as the Ruakura Superhub, more housing will be required city wide. The opportunity arises for investing capital into multiple new dwellings which under the current and proposed Hamilton District Plan restricts homeowners and landlords from experiencing warmer, healthier homes. • The opportunity for new development also allows the potential for upgraded and amended three waters infrastructure to ensure longevity in the council owned systems. 	<p>The following decisions are sought from Hamilton City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal and demolition of existing dwellings on a front corner or through site is permitted. • Construction is permitted in line with New Zealand Government Medium Density Housing (MDH) model. Or • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- Residential Intensification Zone Or • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- General Residential

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
G.J. Gardner Homes - Lawrence Lee Marcus Feisst	288.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2e Demolition of existing dwellings on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding detached accessory buildings, or heritage buildings listed in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage), because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current recent development in the area has improved the overall number of dwellings in an area close to schooling, transport routes and major amenity centres including parks, shopping and <2km to the Hamilton CBD. Examples of recent development in the area are as follows 129-135 Forest Lake Road 1-3/7 Rata Street 14A-B Hinau Street and 1A-1B Lafferty Street 22-30 Hinau Street 171 Rimu Street • The age of certain dwellings built in the area is not conducive to providing accommodation that attains Healthy Homes standards whether for tenants or homeowners. New housing in the area will be in line with current NZ3604 standards and in the near future updated H1 calculations ensuring new homeowners or tenants in the area are provided with housing that meets current and upcoming standards and a more enjoyable, healthier home. • The cost involved in renovating and updating current housing outweighs the opportunity to provide a larger number of newer housing to our growing population. With future Hamilton growth sectors such as the Ruakura Superhub, more housing will be required city wide. The opportunity arises for investing capital into multiple new dwellings which under the current and proposed Hamilton District Plan restricts homeowners and landlords from experiencing warmer, healthier homes. • The opportunity for new development also allows the potential for upgraded and amended three waters infrastructure to ensure longevity in the council owned systems. 	<p>The following decisions are sought from Hamilton City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal and demolition of existing dwellings on a front corner or through site is permitted. • Construction is permitted in line with New Zealand Government Medium Density Housing (MDH) model. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- Residential Intensification Zone <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- General Residential

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
G.J. Gardner Homes - Lawrence Lee Marcus Feisst	288.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to Rule 19.3.2f Demolition of existing dwellings on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding detached accessory buildings, or heritage buildings listed in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage), because</p> <p>We oppose the aforementioned provisions due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current recent development in the area has improved the overall number of dwellings in an area close to schooling, transport routes and major amenity centres including parks, shopping and <2km to the Hamilton CBD. Examples of recent development in the area are as follows 129-135 Forest Lake Road 1-3/7 Rata Street 14A-B Hinau Street and 1A-1B Lafferty Street 22-30 Hinau Street 171 Rimu Street • The age of certain dwellings built in the area is not conducive to providing accommodation that attains Healthy Homes standards whether for tenants or homeowners. New housing in the area will be in line with current NZ3604 standards and in the near future updated H1 calculations ensuring new homeowners or tenants in the area are provided with housing that meets current and upcoming standards and a more enjoyable, healthier home. • The cost involved in renovating and updating current housing outweighs the opportunity to provide a larger number of newer housing to our growing population. With future Hamilton growth sectors such as the Ruakura Superhub, more housing will be required city wide. The opportunity arises for investing capital into multiple new dwellings which under the current and proposed Hamilton District Plan restricts homeowners and landlords from experiencing warmer, healthier homes. • The opportunity for new development also allows the potential for upgraded and amended three waters infrastructure to ensure longevity in the council owned systems. 	<p>The following decisions are sought from Hamilton City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal and demolition of existing dwellings on a front corner or through site is permitted. • Construction is permitted in line with New Zealand Government Medium Density Housing (MDH) model. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- Residential Intensification Zone <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction is permitted in line with Hamilton City Council Operative Plan 4.4 - Rules General Standards- General Residential
Jacqueline Naomi Fitchman	289.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Policy 19.2.5a.iv, stating "I understand that this policy would require a Heritage Impact Statement if, for example, I needed to temporarily erect scaffolding to repaint the exterior of my house. I cannot see how this policy helps to maintain the area's heritage values. It appears to simply creates unnecessary hurdles and costs for ratepayers".</p>	<p>That the existing rules and provisions are retained.</p>
Jacqueline Naomi Fitchman	289.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.j, stating "given the definition of buildings includes temporary scaffolding, as well as tents and trailers, I understand that this rule would require me to obtain a resource consent if I needed to erect scaffolding to repaint the exterior of my house, or if I wanted to store a trailer on my property, or put a tent up for a short time on my back lawn".</p>	<p>That the existing rules and provisions are retained.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Cheal Consultants Ltd - Philip Barrett	290.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 137 Ward Street as a built heritage item (H309) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A by deleting all reference to H309, 137 Ward Street.
Fraser McNutt Ming Tang - 2 Liverpool Street, Hamilton CBD	291.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the listing of 2 Liverpool Street as a listed 'B' heritage item because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several dwellings within the wider residential environment that have similar characteristics (which have not been identified or are within a HHA) - this demonstrates an inconsistency in the assessment undertaken. • the characteristics of the building are no different to those characteristics of buildings in other existing Character Areas under the current ODP; the buildings special characteristics (i.e. large Californian bungalow style) does not result in a 'B' ranking heritage classification. 	Remove the heritage 'B' ranking from H276, 2 Liverpool Street in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Fraser McNutt Ming Tang - 2 Liverpool Street, Hamilton CBD	291.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.1(l) because the activity status for demolition of a heritage building ranked 'B' is proposed as Discretionary. This is too restrictive for a 'B' ranked heritage item and allows Council full discretion when assessing a resource consent application which is unnecessary for the potential environmental effects in question. If Council decided to retain the building as a 'B' ranked item, then an activity status of Restricted Discretionary would be better suited to a 'B' ranked heritage item, as it still allows Council to decline the application, but the assessment would be restricted to heritage values, which is sufficient for a 'B' ranked heritage item.	Amend the activity status for Rule 19.3.1.l. from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity. Or, if Council decided to retain the building as a 'B' ranked item, then an activity status of Restricted Discretionary would be better suited to a 'B' ranked heritage item, as it still allows Council to decline the application, but the assessment would be restricted to heritage values, which is sufficient for a 'B' ranked heritage item.
Fraser McNutt Ming Tang - 2 Liverpool Street, Hamilton CBD	291.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Heritage Inventory Assessment for 2 Liverpool Street, particularly the section providing the reasoning for the 'B' ranking.	Remove H276, 2 Liverpool Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Fraser McNutt Ming Tang - 2 Liverpool Street, Hamilton CBD	291.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the classification identified for 2 Liverpool Street in Section 3e Archaeological Qualities of the inventory.	Amend Appendix 8: Part 1 'Heritage Inventory Assessment Form Draft' Section 3e Archaeological Qualities by deleting the text 'unknown' to 'none'.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Mark Donaldson Marr	292.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the provisions of the Plan Change in protecting areas of the City, because their property is within a proposed HHA [Matai Street, Hinau Street and Rata Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA20] and "due to there being a low number of redevelopments in place protecting its character now is essential".	Retain the provisions of the Plan Change in protecting areas of the City.
Nicole Stanley	293.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter requests Stanley Street (or part thereof) be included in the Claudelands HHA given that it was part of the prior Special Character Zone (Claudelands West). Stanley Street shares same/similar heritage characteristics of streets in close proximity i.e. Thames, Union, Kitchener Str, etc. The submitter assess the criteria for HHA's, scoring (Green 4/7), (Orange 3/7) and mentions that Stanley Street should actually be a 5/7 on the HHA scale and included in the Claudelands HHA map (or in part similar to other HHA's).	Include Stanley Street in the Claudelands Historic Heritage Area, HHA 8. Alternatively, to include 27, 28, 25, 23, and 21 Stanley Street in the Claudelands HHA.
Nicole Stanley	293.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Support	The submitter supports the notable tree designations and root zones for Stanley Street, Claudelands [the group of notable trees T289 (Street Trees) on Stanley Street].	Retain the the group of notable tree T289 (Street Trees) on Stanley Street as notified.
Janice Lynn Clarke	294.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the resource consent requirements for a small garden shed, a carport and a 1.8m high fence.	Remove the need for a resource consent to erect a a small garden shed, a carport and a 1.8m high fence.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12 being placed over 65 and 65B Wellington Street (Galloway to Fox Street).	Remove the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area, HHA12, from 65 and 65B Wellington Street; or alternatively, Wellington Street (Galloway to Fox Street) from the proposed Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zone identified for the Notable Tree T323.5 (Wellington Street) because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Tree Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	Reduce the size of the Root Protection Zone for the notable tree, T323.5 to ensure there is no encroachment on 65 and 65B Wellington Street.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zone identified for the Notable Tree T323.6 (Wellington Street) because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Tree Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	Reduce the size of the Root Protection Zone for the notable tree, T323.6 to ensure there is no encroachment on 65 and 65B Wellington Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.4	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zone identified for the Notable Tree T323.5 (Wellington Street) because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Tree Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	Reduce the size of the Root Protection Zone for the notable tree, T323.5 to ensure there is no encroachment on 65 and 65B Wellington Street.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.5	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zone identified for the Notable Tree T323.6 (Wellington Street) because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Tree Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	Reduce the size of the Root Protection Zone for the notable tree, T323.6 to ensure there is no encroachment on 65 and 65B Wellington Street.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zones for notable trees, T323.5 and T323.6, because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	Amend the rules relating to the Protected Root Zone so that activities relating to the sealing and paving of an existing driveways or additions to or replacement of existing structures are not subject to the new rules and are to be permitted activities.
Aslan Kanzas Aslan Kanzas and Claudia Avril (65 Wellington Street) and Shawn Salisbury (65B Wellington Street)	295.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Protected Tree Root Zone because activities relating to existing driveways, buildings or structures within a Protected Tree Root Zone will require a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under rule 20.3w.	The rules are amended to require HCC to compensate (including paying for damage) land owners where damage is caused to properties from roots of a Notable Tree or where a resource consent is needed for development or maintenance.
Nigel Clifford Holman	296.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendment to the "blanket overlay on my property" [SNA (F29) at 19 Linthorpe Place] to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit 'islands' of existing exotic plantings within the blanket of the SNA. • recognise existing plantings individuals may want to continue developing. • allow for existing vege plots. 	To amend the extent of the SNA (F29) on the property at 19 Linthorpe Place, to make allowances for an 'island' within the overlay of approximately 200m ² so the landowner may continue the 20-year project of trailing exotic plants for bird forage.
Nigel Clifford Holman	296.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendment to the "blanket overlay on my property" [SNA (F29) at 19 Linthorpe Place] to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit 'islands' of existing exotic plantings within the blanket of the SNA. • recognise existing plantings individuals may want to continue developing. • allow for existing vege plots. 	To amend the extent of the SNA (F29) on the property at 19 Linthorpe Place, to make allowances for an 'island' within the overlay of approximately 200m ² so the landowner may continue the 20-year project of trailing exotic plants for bird forage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Nigel Clifford Holman	296.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendment to the "blanket overlay on my property" [SNA (F29) at 19 Linthorpe Place] to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit 'islands' of existing exotic plantings within the blanket of the SNA. • recognise existing plantings individuals may want to continue developing. • allow for existing vege plots. 	To amend the extent of the SNA (F29) on the property at 19 Linthorpe Place, to make allowances for an 'island' within the overlay of approximately 200m ² so the landowner may continue the 20-year project of trailing exotic plants for bird forage.
Nigel Clifford Holman	296.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendment to the "blanket overlay on my property" [SNA (F29) at 19 Linthorpe Place] to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit 'islands' of existing exotic plantings within the blanket of the SNA. • recognise existing plantings individuals may want to continue developing. • allow for existing vege plots. 	To amend the extent of the SNA (F29) on the property at 19 Linthorpe Place, to make allowances for an 'island' within the overlay of approximately 200m ² so the landowner may continue the 20-year project of trailing exotic plants for bird forage.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Policy Framework of the Chapter	Oppose	The submitter opposes, as notified the wording of Policy 19.2.3f - because the policy now requires development to maintain " <i>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</i> " which the submitter considers too restrictive for new development.	Amend the wording of Policy 19.2.3.f to read: 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.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2a. the requires a resource consent for any alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HAAs. Minor 'buildings' as such garden sheds, decks, or roofed pergolas are often insignificant features and their construction, alteration, or removal should not require consent unless the features contribute to the values of the HAA, particularly where they are not visible from the street.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.a. by deleting the Restricted Activity status, and replacing it with a Permitted Activity Status for 'Minor 'buildings' as such garden sheds, decks, or roofed pergolas to be constructed, altered, or demolished.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.f because it requires a resource consent to demolish existing accessory buildings on front, corner or through sites in an HHA. Minor 'buildings' as such garden sheds, decks, or roofed pergolas are often insignificant features and their construction, alteration, or removal should not require consent unless the features contribute to the values of the HAA, particularly where they are not visible from the street.	Amend Rule 19..3.2.f by deleting the Restricted Discretionary Activity status and replacing it with a Permitted Activity status.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.4	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes Assessment Criteria E1. b. that 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 considers that new development in these areas should be able to be of a higher density or contain different building forms and heights. Such development can ensure compatibility with the area by retaining similar styles and designs and using similar materials as the buildings in the area.	Amend Assessment Criteria E1.b to read (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.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the identification of 3 Oxford Street as a heritage building because the home is in poor condition, not fully compliant with the healthy homes provisions, is riddled with borer holes, and requires demolition.</p> <p>A s139 Certificate of Compliance has been obtained from Council to demolish the building (see Attachment B) and the building will be legally demolished within the next 5 years before this certificate expires (regardless of overlay).</p> <p>It is the submitter's opinion that Council have overlooked the potential of this site and weighted the protection of heritage over the need for more appropriately located housing at a time when there is a clear shortage. The development of this site is precisely the type of situation that would assist in meeting the intent of the NPS-UD.</p>	Remove H253, 3 Oxford Street for Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Oxford Street West HHA (HHA 23), because: Both 3 and 5 Oxford Street contain buildings that are of poor quality and are worthy of demolition (not protection). Both sites have s139 Certificates of compliance to demolish all buildings located on these sites and this will be actioned within the next 5 years (see Appendix B). This renders the HHA over these properties essentially pointless and maintaining it would simply restrict the development that would occur in its place (in essence achieving neither the purpose of the HHA provisions or the NPS-UD).</p> <p>In addition to the fact these buildings are not worthy of protection, this HHA essentially sterilizes valuable developable land by preventing buildings from being demolished and by limiting the development that might take their place. As noted above, the HHA is in a prime location for development that would be supported by the NPS-UD, and we believe Council should be prioritizing this over the protection of heritage in the current housing climate.</p> <p>The HHA as proposed also consists of only 7 properties which is considered to offer little benefit to the surrounding area if protected, given any views of the area will be fleeting for passersby. Given the dwellings at 3 and 5 Oxford will be demolished in the near future, any benefit that this HHA might bring would be reduced further.</p>	<p>Remove in full the Historic Heritage Area, HHA 23 - Oxford Street West from Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas.</p> <p>Or, as an alternative:</p> <p>The uplifting of the Historic Heritage Area, HHA 23 - Oxford Street West from 3 and 5 Oxford Street.</p>
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.7	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of 3 Oxford Street as a heritage building and seek that this is removed from the planning maps.	Remove the notation for H253 - 3 Oxford Street from the planning maps.
David, Sarah, Zoe Yzendoorn	297.8	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the HHA on Oxford Street (west) and seeks that it is removed for the same reasons stated in the Appendix 8 assessment above. As noted, we would support the uplifting of the HHA over 3 and 5 Oxford Street.	<p>Removal of the Historic Heritage Area HHA23 - Oxford Street (west) in its entirety;</p> <p>or, as an alternative</p> <p>Uplift the HHA over 3 and 5 Oxford Street.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Veronica Indyk	298.1	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter, a resident of Hamilton East, residing here for over 27 years. Owing to my concern regarding the "changing face" of Hamilton East, I have joined H.E.A.T. (Hamilton East Advocacy Team), opposes rules:</p> <p>4.4.3 Permeable Surface. 20% of a developed site is to be permeable land per site. My concern - storm water - little absorption through grass areas - look at Albert St for flooding!!! Parking! Rubbish! How ill conceived an idea to build houses without adequate parking.</p> <p>4.4.5b Height in relation to boundary. Heritage, special character or in fact any home should not be rendered damp, mouldy & empty of sunlight.</p>	No relief stated.
Veronica Indyk	298.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports 19.1g, stating "Why did I choose to live in Hamilton East? Heritage, character houses, wide streets, tree lined - beautiful. In the last few years I have watched house after house on my street demolished & five or more two storey dwellings built. I realise people need homes - need somewhere to live but at whose expense?"	Retain 19.1g.
Veronica Indyk	298.3	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	General	Support	The submitter states "I agree & support change like 4.4.10 and 19.1g".	Retain Rule 4.4.10.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
H.E.A.T (Hamilton East Advocacy Team) - Kristina Vlla Maria Bisley	299.1	General	General	Support	The submitter generally supports PC9 however, there are concerns that PC12 may impact on HHA areas and character areas as in Hamilton East, stating "where the intention is to; identify, protect, maintain and enhance the heritage attributes but I can see a threat to this with plan change 12/Intensification coming in to place especially in HHA areas and character areas as in Hamilton East. A lot of heritage has been lost and diluted in the last 30 years and some of the "blocks of intensification" has become "dumps". I strongly support HCC increased protection of heritage areas but would like to see less or no demolition of heritage and no removal of heritage buildings (as this is what makes an area lose more of it's heritage status)."	Regarding density; To as much as possible keep Ham. East housing to one storey or two (building height remain at 10m) Infill housing; If 3x3 are introduced to maintain colour, style, materials in accordance with surrounding heritage ethics. Steele Park surroundings; if 3x3 are introduced around Steele Park, to maintain high building standard and at bottom floor perhaps provide cafes shops or services Protection of heritage; strict rules on demolition or removal of heritage buildings (see point 3) Population Increase; could some of the empty housing/apartments in the CBD be done up for living purpose, in line with many european cities (would also benefit business in the CBD Notable trees; Increased protection of notable trees in Ham. East to maintain heritage streetscape.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction of development of its land, 26 & 28A Nixon Street, and associated costs that will arise from it. It is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance. It seems that "moderate value" is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development. This part of Nixon Street does not display the consistency in physical and visual qualities which make is readily apparent that the area represents a particular design theme.</p> <p>The layout of the plan change is very cumbersome and confusing to follow for any lay person. It presents a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. It is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	Delete the hatch shaded area identified on the map on page 6 of the submission (which covers 26 and 28A Nixon Street) from the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	That Section 19 be rewritten to be more user friendly and better aligned with National Planning Standards. The submitter provides an example of how this could be achieved.	Apply the National Planning Standards to the format for Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction of development of its land, 26 & 28A Nixon Street, and associated costs that will arise from it. It is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance. It seems that "moderate value" is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development. This part of Nixon Street does not display the consistency in physical and visual qualities which make is readily apparent that the area represents a particular design theme.</p> <p>The layout of the plan change is very cumbersome and confusing to follow for any lay person. It presents a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. It is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	That Alterations and Additions to an existing building which do not change the street facing façade be a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.4	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	<p>That requirement for provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment only occurs in relation to construction of new buildings/additions to existing buildings which propose to change the nature of the street frontage and that discretion be given to enable this to be applied on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the requirement for any activity requiring a resource consent to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. Stating this requirement automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p> <p>That requirement for provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment only occurs in relation to construction of new buildings/additions to existing buildings which propose to change the nature of the street frontage and that discretion be given to enable this to be applied on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>Amend 1.2.2.8 to read:</p> <p>(a) Any activity requiring resource consent, <u>for a new building or additions, alterations, or relocation of an existing building</u>, relating to a <u>front, corner or through site</u> located <u>located</u> within a historic heritage area shall <u>may be required</u> to include a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the resource consent application. <u>Where an assessment is required to be provided it shall address the matters in (b) – (e) below as relevant to the proposed activity.</u></p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the activity status for new buildings, stating a concern that the presents rule framework is a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. The effect of Plan Change 9 as is relates to front sites within the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area (and by default all other Historic Heritage Areas).	Amend Rule 19.3.2j to accommodate a permitted activity status for new buildings located behind the existing dwelling.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter opposes the activity status for demolition of exiting detached accessory buildings.	That demolition of existing detached accessory buildings be a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton P.S Brown	300.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the activity status for the relocation of existing buildings within a site.	Amend Rule 19.3.2l allowing the relocation of existing buildings within a site to be a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3w. to the extent that it requires resource consent for the planting of all trees; the storage of materials, vehicles and equipment; laying, sealing, and paving; alterations to buildings; and the construction of new ones because these requirements are far too restrictive considering how many properties are now affected by the protective root zone overlays.	Amend Rule 20.3w. to change the activity status so that consent is not required for the activities identified.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T172 (172.1-172.20) Street Trees along Fox Street due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trees are unsuitable in their location, poor structure, lack of full canopy, visually unappealing and seem in poor health, which can cause health and safety issues like branches falling and can lead to damage for neighbouring residential properties. “Additionally, the associated protective root zone places unnecessary restrictions on what can occur within our property (particularly considering the nature of the trees)”. • The branches and leaves regularly drop into the neighbouring residential land from these trees. • The protected root zone extends over the majority part of the property (189 Fox Street). The requirement of resource consent for developments within the property such as replacing, repairing will result significant change to the property, which is entirely inappropriate. • “The s32a appendices that contain the assessment of these trees even indicates that the trees themselves are poor quality”. 	Remove the trees identified as T172 (172.1-172.20) from Schedule 9D.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports 189 Fox Street not being included within an HHA	Maintain 189 Fox Street outside of any HHA.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.4	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the Notable Trees identified as T172 because the trees are not suitable to be notable, are displayed in the wrong location and should be more accurately mapped, if they are to be mapped at all.	Remove the tree identified as T172 from Schedule 9D.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.6	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C26) at 29 Petersburg Drive because they are currently working through a resource consent process over this land and the introduction of the SNA will further complicate (if not entirely halt) what has been an already lengthy, costly and complicated process. See Appendix B for further information.	Remove SNA (C26) from the property at 29 Petersburg Drive or realign the SNA outside of the development area proposed for this site.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter partially supports appropriate vegetation activities being able to be undertaken as Permitted Activities in SNAs; however, it is considered that consented and lawfully established land use activities should be enabled.	Include a permitted activity provision for consented or lawfully established land use activities.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 189 Fox Street	301.8	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C26) at 29 Petersburg Drive because they are currently working through a resource consent process over this land and the introduction of the SNA will further complicate (if not entirely halt) what has been an already lengthy, costly and complicated process.	Remove or realign the SNA (C26) over 29 Petersburg Drive with the development that is proposed within this site.
Bevan and Haylie Newbold	302.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C35) at 4 Helmsdale Court, Huntington.	Remove SNA (C35) from the property at 4 Helmsdale Court, Huntington or compensate the owners for their loss of property rights.
Wendy Maclarn	303.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports Historic Heritage Areas, stating the following:</p> <p>"My house is in the Railway Village and my understanding is that it is to retain heritage. I have lived in this village observing all the conditions and buildings requirements for a heritage house. I believe that all the restrictions have been the reason that this Village still retains most of the character of the original village. As there is not many places of heritage other than this village and Hayes Paddock we need to retain it.</p> <p>We keep ALL Railway houses originally built as part of the village under the protection of being heritage. ALL railway houses were built to be part of the village and so should be included whether they are inside the village or on surrounding street and road.</p> <p>Hamilton needs these areas."</p>	<p>Keep our heritage areas and buildings safe.</p> <p>Keep them from being blocked out of sunlight by high rise apartments. This will keep them from damp and decay.</p> <p>Assist owners to keep the houses in good condition.</p> <p>Be proud of our heritage.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Arron McKoy	304.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the Hayes Paddock HHA and suggests the areas needs review from Council. The rear of the property within the HHA should be under the owners discretion. Current rules are not being followed as the area does not have uniformity noticing various obstructions to frontages throughout the area. The restrictions have suppressed property values therefore a Council Tax reduction should be imposed to those properties that did not have similar capital gain to other properties in the city or to those who follow the HHA guide. Suggests that council invests in the suburb noting decay of streetscapes.</p> <p>The submitter supports the continued protection of the Hayes Paddock heritage area and do not think multi-home development should occur. However, the Council approach to the area needs to be properly reviewed. The submitter providing the following observations:</p> <p>"1. I appreciated how accessible Council Staff were and feedback, however staff have vastly differing levels of understanding on the Hayes Paddock Guide and how it applies. i.e. the Guide states houses should aim for open front yards, however we were guided toward higher shrubs/fences to mask our proposed addition.</p> <p>2. The guide is focused on the front and street-view of houses, and the street area. Therefore the rear of the section should be up to the homeowner on how to use. This should not be at the discretion of Council staff. This is on the assumption any rear addition matches the same build appearance.</p> <p>3. The application of the current 'rules' and guidelines are not applied. There are garages, high fences and various other obstructions in the frontage areas throughout the area. Does the Council wish for homeowners to follow these or not? If no effort is made by the Council across all houses, then the only time it comes up is if homeowners apply for a consent and essentially becomes a costly punishment on any new development. If the Council wishes to remain relatively hands-off then the same approach should be applied to resource consent.</p> <p>4. Restrictions on the area thus far have suppressed property values. Property values in the area did not grow at the same rate as the rest of the city. Owners are effectively being punished for living in the area. In addition most development requires resource consent. Perhaps a Council Tax reduction is due, especially considering residents have been paying 80 years worth of Council Tax in some capacity and do not have the same capital gains. Perhaps this could be applied to those who make an effort to follow the Guide?</p> <p>5. If the Council values the area, then I would expect it to celebrate and build value into the suburb. The current trees are Australian and prone to splitting after a few decades. The footpaths, roads, kerbs, carpark, local facilities (bar the recently built playground) etc are in relatively poor state. Cars perform burnouts at junctions. If the Council wants homeowners and city to value the heritage, then the Council should also make an effort to value the heritage. It should be an asset, yet I feel it is an afterthought. Writing something in the plan ...is just writing. Heritage actually requires action."</p>	No relief sought.
Giulie and Pat Garvey	305.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street as a B ranked heritage item (H276) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove the heritage 'B' ranking for H276, 7 Radnor Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Giulie and Pat Garvey	305.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Discretionary Activity status for the demolition of B ranked built heritage items.	Amend the activity status for Rule 19.3.1. I. Demolition of any structure or building ranked B by deleting the Discretionary Activity status and replacing it with a Restricted Discretionary Activity status.
Giulie and Pat Garvey	305.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3a(ii) Historic Pattern as stated in the inventory for H276.	Remove H276, 7 Radnor Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Giulie and Pat Garvey	305.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3b Physical/ Aesthetic/ Architectural Qualities as stated in the inventory for H276.	Remove H276, 7 Radnor Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Giulie and Pat Garvey	305.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3e Archaeological Qualities as stated in the inventory for H276.	Amend the level of significance stated for Archaeological Qualities in the inventory for H276, 7 Radnor Street from 'unknown' to 'none'.
Keith Robert Houston	306.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes any notification or attachment on their title relating to this zone as it only applies to council owned land and river area adjacent to my property [SNA (C72) at 1043 River Road], stating: "I pay to keep this area maintained; what effect does this zoning have on the area indicated as i cannot find any rules relating to the zoning of what can and must not happen? Please can you keep me informed of what rules apply to this zone."	1/ give clarity to what effect this zone entails [SNA C72]. 2/ do not encumber any titles where this zone [SNA C72] is adjacent to freehold property.
Antanas Procuta	307.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the Built Heritage and Historic Heritage Areas components of Plan Change 9 that align with and generally uphold the Urban Design Protocol principles and imperatives.	No specific relief sought.
Antanas Procuta	307.2	General	General	Support in part	The submitter, while stating support in part, raises concerns about the consultation undertaken for Plan Change 9, in particular for built heritage and historic heritage areas.	That the effects of Plan Change 12 on proposed heritage areas is addressed within Plan Change 9 and there is further community consultation within the process of Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Antanas Procuta	307.3	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter raises concern that applying heritage status will cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added compliance costs (additional heritage reports etc), • Restricted access to heritage fund monies given the increase in the number of listed structures and the limited amount available within the HCC heritage fund • Concerns over costs and consenting for buildings with heritage values that are important to the community requires a robust financial support system for owners. 	A significant increase to the \$80,000 HCC Heritage Fund, and additional support to owners with reductions in compliance costs, rates relief and other means needs to be considered and implemented by Council.
Antanas Procuta	307.4	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter raises concern over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a lack of integration between Plan Change 9 and 12 in terms of intensification and potential rules. • the relationship between the effects of Plan Change 9 and Plan Change 12 are not clearly articulated, and in parts confusing. This is particularly relevant when Plan Change 12 is only notified a few days after closing submissions. 	That the effects of Plan Change 12 on proposed heritage areas is addressed within Plan Change 9.
Antanas Procuta	307.5	General	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter raises concern over the unintended consequences of Plan Change 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of sufficient protection on Hamilton character areas or complete removal without owners and the community being fully aware; and • removal of character areas that are key to retaining an understanding of Hamilton's identity. • Removal of the character zone is not clear and without a zone or overlay transition that includes character overlay to historic heritage Hamilton's built heritage and historic suburbs will be a poorer urban environment. 	That the effects of Plan Change 12 on proposed heritage areas is addressed within Plan Change 9.
Antanas Procuta	307.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports the inclusion in Appendix 8 Historic Heritage of significant buildings and structures designed by Waikato and Hamilton architects in the mid- and late 20th century, including but not limited to, significant residential and non-residential examples of Mid-Century Modernism. However, there remains a lack of inclusion of post 1950s Modernist Waikato architecture and, specifically, nationally and regionally acknowledged Enduring Architecture in proposed historic heritage items schedule. There are insufficient examples of post 1950s buildings within the proposed historic heritage items, yet archival documentation available.</p>	Amend Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to incorporate known post 1950s architecture which is recognised regionally and nationally by NZ Institute of Architects Inc.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Antanas Procuta	307.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part the methodology applied for the identification of HHAs, however continues to have the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historic town planning in terms of street is not sufficiently identified with rules; and historic landscape and the work of prominent landscape architects has not been specifically reviewed. • proposed historic area should have a range of building types, and historic landscape should be included which includes streets, built landscape and plantings • better identification of places that are historic heritage within the proposed areas and those that are non-heritage [non heritage as per WCC PDP definition in terms of demolition] is required 	Amend the methodology used for the identification of Historic Heritage Areas by including a range of buildings types including non-residential buildings and design elements such as historic town planning, streets, and built and designed landscape within proposed historic areas which are historic suburb placeholders, with associated rules.
Antanas Procuta	307.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed Historic Heritage Areas, but seek the addition of the Central Frankton area as a Historic Heritage Area.	Apply the Historic Heritage Area over the Central Frankton area.
Antanas Procuta	307.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Schedule 8A: Built Heritage as notified; however seeks the addition of all the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings located in Hamilton.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include all the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings located in Hamilton.
Antanas Procuta	307.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed Historic Heritage Areas, but seek the addition of the suburban commercial centre of Claudelands as a Historic Heritage Area	Apply the Historic Heritage Area over the suburban commercial centre of Claudelands.
Antanas Procuta	307.11	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter in supporting, in part, the methodology used for the identification Historic Heritage Area seeks the inclusion of at least one historic heritage building within each proposed HHA.	The identification and inclusion of built heritage buildings in each Historic Heritage Area.
Antanas Procuta	307.12	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Policy 7.2.2d: <i>Heritage resources and heritage values are recognised and managed to maintain and enhance the sense of identity and wellbeing of the City's residents and the historical legibility of the Central City.</i>	not specifically stated.
Antanas Procuta	307.13	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Policy 7.2.6i: <i>Developments within the historic heritage area are required to be sympathetic to the heritage values and be accompanied with a Heritage Impact Assessment.</i>	not specifically stated.
Antanas Procuta	307.14	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter opposes the existing definitions for Special Heritage Zones and Historic Heritage Areas because there are inconsistencies between the definitions that need to be resolved to facilitate clarity and ease of use. Noting also that the definition of Historic Heritage Areas in Chapter 19 is more commensurate with character than historic heritage values.	Review of the definitions for Special Heritage Zones and Historic Heritage Areas to remove inconsistencies between the definitions.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Antanas Procuta	307.15	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the notified version of the Assessment Criteria for Historic Heritage Areas, however recommends they should be the same as for Historic Heritage Items [Buildings and Structures] for consistency in the plan, with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the RMA.	Amend 1.3 Assessment Criteria for Historic Heritage Areas so they align with the assessment criteria for Historic Heritage Items [Buildings and Structures].
Antanas Procuta	307.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter agrees with the Plan Change's initiatives, policies and rules that align with and generally uphold the UDP principles and imperatives, supporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a plan change that seeks to identify and protect Hamilton's historic heritage items and areas in principle • Support Heritage Design Guidelines by specialist consultants that include guidance on the range of heritage items and setting, and spaces in between which include historic landscape and streets and landscape design • ensuring historic heritage is given the highest level of protection and are in line with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter best practice 	That the work of Landscape Architects, whose work forms an integral part of the built environment, is reviewed and included into Chapter 19.
Antanas Procuta	307.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter agrees with the Plan Change's initiatives, policies and rules that align with and generally uphold the UDP principles and imperatives, and supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for a plan change that seeks to identify and protect Hamilton's historic heritage items and areas in principle • Support Heritage Design Guidelines by specialist consultants that include guidance on the range of heritage items and setting, and spaces in between which include historic landscape and streets and landscape design • ensuring historic heritage is given the highest level of protection and are in line with the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter best practice 	Request appropriate rules, which retain heritage values of proposed historic items and areas, within their setting and in relation to any identified group values. And that the relationship of historic heritage [items and areas] to non-historic heritage be identified , and considered in terms of height, set back, and density to hold and not diminish heritage values
Antanas Procuta	307.18	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	Support is given to the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain, as notified H230 - Harris House, Roger Walker, 58A Lake Crescent, Appendix 8A: Built Heritage.
Antanas Procuta	307.19	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the built heritage scheduling of the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain, H284 - 1970s Dwelling - Roger Walker Design, 913 River Road, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Antanas Procuta	307.20	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the built heritage scheduling given to the buildings designed by Wellington Architect Roger Walker [of which some also have regional NZIA Enduring Architecture Awards] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H230 - Harris House, 58A Lake Crescent • H284 - 1970s Dwelling, 913 River Road • H286 - 1960s duplex units, 120 Sandwich Road 	Retain H286 - 1960s Town Houses - Roger Walker design, 120 Sandwich Road, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Antanas Procuta	307.21	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion in Appendix 8 Historic Heritage of all the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings in Hamilton.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to add all of the NZIA Enduring Architecture Awarded buildings in Hamilton.
Antanas Procuta	307.22	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The protection of the buildings designed by early Waikato architects.	Retain on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage all buildings designed by early Waikato architects.
Stephen Philip Gale	308.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter considers any inclusion of 1859 River Road as an Archaeological Site to be an error. [Noting the archaeological site being reference is A1/A105, S14/165, Schedule 8C]	Confirm that any Archaeological Site overlay on 1859 River Road is an error.
Stephen Philip Gale	308.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C78) on 1858 River Road because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the area should have significant indigenous vegetation AND significant habitats; (ii) 1859 River road is not primarily indigenous vegetation and where it is indigenous this is due to human efforts rather than a reversion to native vegetation (part of the vegetation was planted by the submitter); (iii) there is no consistency in designation of SNA's in terms of these being habitats for native animals (every garden that has a resident fantail, weta, and native cockroaches could also be included); (iv) the area is a garden. 	Remove the SNA (C78) from the property at 1858 River Road.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Stephen Philip Gale	308.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA (C78) on 1858 River Road because:</p> <p>(i) the area should have significant indigenous vegetation AND significant habitats;</p> <p>(ii) 1859 River road is not primarily indigenous vegetation and where it is indigenous this is due to human efforts rather than a reversion to native vegetation (part of the vegetation was planted by the submitter);</p> <p>(iii) there is no consistency in designation of SNA's in terms of these being habitats for native animals (every garden that has a resident fantail, weta, and native cockroaches could also be included);</p> <p>(iv) the area is a garden.</p>	Remove the SNA (C78) from the property at 1858 River Road.
Stephen Philip Gale	308.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers any inclusion of 1859 River Road as an Archaeological Site to be an error. [Noting the archaeological site being reference is A1/A105, S14/165, Schedule 8C]</p>	Confirm that any Archaeological Site overlay on 1859 River Road is an error.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Jane Sherrard - 131 Albert St, Hamilton East, 3216	309.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the built heritage scheduling of the dwelling at 131 Albert Street, because of the low heritage ratings identified in HCC's Assessment and on the basis that the Property will remain in the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.</p> <p>.</p>	Remove 131 Albert Street (H146) from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites) and any associated planning maps Or, in the alternative: Delete all rules that restrict activities that can be done to and on Built Heritage.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Jane Sherrard - 131 Albert St, Hamilton East, 3216	309.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter states that they are neutral on the application of the Historic Heritage Area, HHA 12 - Hamilton East.</p>	None stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kath Letford	310.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern over the proposed SNA C23 - Hammond Park, stating:</p> <p>"Our property adjoins Hammond Park. I see that under PC9 the area we adjoin is now an SNA. My concern is that there are some very large trees immediately in front of our house that have been included in the SNA. As I understand it these are 'box elders' and are a weed. They also drop a lot of pollen over our house and property. I am concerned about them being labelled as SNA because it will now be difficult to get them trimmed / pruned or cut down.</p> <p>The SNA shouldn't be including these types of trees. They are a weed species. In the past HCC have been willing to trim back trees for residents adjoining Hammond Park. I made a request for this in 2019 but then covid hit and since then I've had difficulty getting anyone to meet me to organise this. If the trees in front of us are included in SNA it will be difficult / too expensive for the Council to keep them under control if Resource Consent is required to work on these trees.</p> <p>SNA should be specific to trees that have more significance, not weed species that are not natives."</p>	That the SNA should be specific to trees that have more significance, not weed species that are not natives.
Palaone Enterprises Ltd - Raymon Joseph Palaone	311.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA (C78) on 15 Riverlinks Lane, because the five native trees in this steep part of our section was planted by the Gordons when they subdivided their farm and cleaned out the gully along the Te Awa o Katipaki Stream.</p>	Remove part of the SNA (C78) from the property at 15 Riverlinks Lane.
Palaone Enterprises Ltd - Raymon Joseph Palaone	311.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA (C18) on their property (valuation number 04211-093-13) stating:</p> <p>"I oppose the extensive work heritage and environmental experts have proposed on my property as I do not believe that they have physically sited my property. They would have seen that it is a flat garden section with two Rimu trees that I planted over thirty year ago under which I have planted all our children and grandchildren's whenua 16 to date so far. There is one Totara tree on the side bank which has grown sideways and in danger of falling over. The rest of the trees that aren't pest trees were planted by the owner, great grandson of the family that subdivided our street. This land was there fam where they would take the cows to the milking shed on the grounds of what is now DZO school."</p>	Remove SNA (C18) from 12 Chartwell Crescent (valuation number 04211-093-13).
Palaone Enterprises Ltd - Raymon Joseph Palaone	311.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Archaeological Site A106 (S14/23) citing past excavation works that would have removed any archaeological remnants.</p>	Remove Archaeological Site A106 (S14/23) from 12 Chartwell Crescent.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Ian David Williams	312.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the gullies at 440 Peacockes Road being an SNA (C87), stating: "We support our gully being a SNA. However we feel it is unfair/unjust that we (1) Loose control over this area and (2) we will be required to pay rates on the area we have no control over".	Council forfeits rates on any portion of land declared a SNA; or Council pays for the land taken as SNA; or Council reimburses any work undertaken by a land owner to improve a SNA.
Patricia Collin	313.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	Although the submitter supports inclusion of gully systems within Hamilton City as SNA's in Plan Change 9, the submitter opposes to the SNA (C41) at 68 Nevada Road, Silverdale.	Remove the SNA (C41) from the property at 68 Nevada Road, Silverdale.
Matthew Bredin-Grey	314.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and inclusion of property at 57 Sare Crescent as par of the Sare Crescent Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 because the house has been renovated and altered in relation to the floors, windows and gutters. The submitter also acknowledges the shed was built in the 90s'.	Amend the extent of Sare Crescent Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 to exclude the property at 57 Sare Crescent.
Liam Kyle and Amy Yasutake-Watson	315.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA because it will impact the ability to renovate, and maintain their home to a liveable standard. It will push people away from the area and the street will fall into disrepair due to these restrictions. The submitter questions the HHA classification methodology. The submitter also relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D in the HCC ODP as it is not being representative of the two historical heritage themes as stated.
Liam Kyle and Amy Yasutake-Watson	315.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
Liam Kyle and Amy Yasutake-Watson	315.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.
Janice Mary Trass	316.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned with how the notified SNA rules will affect their property.	Direct contact details for someone in HCC regarding weed control.
Janice Mary Trass	316.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the tree canopy of the proposed SNA (C35) that encroaches their property because they may require a resource consent to carry out any earthworks where it requires the cutting of large roots of the tree and pruning of the foliage will be restricted. There are also concerns about lack of weed control (particularly Old Man's Beard, Gorse and Ivy) by Council.	Review weed control.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Dean, Wardens, and Vestry of the Cathedral Church of St Peter, Victoria Street, Hamilton - The Most Reverend Sir David Moxon, and Canon Dr Bryan Bang	317.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the continued built heritage status of the Cathedral Church of St Peter together with that of the Courthouse, as part of the Ferrybank Precinct.	Retain H137 - Cathedral Church of St Peter on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
The Dean, Wardens, and Vestry of the Cathedral Church of St Peter, Victoria Street, Hamilton - The Most Reverend Sir David Moxon, and Canon Dr Bryan Bang	317.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the continued built heritage status of the Cathedral Church of St Peter together with that of the Courthouse, as part of the Ferrybank Precinct.	Retain the schedule H7 - Hamilton Courthouse on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	318.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the identification and implementation of Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 because the unique architectural styles, buildings and lots layouts of the area.	Approve Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area and its extent identified under Plan Change 9.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	318.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed provisions and controls in relation to Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, provided that these provisions and controls will restrict and/or avoid inappropriate developments that are out of character or of high-rise developments. Thereby resulting the loss of historic values of the area.	Approves proposed provisions and controls in relation to Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9, and seeks limitation of establishment of dwellings at the rear of the sites, as well as avoidance of demolition and/or removal of railway houses within the area.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	318.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the recognition and identification of historic values of Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 however the submitter wishes to include the inclusion of the property at 9 Weka Street as scheduled Built Heritage under Plan Change 9.	Seeks the property at 9 Weka Street to be scheduled as Built Heritage under Plan Change 9.
Alan Warwick Kellaway	318.4	General	General		The submitter seeks funding from Council heritage fund for repairs and maintenance on properties and roading.	Seeks funding from Council heritage fund for repairs and maintenance on properties and roading.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Alan Warwick Kellaway	318.5	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the recognition and identification of historic values of Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change and the submitter wants protection of trees within this area as they are a memorial for the dead soldiers from WW1.	Seeks the protection of trees in Frankton Railway Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones Hamilton Campground Limited	319.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The Te Aroha Street Historic Heritage Area does not appropriately identify properties that exhibit the necessary historic heritage qualities to merit protection through the proposed provisions. The notification of PC9 in advance of PC12 creates significant disconnect in determining the degree for which the land should be retained for the purpose of historic heritage and is a qualifying matter. This situation does not allow for an integrated approach to managing historic heritage and allowing more intensive residential development in terms of central government's directives.	The submitter seeks: (a) That the proposed Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area overlay be deleted in its entirety; or (b) That the extent of the proposed Te Aroha Historic Heritage Area overlay be reduced by removing all properties that have direct frontage to the western side of Peachgrove Road from this overlay.
Jones Lands Limited and Hamilton Campground Limited - Tristan Jones Peacocks South Limited	320.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter considers that it is inappropriate for SNA's subject to submissions on PC5 to have been duplicated for inclusion in PC9 when no decision has yet been made on PC5.	Seeks that all Significant Natural Areas (SNA's) identified in PC9 which related to SNA's identified by PC5, be subject to any modification to the SNA area (including deletion) agreed through the PC5 process.
Nick King and Maddy Kear	321.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C38) at 27 Saxbys Road, Glenview as no fieldwork or ground-truthing was undertaken (s32 Report, Appendix 12, pg. 9) and, therefore, it is no possible to confirm the area on the subject site as significant.	Remove the SNA (C38) from the property at 27 Saxbys Road, Glenview.
John Warwick Kellaway The Kellaway Family Trust	322.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the part of the SNA (C83) on the property at 121 Maeroa Road because the site has not been properly assessed (the section is a sub branch which formally starts in 123 Maeroa Road). The area is landscaped with trees - both exotics and natives planted mostly by the owners. The submitter clarifies the chronology of the trees planted on the area, stating that the area is a mixture of 1960s-1970s orchard and plantings by theirselves on what was a bare site.	Do a site visit and review the SNA (C83) affecting the property at 121 Maeroa Road and remove the SNA particularly where existing fruit and citrus trees are planted and any extent on the car parking area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
John Warwick Kellaway The Kellaway Family Trust	322.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter seeks the scheduling of the Kellaway Residence on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage because the house to be a very good example of one of the few surviving Hamilton architect homes of the 1960s and shows early use of modular construction and of reintroduction of traditional verandahs that allowed my family to live under the verandahs. Designed in 1964 by Warwick Kellaway for his young family, there were very few houses like this, in design and detail, designed to fit into a narrow and steep section near a gully. The house design is very much as originally designed in 1964 apart from enclosing part of the downstairs open space for a rumpus room, and installing two skylights more recently, and the addition of a shower space internally.	Scheduling the Kellaway Residence at 121 Maeroa Road as built heritage.
John Warwick Kellaway The Kellaway Family Trust	322.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter seeks the scheduling of the following buildings as built heritage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deanwell Primary School <p>Deanwell School and Aberdeen School lead to the first Open Plan Intermediate School at St Andrews and assisted in changing education practices and construction and design methods. I designed all three with assistance from my colleagues, led by Steve Mrkusic. Deanwell represents the significant contribution of the South Auckland Education Board to school design and construction in New Zealand, with over 400 schools in their care. It recognises the significant contribution of the South Auckland Education Board to New Zealand. Deanwell School is recognised as of national significance, and should be in Category A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former St Andrews Intermediate Gym St Andrews (now Hamilton North Middle School) <p>This radical design of the 1970s was the work of W. Kellaway and engineer the late Thomas Flood of Angus Flood and Griffiths. This was the first time in New Zealand that an intermediate was allowed a separate gym, and it formed a standard design used in areas schools in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty, with an example at Raglan and Whangamata. The parabolic form was based on hay barn and economy of construction. Thomas Flood was an exceptional structural engineer based in the Waikato with international credibility and should be recognised for his role. The gym formed part of the first open intermediate school in New Zealand, which is also in my view nationally significant. The school today is very similar to my original design in terms of design, materials, layout and courtyards. The gym could be with maintenance which appears to have been poor. It remains a significant regional design.</p> <p>This building form has probably influenced others as the design was developed and used by Kellaway's colleagues such as Vaclavas Procuta and Brian Aish in Area Schools on the coast where the form became part of the local architecture.</p>	Scheduling the following buildings as built heritage in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage : Deanwell Primary School, Deanwell Former St Andrews Intermediate Gym, St Andrews

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Anthony (Tony) Alfrso Street	323.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter oppose the inclusion of the SNA, F64 on their property, 8 Minchin Crescent, stating: "The Hamilton City Council has assigned my property SNA status - apparently because it is partly on a sloping river bank. However on the sloping part of my property, it was densely planted with exotic trees and shrubs by my late parents - and these planting have strong sentimental value, In terns of indigenous vegetation, there are only a small number of ferns - which I have not interfered with. In terms of fauna habitats, to the best of my knowledge there are no long tailed bats in the vicinity whilst the ferns are enjoyed by the occasional fantail bird. In view of these attributes, I believe that the assigned SNA status is questionable."	That HCC reduces the rates imposed on SNA impacted private properties to fully compensate those affected - for the loss of their quiet enjoyment. Due to the restrictions imposed, the land affected will become worthless.
Anthony (Tony) Alfrso Street	323.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.1 that limits the amount of foliage that can be removed per tree in a calendar year to 15%, and a maximum prunable branch thickness of 50mm. The submitter does not consider this rule to be reasonable and suggests that the ordinances be eased to 20\$ and 100mm respectively.	Amend provision 20.5.1 to enable up to 20% of foliage removal and up to 100mm of branch diameter pruning.
Anthony (Tony) Alfrso Street	323.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.5 as notified because it is too prescriptive and substantially transgresses natural property rights.	Delete Rule 20.5.5.
WITHDRAWN	324.1					
Rachit Bakshi and Kritika	325.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA, the submitter is opposed to the inclusion of 36 Marshall Street within the HHA and considers that due to the significant structural renovations, changes and improvements that have been made, that the property is not consistent with the heritage of the area.	Remove 36 Marshall Street from the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA.
Rachit Bakshi and Kritika	325.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas		As many activities require consent, the submitter is concerned with the increase in costs, as a result of being located within a HHA.	Remove 36 Marshall Street from the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA.
Rachit Bakshi and Kritika	325.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The property in question has been subject to anti-social activity and the submitter has significant safety concerns for the family and much of this is as a result of the existing boundary conditions giving strangers easy access to the property.	Remove 36 Marshall Street from the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
John Badham	326.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitter supports the broad intent of expanding the existing Operative District Plan SNAs to include both indigenous flora and fauna values.	No specific relief requested for Chapter 20 - Purpose 20.1a. to 20.1f. iii.
John Badham	326.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the broad intent of expanding the existing Operative District Plan SNAs to include both indigenous flora and fauna values.	No specific relief requested for Policy 20.2.1c
John Badham	326.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the effects management hierarchy in Policy 20.2.1d. iv. to vi. of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation because there is uncertainty in the research (as outlined in their submission) and the use of the precautionary principle in New Zealand Environmental Law.	The submitter seeks that unproven biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation management options in Policy 20.2.1d. iv. to vi. are avoided. Consequential changes are sought by deleting to Policies 20.2.1e. i. to iii.
John Badham	326.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter considers that Chapter 20 - Natural Environments does not include adequate protection for long-tailed bats.	Seeks amendments to Chapter 20 to extend the provisions provided within the Amberfield consent decision apply city-wide, including early planting between and within existing SNAs, sound pest control measures and control of night-time artificial lighting from buildings, vehicles and street lights.
John Badham	326.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	The submitter considers that Chapter 20 - Natural Environments does not include adequate protection for long-tailed bats.	Seeks amendments to Chapter 20 to extend the provisions provided within the Amberfield consent decision apply city-wide, including early planting between and within existing SNAs, sound pest control measures and control of night-time artificial lighting form buildings, vehicles and street lights.
John Badham	326.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers that the lack of communication is one the issues with conservation efforts, by prioritising communication prior to restoration work will avoid potential tensions, mistakes, trespasses and omissions	Seeks amendment to Policy 20.2.2a so that communication is required between landowners, Department of Conservation, mana whenua and other organisations for Discretionary and Non-Complying activities.
John Badham	326.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Peat Lakes, Wetlands and Peat Lake Catchments	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments because of instances where gullies have been modified to suit urban development without any consideration to ecosystem values on fish and fresh water invertebrates.	Seeks amendment of Policy 20.2.4b to prevent the modification of natural springs, seepages and streams, and negative effects on fish and freshwater invertebrates, through inappropriate modification of gullies by urban development.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
John Badham	326.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Considers that gully restorers should not have to pay for regulatory requirements and that Plan Changes should not inhibit or prohibit enhancement or restoration of SNAs.	Seeks the addition of definitions for 'Structure' and 'existing structures'. Also seeks any new structures or structures requiring amending and/or upgrading that will contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs should either have consent waivers or have stipulated standards that should be fulfilled to determine whether a consent would be required or not.
John Badham	326.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA		The submitter seeks amendments to Rule 20.5.6 a. ii. as consider that there are issues with limiting the amount of exotic vegetation to only 50m ² . The Plan Change as notified would greatly restrict the attainment of resotration goals, including reaching the 10% native vegetation goal set by Hamilton's Nature in the City program. The submitter seeks a longer timeframe for replanting in Rule 20.5.6 b. as it can take up to 2 years for replanting.	Amend Rule 20.5.6 a. ii. to "No more than 50m2 of <u>indigenous</u> vegetation or trees are removed per site per calendar year; and". Amend Rule 20.5.6 b. to "The area cleared is planted with indigenous vegetation or trees within <u>24</u> months; and"
John Badham	326.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways		The submitter seeks that Rule 20.5.7 A a. as the Plan Change should not inhibit or prohibit restoration activities	Add the following to this provision: "The works are required to maintain an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure <u>or to contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs</u> , and;"
John Badham	326.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter identifies that potential tensions can be caused by micromanaging and balancing the aspirations of landowners with protection of the environment.	The submitter seeks additional Policies and Rules which provide incentives and penalties for enhancement and restoration of all or part of SNA's which are causing significant negative impacts on the SNA.
John Badham	326.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The cavities that native species use are mainly found within older trees. Allowing removal of exotic trees because of their age may be detrimental as potential habitat may be removed for native species.	Amend Rule 20.3a. i. by deleting the words 'or age'.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Nick Evetts	327.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 (PC 9), stating PC9 "erodes the value of my property by limiting its development potential. Under Plan Change 12 (PC12) my options for development would be broadened and hence the properties intrinsic value would be enhanced. The opposite would occur under (PC 9).</p> <p>Under PC 9, any form of development or intensification will now require a resource consent. The need for and cost of a resource consent further erodes the property's value. Plan Change 9 talks about "value locally or regionally'. That is value to the wider community and not me the owner of the property for 26 years.</p> <p>Whilst I support the general intent of PC 9, I believe that any costs to provide sympathetic development of my property should not be a cost on me. By this I mean both compliance cost and the cost of lost opportunity as a result of PC 9. That is, if the Hamilton City Council perceive value to the community from my ownership and occupation of a "museum" then Hamilton City Council should provide compensation or at least relief from the cost imposed on me. The Resource Consent process is expensive, time consuming, and often lacking in certainty. I believe that as a minimum, Hamilton City Council should compensate me by meeting the planning application costs and the consenting fees."</p>	Hamilton City Council should compensate the landowner by meeting the planning application costs and the consenting fees.
Nick Evetts	327.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 (PC 9), stating PC9 "erodes the value of my property by limiting its development potential. Under Plan Change 12 (PC12) my options for development would be broadened and hence the properties intrinsic value would be enhanced. The opposite would occur under (PC 9).</p> <p>Under PC 9, any form of development or intensification will now require a resource consent. The need for and cost of a resource consent further erodes the property's value. Plan Change 9 talks about "value locally or regionally'. That is value to the wider community and not me the owner of the property for 26 years.</p> <p>Whilst I support the general intent of PC 9, I believe that any costs to provide sympathetic development of my property should not be a cost on me. By this I mean both compliance cost and the cost of lost opportunity as a result of PC 9. That is, if the Hamilton City Council perceive value to the community from my ownership and occupation of a "museum" then Hamilton City Council should provide compensation or at least relief from the cost imposed on me. The Resource Consent process is expensive, time consuming, and often lacking in certainty. I believe that as a minimum, Hamilton City Council should compensate me by meeting the planning application costs and the consenting fees."</p>	Hamilton City Council should compensate the landowner by meeting the planning application costs and the consenting fees.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roderick Aldridge	328.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	<p>The submitter considers that Plan Change 9 should meet the objectives in accordance with The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft (2022).</p> <p>The submitter also believes the District Plan needs to enable all land to be managed sustainably not just SNA's and all landowners should be enabled and incentivise to enhance indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>Council needs to activity promote indigenous biodiversity and actively involve the public, particularly Maaori groups and the Kirikiriroa Restoration Forum. Ways of doing this could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing materials and services for restoration • restoration advice • plants • help with weed and predator control • removing obstacles from restoration work that enhances biodiversity <p>The submitter believes that Council should take the imitative integrate activities with other Waikato local bodies since integrated ecosystems are much more effective and resilient than the same area of fragmented ones. Because if done well this enables multiple benefits – enhanced indigenous biodiversity, protection from erosion, better water quality, wetland enhancement, carbon sequestration and climate resilience, positive public involvement, public access to nature, opportunities for recreation and more.</p> <p>The submitter identifies that in it's He Pou Manawa - Pillars of Wellbeing (2022), Council has already recognised the role of Maaori as kaitiaki (guardians) of the natural and physical environment, working in partnership to promote the protection and enhancement of Kirikiriroa/Hamilton.</p> <p>We need to enable Maaori to reconnect with their land and culture by actively involving them in the planning and execution in all matters affecting them, in line with The Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan - Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao. This should apply particularly to their role as kaitiakitanga and where there is an opportunity to restore their role as rangatira. This should be active involvement – not just "consultation" after the Council has planned what to do.</p>	<p>Seeks a permitted activity status for work that complies with a Council restoration guide or with a panel of biodiversity experts.</p> <p>Seeks Council engage in active involvement of Maaori in restoration activities.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to the policies and rules to allow this Plan Change to be as workable as possible for those wishing to engage in restoring, regenerating, enhancing, and protecting the indigenous flora and fauna of our SNAs.</p> <p>Seeks improved communication support between all stakeholders and agencies when they engage Council for activity consents.</p>
Roderick Aldridge	328.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes Policies 20.2.1 and 20.2.1 c. i. as notified because it does not recognise the potential tension caused by micromanaging and balancing the aspirations of landowner with the protection of the of the environment.</p>	<p>Seeks amendments to Policies and rules to provide incentives and penalties to carry out enhancement and restoration of all or part of SNAs that are neglected to the point of causing significant negative impacts to the SNA.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roderick Aldridge	328.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	<p>The submitter identifies that one of the causes of issues with conservation is the lack of communication and considers it necessary to prioritise communication prior to restoration work being undertaken.</p> <p>The submitter identifies that consultation is often transitional and a tick box exercise which results in a power imbalance and should instead be a participatory process which reduces imbalance allows for active engagement. Also give effect to Treaty partners allowing them to exercise their full role as rangatira and practice kaitiaki.</p>	Seeks a new provision that it is "it is strongly encouraged that all communication follows a participatory approach or process rather than a consultative approach or process"
Roderick Aldridge	328.4	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for costly regulatory requirements to protect and enhance privately owned SNA sites because restorers want to protect, maintain, and enhance SNA's. A plan change should not inhibit or prohibit the enhancement or restoration of SNA's.	Seeks the addition of specific definitions of "structure" and "existing structures" and; that any new structures or structures that require amending and/or upgrading which will contribute to restoring or enhancing SNA's should have consent waivers or have stipulated standards that should be fulfilled to determine if consent is required.
Roderick Aldridge	328.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.6 because there is an issue with limiting the amount of exotic vegetation or trees that can be removed in a calendar year to only 50m ² , in certain instances, especially large-scale restoration efforts, this would not be feasible since it would lead to very long-time scales and the probability of re-infestation from pest plants that could not be removed on account of this area limitation. In the case of exotic vegetation, species labelled as pests within the Waikato Pest Management Plan, for example Tradescantia sp and blackberry, can often be growing in significantly larger amounts than this stipulated threshold. Therefore, as this plan change currently suggests, restorers would have to go through a resource consent process to remove anything more than threshold which would greatly restrict the attainment of restoration goals including reaching the 10% native vegetation goal set by Hamilton's Nature in the City program.	Amend 20.5.6 a. ii. to ""No more than 50m ² of indigenous vegetation or trees are removed per site per calendar year; and"
Roderick Aldridge	328.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The submitter states that plan changes should no inhibit or prohibit restoration activities and the proposed provision will assist with access to areas that require restorative work.	<p>Amend Rule 20.5.7 A. a. to read:</p> <p>The works are required to maintain an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure <u>or to contribute to restoring or enhancing SNAs, and;</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Roderick Aldridge	328.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter identifies that cavities that our native species use are mainly found within older trees, therefore allowing the removal of indigenous or exotic trees based on age will remove potential habitat and be detrimental to the native species.	Seeks amendment of Rule 20.3 a. i. by deleting "or age" from the provision.
Roderick Aldridge	328.8	General	General	Oppose	<p>My concern is that the (Plan Change 9: Historic Heritage and Natural Environment) should meet the objectives in accordance with:</p> <p>The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft (2022) “(1) The objective of this National Policy Statement is to protect, maintain, and restore indigenous biodiversity in a way that: (a) recognises tangata whenua as kaitiaki, and people and communities as stewards, of indigenous biodiversity; and (b) provides for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities now and in the future.”</p> <p>And the Te Mana o Te Taiao Aotearoa: New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020 “Outcomes: - Ecosystems, from mountain tops to ocean depths, are thriving. - Indigenous species and their habitats across Aotearoa New Zealand and beyond are thriving. - People’s lives are enriched through their connection with nature. - Treaty partners, whānau, hapū and iwi are exercising their full role as rangatira and kaitiaki. - Prosperity is intrinsically linked with a thriving biodiversity.”</p> <p>The District Plan needs to enable all land to be managed sustainably, not just Significant Natural Areas. All landowners should be enabled and incentivised to enhance indigenous biodiversity. To meet these aims the Council needs to actively promote indigenous biodiversity – actively involving the public, particularly groups such as Maaori with their special needs and knowledge and community groups such as the Kirikirroa Restoration Forum. Possible ways include providing materials and services for restoration, including restoration advice, plants, help with weed and predator control, and removing obstacles from restoration work that enhances biodiversity. Such work should be a permitted activity if it complies with a Council restoration guide or with a panel of biodiversity experts. The Council should take the initiative to integrate activities with other Waikato local bodies since integrated ecosystems are much more effective and resilient than the same area of fragmented ones. Done well this enables multiple benefits – enhanced indigenous biodiversity, protection from erosion, better water quality, wetland enhancement, carbon sequestration and climate resilience, positive public involvement, public access to nature, opportunities for recreation and more.</p> <p>In it’s He Pou Manawa - Pillars of Wellbeing (2022) the Council has already recognised the role of Maaori as kaitiaki (guardians) of the natural and physical environment, working in partnership to promote the protection and enhancement of Kirikirroa/Hamilton. We need to enable Maaori to reconnect with their land and culture by actively</p>	That the (Plan Change 9: Historic Heritage and Natural Environment) meets the objectives in accordance with The National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity exposure draft (2022) and the Te Mana o Te Taiao Aotearoa: New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy 2020; the District Plan needs to enable all land to be managed sustainably, not just Significant Natural Areas; The Council should take the initiative to integrate activities with other Waikato local bodies since integrated ecosystems are much more effective and resilient than the same area of fragmented ones; and enable Maaori to reconnect with their land and culture by actively involving them in the planning and execution in all matters affecting them, in line with The Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan - Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
					involving them in the planning and execution in all matters affecting them, in line with The Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan - Tai Tumu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao. This should apply particularly to their role as kaitiakitanga and where there is an opportunity to restore their role as rangatira. This should be active involvement – not just “consultation” after the Council has planned what to do.	
Roderick Aldridge	328.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter identifies that one of the causes of issues with conservation is the lack of communication and considers it necessary to prioritise communication prior to restoration work being undertaken. The submitter identifies that consultation is often transitional and a tick box exercise which results in a power imbalance and should instead be a participatory process which reduces imbalance allows for active engagement. Also give effect to Treaty partners allowing them to exercise their full role as rangatira and practice kaitiaki.	Seeks amendment to Discretionary and Non-complying activities to 'require' communication between landowners, Department of Conservation, mana whenua and other organizations that can assist in the management, protection, and restoration of Significant Natural Areas.
Roderick Aldridge	328.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.6b stating that "often replanting of an area that has had weeds removed does not always occur within a year and can be a process that can take up to 2 years, hence the increase in time required for replanting".	Amend Rule 20.5.6b to read: The area cleared is planted with indigenous vegetation or trees within 12 <u>24</u> months;
Roderick Aldridge	328.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter states that due the sensitivity and National Critical status of the Pekapeka-tau-roa every effort must be taken to protect, maintain and if possible increase populations, including addressing the lack of research, education and advocacy.	Amend 20.5.6 c. to include requirement if felling is required and confirmed it must follow the DOC Tree Felling Protocol and any felling needs to be conducted after 5 nights of no bat activity. Amend 20.5.6 c. ii. 1. "suitably qualified person" to "suitably qualified person endorsed by Mana Whenua".
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 141, 143, and 148 Hall Road, Peacocke because extent of land identified as an SNA (as part of site ID C87) is a highly modified ecosystem and applies to that area of the Submitter's land that operates as a “bird park” that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Appendix 9 Schedule 9C to remove modified gully areas located within 141, 143, and 148 Hall Road, Peacocke (SNA C87).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.2	Chapter 15 Open Space Zones	15.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 15.3 because part of their land that is a highly modified ecosystem and currently operates a “bird park” that is freely accessible to the public.	<p>Amend Rule 15.3 to enable the following as Permitted Activities within the gully system forming part of the “Bird Park” that extends across 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and replacement of all existing and lawfully established buildings and structures including any associated earthworks and vegetation modification; • Maintenance, replacement and construction of walkways, board walks, cycle paths and pedestrian bridges including associated signage including any associated earthworks and vegetation modification; • The establishment, maintenance and removal of trees and vegetation across up to 10% of the land area in any year.
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Retain new Policies 20.2.1c and 20.2.1d
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Add new Objective 20.2.2 Enable and facilitate public access and utilisation of Corridor SNA areas, where such uses are compatible with the maintenance, restoration, and enhancement of the SNA.
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	<p>Either:</p> <p>Amend Rule 20.3 – Activity Status Table as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Rule 20.3 a. by deleting subclauses i, ii, iii and iv. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Rule 20.3 c. by including the following additional purposes “maintenance, replacement, and enhancement” • Amend Rule 20.3 e. by deleting the word “where” and the subsequent sub-clauses i. and ii. • Replace Rule 20.3 g. with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earthworks associated with the establishment,

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
						<p>maintenance or upgrading of tracks, paths, cycle ways, boardwalks and pedestrian bridges and associated fencing and signage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Rule 20.3 k. by deleting the word “where” and the subsequent sub-clauses i. and ii. • Amend Rule 20.3 l. by changing the activity status from RD to P (Permitted Activity) within the cSNA area. • Amend Rule 20.3 m. by changing the activity status from D to C (Controlled Activity) within the cSNA area. • Amend Rule 20.3 o. by changing the activity status from D to C (Controlled Activity) within the cSNA area. • Amend Rule 20.3 p. by changing the activity status from NC to D (Controlled Activity) within the cSNA area. • Amend Rule 20.3 q. by changing the activity status from NC to D (Controlled Activity) within the cSNA area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N.B. consequential amendments will be required to Clause 20.6 Matters Discretion and Assessment Criteria to include “matters of control” and to delete redundant matters where the associated activity status has been amended. <p>Or:</p> <p>Amend the Activity Status Table in Rule 20.3 applicable to the cSNA area to provide Permitted Activity Status for each of the following activities at 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road (legally described as Section 3 SO539766, Lot 1 DPS 52139 (to become Sections 4, 5 and 6 SO 539766) , Section 7 SO 539766 and Section 8 SO 539766:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and replacement of all existing and lawfully established buildings and structures including any associated earthworks and vegetation modification; • Maintenance, replacement and construction of walkways, board walks, cycleways and pedestrian bridges including associated signage including any associated earthworks and vegetation modification; • The establishment, maintenance and removal of trees and vegetation across up to 10% of the land area in any year.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 20.5.1 so that it applies within fSNA areas only.
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 20.5.5 to that it applies within fSNA areas only
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 20.5.6 so that it: i) permits pruning, maintenance of trees and vegetation within a cSNA; and ii) permits removal and replacement planting of trees and vegetation within a cSNA of up to 10% of the area of any site in any calendar year, and iii) requires the tree removal and replacement planting to be supervised by a suitably qualified and experienced person (e.g. an arborist).
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 20.5.7 so that it applies within fSNA areas only
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 20.5.7 to that it applies within fSNA areas only
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.12	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Support amendment to Objective 23.2.5 and Policy 23.2.5a.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.13	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support in part	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Table 23.3c rule xii to provide for Subdivision as a Controlled Activity within a cSNA area, while retaining the Discretionary Activity status for Subdivision within a fSNA area.
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.14	Chapter 23 Subdivision	General		The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Clause 23.8 Matters Discretion and Assessment Criteria to include “matters of control” for subdivision within a cSNA area
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.15	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend Standard 25.2.4.3 so that it applies within fSNA areas only
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.16	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Support proposed definition of Restoration (in relation to a Significant Natural Area)
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.17	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Oppose amendments to the definition of Vegetation trimming and maintenance to prevent application of the definition to SNA areas
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.18	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Oppose amendments to the definition of Vegetation removal to prevent application of the definition to SNA areas
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	329.19	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) on 143, 141 and 148 Hall Road because the area is a highly modified environment that currently operates as a 'bird park' that is freely accessible to the public.	Amend D3D to include “board walks and pedestrian bridges” along with public walkways and cycleways.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the review of historic heritage in principle, and support in principle the increased number of proposed historic items to be scheduled. The submitter is pleased HCC has reviewed the District Plan's Schedule of Heritage Items, which is long overdue, and that this has resulted in an increased number of proposed heritage items. It is also good to see the inclusion of proposed heritage areas that better reflect Hamilton's history of growth and development rather than seeing individual items in isolation without their context. The inclusion of the south end of Victoria Street as a heritage area completes a long process of input from the community.	None specifically stated for this submission point.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	General	Support	The submitter request to include the trees around Hockin House that were planted in memory of WHS members in Schedule 9D because these trees form an important historic group and stating about Hockin House as follows: "Hockin House, built in 1893 as the residence for the Medical Superintendent, is the headquarters for the Waikato Historical Society and a history museum. It is scheduled with Hamilton City Council's Operative District Plan and listed with Heritage New as a Category 2 historic place. Along with the former hospital residence and nurses' home are memorial trees planted by the Society within the council reserve Graham Park".	Seeks the inclusion of the memorial trees around Hockin House relating to the Waikato Historical Society in the Schedule 9D.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the review of historic heritage in principle; and are pleased HCC has reviewed the District Plan's Schedule of Heritage Items, which is long overdue, and that this has resulted in an increased number of proposed heritage items. It is also good to see the inclusion of proposed heritage areas that better reflect Hamilton's history of growth and development rather than seeing individual items in isolation without their context. The inclusion of the south end of Victoria Street as a heritage area completes a long process of input from the community.	That consideration be given to assess those items identified in the Waikato Heritage Group's preliminary survey [Submission 427].
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	While the submitter supports in principle the additional built heritage they raise the following concern - when looking at the map provided of individual items there appear to be areas of the city whose heritage has not been identified and therefore not included. A more comprehensive survey of the whole of Hamilton City including those areas that were once farms would better represent the histories of our communities and the development of Hamilton.	A broader representation and selection of heritage items, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the inclusion of places of local and regional heritage significance around the perimeter areas of the city and on the western side of the city. Examples include former farm houses, industrial, commercial and educational buildings, with a wider range of types and more modern heritage up to the late 1970s. A more comprehensive survey of the whole of Hamilton City including those areas that were once farms would better represent the histories of our communities and the development of Hamilton.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The proposal of historic areas within the historic heritage chapter is supported in principle; this includes placing the long-established known historic areas (character overlay) of Frankton Railway Village, Hayes Paddock, Hamilton East and Claudelands within this section.	No relief sought.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned what new proposed density rules will mean for historic areas and do not support new apartment developments behind historic houses and in the proposed historic areas. To keep these historic items and areas into the future there needs to be a higher level of control and more assistance given to owners.	Stronger controls over intensification in Historic Heritage Areas, including retaining the setting and context of the historic place and or area. Building a multi-storey structure behind a single-storey house or group of historic houses ruins the integrity of the historic place and negates the value of the heritage area.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules that limit relocation, and provide better control of partial demolition and demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules better control of partial demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control partial demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part plan provisions regarding the proposed historic areas, however would like to see stronger policies, objectives and rules better control of partial demolition.	Stronger policies, objectives and rules to limit relocation on site and off, and to control partial demolition for Historic Heritage Areas.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes having different rules for Front and rear sections in historic areas; stating that they need to have the same rules to retain overall heritage values.	Ensure front and rear sections in historic areas have the same rules to retain overall heritage values.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter states that there needs to be rules to retain context and integrity of the historic place and area.	Provision of rules to retain context and integrity of the historic place and area.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.19	General	General		The submitter, while supporting in part the HCC Heritage Fund, which is very small currently, considers that it ought to be available for all owners of heritage places. We seek a more substantial fund to support the increased number of owners seeking to preserve or maintain their heritage places.	The provision of a more substantial fund to support the increased number of owners seeking to preserve or maintain their heritage places.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.20	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas - HHA31 - Victoria Street We request that the proposed Southern Victoria Street Historic Area be extended to include Knox Street and Hood Street.	Amend the extent of Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas - HHA31 - Victoria Street to include Knox Street and Hood Street.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.21	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage: The submitter request that the commercial buildings at 226/228 and 232 Victoria Street are scheduled as heritage items.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include the commercial buildings at 226/228 Victoria Street as a built heritage item.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.22	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage: The submitter request that the commercial buildings at 226/228 and 232 Victoria Street are scheduled as heritage items.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include the commercial building at 232 Victoria Street as a built heritage item.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvn, President	330.23	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter seek a wider survey of other historic blocks within the central city, such as the eastern block of Collingwood Street, Barton Street, Hamilton North (central city), as well as Frankton and early suburban shopping areas including Claudelands.	A wider survey is undertaken of other historic blocks within the central city, such as the eastern block of Collingwood Street, Barton Street, Hamilton North (central city), as well as Frankton and early suburban shopping areas including Claudelands.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvin, President	330.24	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of an up-to-date list of NZAA sites, and to include known scheduled pre-1900 buildings, but they note some known archaeological sites are not in the NZAA list yet are known by historians.	Please include the following as archaeological sites to the district plan [noting level of significance will determine Group ranking]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 1864 saw mill site with associated tramway operated by Ebenezer Gibbons; the 1877 Frankton railway station complex; the Frankton drain and the three rifle ranges (Dinsdale, Frankton and Hamilton East); Beale Cottage's well and site; and Lake House's cellar.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvin, President	330.25	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of an up-to-date list of NZAA sites, and to include known scheduled pre-1900 buildings, but they note some known archaeological sites are not in the NZAA list yet are known by historians.	Please include the following as archaeological sites to the district plan [noting level of significance will determine Group ranking]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the 1864 saw mill site with associated tramway operated by Ebenezer Gibbons; the 1877 Frankton railway station complex; the Frankton drain; the three rifle ranges (Dinsdale, Frankton and Hamilton East); Beale Cottage's well and site; and Lake House's cellar.
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvin, President	330.26	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter requests a wider approach of having an archaeological alert layer within the three pre-1900 towns of Hamilton West, Hamilton East and Frankton and include known pre-1900 buildings. (Existing historic maps to be the base.).	A wider approach of having an archaeological alert layer within the three pre-1900 towns of Hamilton West, Hamilton East and Frankton and include known pre-1900 buildings. (Existing historic maps to be the base.)
Waikato Historical Society - Neil Curgenvin, President	330.27	General	General	Support in part	<p>The Waikato Historical Society supports the review of historic heritage in principle.</p> <p>It would have been beneficial to the review and its associated survey for the Society to have been consulted at an earlier stage of the process. We have noticed errors in some of the draft inventory assessments and suggest a review of these is required by local historians.</p> <p>With our historical base we are interested in further consultation and would like to see more consultation regarding proposed historic heritage areas, as it is very difficult to understand what is being proposed, especially that intensification is another plan change. The stronger the discussion with local communities the better the result, such as was the process at Frankton railway village. The current process has been too brief, in our view.</p>	Further consultation is undertaken, and the built heritage inventories are reviewed by local historians.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears Keith Clapson - CKC Holdings Ltd	331.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed root protection zone is the impact on private property rights; stating that "any root protection zone that encroaches past Council's land into private property and believe that the root protection zone policy overlay should be amended accordingly".	Amend the Root Protection Zone extents to ensure there is no encroachment into private property or impacts on existing property rights.
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears Keith Clapson - CKC Holdings Ltd	331.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed root protection zone is the impact on private property rights; stating that "any root protection zone that encroaches past Council's land into private property and believe that the root protection zone policy overlay should be amended accordingly".	To amend the root protection zone policy overlay to ensure it does not encroach into private property land and confirm that the decision to introduce the new Notable Trees will not detract from any existing property rights.
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears Keith Clapson - CKC Holdings Ltd	331.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed root protection zone is the impact on private property rights; stating that "any root protection zone that encroaches past Council's land into private property and believe that the root protection zone policy overlay should be amended accordingly".	To amend the root protection zone policy overlay to ensure it does not encroach into private property land and confirm that the decision to introduce the new Notable Trees will not detract from any existing property rights.
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears Keith Clapson - CKC Holdings Ltd	331.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed root protection zone is the impact on private property rights; stating that "any root protection zone that encroaches past Council's land into private property and believe that the root protection zone policy overlay should be amended accordingly".	To amend the root protection zone policy overlay to ensure it does not encroach into private property land and confirm that the decision to introduce the new Notable Trees will not detract from any existing property rights.
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	332.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter identifies the conflict between the mapped SNAs and the roading alignment within the Peacocke Precinct under PC9 (particularly the SNA notation proposed under PC9 for the Mangakotukutuku Gully System - SNA C87) because it directly conflicts with the proposed roading alignments that extend across the through the gully system.	Comprehensively review the alignment for all roads in the Peacocke Structure Plan (Southern Links) area to avoid direct impacts on SNA areas and on the habitat of the nationally significant long-tailed bat including realignment of the roading network to avoid roads (and associated works) within, adjacent to, or crossing the Mangakotukutuku Gully (SNA C87) and other SNA areas within the Peacocke Precinct.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Envivo Limited - James Hook Margaret and Murray Shaw	332.2	General	General		Designation A106 is in direct conflict with Part 2 of the Act and SNA (C87).	<p>Defer decisions on Plan Change 5 – Peacocke Structure Plan, until the following actions are completed AND</p> <p>Following completion of the review of all roading alignments required by c), Notify a new Notice of Requirement in accordance with s.168A for roading within the (Southern Links) area AND</p> <p>Once the Notice of Requirement in d) is confirmed undertake a Variation to Plan Change 5 – Peacocke Structure Plan to incorporate the new roading alignments determined by the Notice of Requirement process AND</p> <p>Such consequential relief that is necessary to satisfy the concerns of the Submitter.</p>
The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest and Bird) - Elvina Van Der Leden	333.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the impact of light spill and glare on indigenous fauna within SNAs - Hamilton City Council should further develop SNA and biodiversity protection initiatives which continue to align with nature-based solutions to climate change and biodiversity loss. <p>18. Under the 2-Tiered SNA categories, the alignment and enforcement of policies for both categories must align with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. NPS-IB 3.10 Managing adverse effects on SNAs of new subdivision, use, and development OR b. WRPS 11.1.3 Avoidance, remediation, mitigation and offsetting (for indigenous biodiversity that is not significant): Regional and district plans.
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears	334.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes to the lack of integration between Plan Change 9 and Plan Change 12 because there are several chosen bulk historic heritage areas that appear to conflict with potential development in some of the newly identified areas in PC12.	To align final notified decisions of Plan Change 9 with Plan Change 12 to enable appropriate consideration of both historic heritage and enabling housing supply.
MG Solutions Ltd - Sam Shears	334.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes to root protection zone associated to notable trees impacting private property rights unless every specific land owner affected has agreed rather than not responded through the District Plan change process.	Removal of any root protection zone policy overlay associated with proposed new notable trees on Council land that encroaches into private property

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Hamilton Central Business Association - Vanessa Williams	335.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the identification and implementation of Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 as to support and benefit the contribution of buildings and place have throughout history in contributing to the story of Hamilton.	Supports the identification and implementation of Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9.
Hamilton Central Business Association - Vanessa Williams	335.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter would like to see enough scope within the plan to allow for a case by case submission being assessed, rather than a blanket rule applying to all.	Common sense application of the HHA [Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area] when applied to development within the central city, with no unreasonable barrier or cost applied.
Hamilton Central Business Association - Vanessa Williams	335.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	HCBA supports the HHA being implemented to benefit the natural historic beautification of the city, however is strongly against this being seen as an additional barrier and cost to development in the CBD.	Common sense application of the HHA when applied to development within the central city, with no unreasonable barrier or cost applied.
Mitch Thomas	336.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions in Plan Change 9 HHA .	Hamilton City Council should not go forward with PC9 HHA.
Mitch Thomas	336.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions in Plan Change 9 HHA	Hamilton City Council should not go forward with PC9 HHA
Mitch Thomas	336.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions in Plan Change 9 HHA	Hamilton City Council should not go forward with PC9 HHA.
Mitch Thomas	336.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions in Plan Change 9 HHA .	Hamilton City Council should not go forward with PC9 HHA.
Mitch Thomas	336.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the provisions in Plan Change 9 HHA.	Hamilton City Council should not go forward with PC9 HHA

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Julie Norma Smith	337.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>Firstly let me say the Waikato river has never been maintained via the methodology of 'dredging' which would afford its protection since that wise gentleman 'Caeser Roose' and his employees threw in the towel!</p> <p>Councils have a lot of work on their hands at the expense of the rate payer to clean up a so-called river that due expressly to neglect, has degraded into a large and filthy drain!</p> <p>And why because council sat on its hands seduced by a rapacious greed for development irrespective of the adverse effect on a fragile environment and the lack thereof of any such mitigating regulations.</p> <p>Identifiable Historic and Heritage Areas, Archaeological sites, Significant Natural Areas, and Notable trees must be protected for posterity. Such clauses/provisions in the absence of ambiguity and fictiousness would serve to make up a prodigious whole, galvanising the preservation of a lost past. But why now when the horse has bolted? ie; The Hamilton Hotel which falls under the definition of 'Built Heritage' has been totally gutted leaving only the façade! No Heritage remains.</p>	No specific relief sought.
Julie Norma Smith	337.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that Plan Change 9 should better protect the remaining built heritage, stating:</p> <p>"Marama Street was classified 'high density'. It is a built heritage early settlers residential area, circa early 1900s. My great grandfather arrived as 4th Waikato Miltia onboard the Rangiora on Waikato river. My grandfather, father and now myself have lived in the same Villa on Marama St all our lives. Council has allowed demolition of most of the villas".</p>	If current council wants to honour redemption it must save what is left of this heritage foundation area [Marama Street].
Julie Norma Smith	337.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that Plan Change 9 should better protect the remaining built heritage, stating:</p> <p>"Marama Street was classified 'high density'. It is a built heritage early settlers residential area, circa early 1900s. My great grandfather arrived as 4th Waikato Miltia onboard the Rangiora on Waikato river. My grandfather, father and now myself have lived in the same Villa on Marama St all our lives. Council has allowed demolition of most of the villas".</p>	If current council wants to honour redemption it must save what is left of this heritage foundation area [Marama Street].
Ronald Gordon White	338.1	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes Plan Change 9 in its entirety. The submitter is concerned that the proposed built heritage will remove private property rights and impose fines on property owners that do not meet the standards. The submitter is also concerned that the heritage assessments undertaken to support the plan change will ultimately be paid by ratepayers and considers that there are local heritage groups that could provide information to Council.</p>	Withdraw Plan Change 9, and in particular rejects Built Heritage A and B and the Heritage Zoning of 7 King Street.
Ronald Gordon White	338.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the identification of 7 King Street (H225) as a B-ranked building in Schedule 8A. A New Zealand Herald article written by Anne McEwen points out that this particular property holds no historic value. The submitter considers that no notable persons have ever lived at the property. The submitter states that the property is located in an area containing buildings for offices, commercial and industrial uses and the property should reflect the surrounding uses.</p>	Amend Schedule 8A by removing built heritage item H225.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Glen William Boyd	339.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitters oppose to a SNA (C28) at their property at 23 Hooker Avenue.	Exclude the property at 23 Hooker Avenue from the SNA (C28), and provide compensation for any reduction of capital value and potential use of the property.
Susan A. Ryder	340.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the implementation of 50m buffer and bat corridor which borders the Mangakootukutuku Stream on the property at 111 Peacockes Lane.	That Council to take ownership and maintains the buffer and bat corridor; and the pine trees are felled & native trees planted.
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer New Zealand Police ("NZ Police")	341.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the building at 12 Anzac Parade as a built heritage item because the listing of the Hamilton Central Police station building, and the associated restrictions this entails for future modification or demolition of all or parts of the building, will inhibit the ability of NZ Police to maintain and develop the building and the wider site as a fit for purpose policing facility.	Remove H153, 12 Anzac Parade from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer New Zealand Police ("NZ Police")	341.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the amendments proposed to Rule 19.3.1.I "Demolition of any structure or building ranked B", because the listing of the Hamilton Central Police station building, and the associated restrictions this entails for future modification or demolition of all or parts of the building, will inhibit the ability of NZ Police to maintain and develop the building and the wider site as a fit for purpose policing facility.	Amend Rule 19.3.1.I to read: Demolition of any structure or building ranked B. - Discretionary Activity
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer New Zealand Police ("NZ Police")	341.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T190 (Street Trees) along the frontage of 12 Anzac Parade, which includes two (2) Pin Oaks and two (2) Red Oaks. (T109 is being identified as Street Trees along Anzac Parade in Schedule 9D and includes T109.1, T109.2, T109.3 and T109.4.) The existing access to the site is through a narrow vehicle service lane and the protection of the trees will create a significant constraint for future improvement of access.	Remove the trees identified as T109 (T109.1, T109.2, T109.3 and T109.4) from Schedule 9D.
John Phillip White	342.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 7 King Street as a built heritage item (H225) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove H225, 7 King Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
John Phillip White	342.2	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the proposed classification on 7 King street is a violation of property rights and is theft of our property rights. And that being said there is no negotiation by the council or suggested negotiation. HCC plans to takes away our rights without anything in return. Any building, developers can claim tax back on building development. However as an a owner and with the financial strain the council wants to impose by violation on property owners without any tax incentives sadly, this is too much to bear. Heritage buildings are not easily sold and we reject the councils plans based on this also. In good faith the council should be able to see that this property going forward in the future should be made commercial or industrial to suit the surrounding areas.</p> <p>- As per below the council is not acting according to LGA. which states that the governing authorities must consider the needs of future generations, and the need to enhance the quality of the environment. Forcing Built Heritage on 7 King Street does not consider the economic social and cultural interest of the property owners neither is it an enhancement of the commercial/industrial area 7 King Street is located in, nor does HCC proposal consider the future generations and their need for housing</p>	<p>That the HCC considers the following for buildings that they wish to make built Heritage.</p> <p>Tax exemptions, Reduced Rates, A grant that allows properties owners to maintain and reflect to a suitable standard that reflects the value and integrity of their properties and true New Zealand Heritage Standards.</p>
John Phillip White	342.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of 7 King street because of the financial strain on the occupant. Devastating. This is a commercial and industrial area. The noise here is not suitable for this type of building as it requires significant maintenance, double glazed windows would not be suitable under the Heritage Built Act, neither is the building suitable for a commercial property as the building requires extreme maintenance. Over the past 10 years significant upkeep has been spent on this property to maintain it. Given that this property is to be divided in the future as an inheritance. Being sold to a developer, it would be worth a significant value. Making this property Heritage takes away its value by up to, if not more than a million dollars. Forcing plan change 9 on King Street is theft, and robbery on the councils part, removing our rights as property owners, we have owned this property for 44 years and have been residents here. The surrounding buildings are all commercial now and going forward this building should be considered for demolition and a commercial building should be built here to keep this property consistent with its surroundings. And we reject the councils proposal to remove this right from us when this time comes to fruition. Furthermore the house is full of bora, and to maintain King Street to a heritage standard will not be affordable by the property owners. The financial strain of making this house build heritage is far too great on the property owner, thus we reject 7 King Street being Heritage A or Heritage B or being part of a historic heritage area under plan change 9.</p>	<p>That the following are provided to owners of built heritage items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tax exemptions • reduced rates • A grant that allows properties owners to maintain and reflect to a suitable standard that reflects the value and integrity of their properties and true New Zealand Heritage Standards.
Darryl and Jo Ward	343.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 233 River Road because there has been a lack of consultation, significant renovations have been undertaken, the property has low historical significance, the disproportionate effects on property owners, and the current homeowner has not agreed to it.</p>	<p>Remove H280, 233 River Road from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Darryl and Jo Ward	343.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Claudelands Historic Heritage Area overlaying their properties at 233 and 237 River Road - HHA8 - Claudelands.	Amend the extent of the Historic Heritage Area, HH8 - Claudelands by removal of the area west of River Road from Boundary Road to O'Neil Street.
Darryl and Jo Ward	343.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support in part	The submitter partially supports the SNA (C67) on 233 River Road because the proposed SNA boundary imposes significantly on the property. The area requested to be removed consists mainly of 2 large non-native trees that have had significant prior pruning and will require future pruning.	Reduce the extent of the SNA (C67) on the property at 233 River Road by approximately 25% (see diagram in the submission).
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitters and co-signatories support the Claudelands HHA, however, have several concerns with specific details and rules. They also support with the Built Heritage of Claudelands West... "Intensification will lead to increased infrastructure problems".	Supports generally the Claudelands HHA with several concerns with specific details and rules. Supports the Built Heritage of Claudelands West and retain low-density housing pattern.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter advises to include parts of Oakley Avenue and Stanley St that have concentrations of pre-1939 housing representing early settlement of Hamilton in the Claudelands HHA , these areas are mainly on the western half of Stanley Street and the southern half of Oakley Avenue. Those areas should be remained under the HHA instead of current Special Character area. The submitter also advises to merge the Claudelands HHA and the Myrtle Street and Te Aroha Street (West) HHA as they belong to similar heritage.	We propose that: a) The boundary for the Claudelands HHA should be extended to incorporate areas of pre-1939 housing on the western half of Stanley Street and the southern half of Oakley Avenue. b) The Myrtle Stree and Te Aroha St (West) HHA should be merged with the Claudelands HHA. They represent slightly different periods of development of Hamilton, but combining them would establish a more cohesive heritage area.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule 19.3.2(e), however, advises that demolition of pre-1939 building should be classified as Non Complying (NC), to be consistent with current rules for the Character Zone.	Insert the new rule for demolition of pre-1939 buildings to be classified as Non Complying (NC) under the 19.3.2 (Activity Status Table for HHA).
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes rule 19.3.2(j) because this rule is overly restrictive to require consents for scaffolding. Scaffolding is included in the definition of new buildings.	Oppose the inclusion of scaffolding in the definition of new buildings in the HHA.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter supports in part rule 19.4.3, however the construction of high fences with no gaps can degrade the heritage value of the area.	Seeks the relaxing of rule 19.4.3 for one side of corner properties.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports with specification of the activity status as NC for New apartments and similar high-intensity development in the Claudelands Character Zone.	Retain as NC for New apartments and similar high-intensity development as NC under the HHA provisions.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter advises to make amendments rule 19.6 (RD activities in HHA) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The restrictions for particular heritage buildings, such as curtilage protection and scaffoldings, are likely to be less appropriate for HHA, instead, HHA may have restrictions such as street setback. • To do separate table for Built Heritage versus HHA. <p>The submitter also supports in part consideration of new buildings under the rule 19.6 (RD activities in HHA), however advise to add additional matters to the RD considerations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Building setback. Maintain setback and building line, as in the current provisions of the Claudelands Special Character Area. • Include consideration of separation between new buildings and existing buildings, especially for pre-1939 buildings, to be consistent with historical context." 	Amend 19.6 so that matters for discretion for built heritage are different to the matters for discretion applied to HHAs. Seek an additional section, akin to section E be introduced for HHA.
Alexander (Sandy) Elliott	344.8	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the protecting of street trees identified in PC9, however, highlights the roots of such trees can encroach into the private properties and there will be impacts upon drains, foundations, driveways and gardens.	Request Council arborists to work with property owners to remove or accommodate roots without imperilling the trees. Support the tree protections afforded in PC9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
KFS Properties Limited - Karl Sawyer	345.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the entirety of chapter 19 and associated provisions in chapter 4 that relate to the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets HHA, stating that: "the proposed plan change is subjective and imposing on private property rights with the residential zone that I have purchased this house in. What is described in the information that has been provided to me in my view relates more to perceived character, rather than Historic Heritage. This area to me feels no different to the wider Maeroa/Forest Lake suburbs with a mixture of housing typologies and designs".	Confirmation that I can maintain and upkeep my property (alterations, extensions, fencing, choice of colours without the requirement of having to go through a land use consent. This includes maintaining my rights under the current Operative District Plan to subdivide.
KFS Properties Limited - Karl Sawyer	345.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the entirety of chapter 19 and associated provisions in chapter 4 that relate to the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets HHA, stating that: "the proposed plan change is subjective and imposing on private property rights with the residential zone that I have purchased this house in. What is described in the information that has been provided to me in my view relates more to perceived character, rather than Historic Heritage. This area to me feels no different to the wider Maeroa/Forest Lake suburbs with a mixture of housing typologies and designs".	Confirmation that I can maintain and upkeep my property (alterations, extensions, fencing, choice of colours without the requirement of having to go through a land use consent. This includes maintaining my rights under the current Operative District Plan to subdivide.
KFS Properties Limited - Karl Sawyer	345.3	4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the entirety of chapter 19 and associated provisions in chapter 4 that relate to the Matai, Hinau and Rata Streets HHA, stating that: "the proposed plan change is subjective and imposing on private property rights with the residential zone that I have purchased this house in. What is described in the information that has been provided to me in my view relates more to perceived character, rather than Historic Heritage. This area to me feels no different to the wider Maeroa/Forest Lake suburbs with a mixture of housing typologies and designs".	Confirmation that I can maintain and upkeep my property (alterations, extensions, fencing, choice of colours without the requirement of having to go through a land use consent. This includes maintaining my rights under the current Operative District Plan to subdivide.
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	We support the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	That Hamilton City Council approve Plan Change 9: with the inclusion of amendments relating to providing "closer alignment of the District Plan text to the wording of the Resource Management Act 1991, with regard to Historic Heritage Areas (being historic heritage as defined in the RMA)".
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	We seek that Hamilton City Council approve Plan Change 9: with the inclusion of amendments to 19.1 Purpose: Historic Heritage Areas, 19.1j intention and 19.1k qualities, to align with the language of the District Plan's Appendix 8-1.2 Heritage Assessment Criteria and with RMA Section 2.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.3	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter supports the the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices; and seek seek closer alignment of the District Plan text to the wording of the Resource Management Act 1991, with regard to Historic Heritage Areas (being historic heritage as defined in the RMA).	Amend the definition for Historic Heritage Area in Appendix 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan to align with the language of the RMA. I.e. include reference to "natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures," and the associated criteria (architectural, cultural, historic).
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.4	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	Subject to proposed amendments, the submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	Amend Appendix 1.2.2.8 Historic Heritage Areas – Additional Information Requirements, 1.2.28b to align to the amended definition [for Historic Heritage Area in Appendix 1.1.2] and to explicitly align with the RMA. I.e. effects on identified values, and their understanding and appreciation.
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	Subject to proposed amendments, the submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	Amend the title: Appendix 8-1 Assessment of Historic Buildings and Structures to read: Appendix 8-1 Assessment of Historic Buildings, Structures <u>and Areas</u> .
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is requesting the amendment of HHA 11 to include 20 additional properties along Brookfield Street as shown in the submission. The submitter suggests that this part of Brookfield Street is equally, if not more representative of these two themes (being the pre-1930s establishment of a service town, and the SAC era of the post-war / 1950s period) and that the street retains a high degree of historical and visual integrity and that as a result, that the RMA-defined qualities this area contributes to are predominately architectural, cultural and historical.	Amend the Graham Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA11 to include the of the western portion of Brookfield Street, between Graham Street and Macfarlane Street, and number 27 and 39 McFarlane Street.
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	Subject to proposed amendments, the submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	Amend Appendix 8-1.2 Heritage Assessment Criteria to also apply to HHAs as well as individual buildings / structures. It is noted that these criteria align with RMA Section 2.
Peter David and Annette Beryl Hill	346.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Subject to proposed amendments, the submitter supports the inclusion of Historic Heritage Areas in the District Plan, including the provisions in Chapter 19 and in the appendices.	Appendix 8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas should be modified to be a subset of (provide additional detail for) the Heritage Assessment Criteria. I.e. "themes" are a subset of historic qualities and cultural qualities, are a subset of physical/aesthetic/architectural qualities and context/group qualities.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the introduction of Built Heritage overlays in Plan Change 9 (PC9) which proposes that buildings or structures that have been substantially altered, or are in such poor structural or physical condition, such that that rehabilitation is not practicable. Similarly, the Submitter also opposes the imposition of HHAs overlays in general. HHAs are opposed because they significantly restrict the fair and reasonable development of developable land – particularly with regard to the NPS-UD direction and the impending Plan Change 12 process where the proposed overlays over prime developable land (i.e., in the walking catchment around urban centres and public transport). The Submitter considers that much of the HHA mapping is too high-level in nature and assigns significant restrictions to land development entitlements on one property – yet properties which are abutting have not been subjected to the notified HHA overlay. The Submitter specifically opposes HHAs in cases where they consist of less than 10 sites, as these areas will be seen through only fleeting views due to the small area that is protected and thus will contribute little to the perceived historic heritage of the area.	No specific relief requested.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the introduction of Built Heritage overlays in Plan Change 9 (PC9) which proposes that buildings or structures that have been substantially altered, or are in such poor structural or physical condition, such that that rehabilitation is not practicable. Similarly, the Submitter also opposes the imposition of HHAs overlays in general. HHAs are opposed because they significantly restrict the fair and reasonable development of developable land – particularly with regard to the NPS-UD direction and the impending Plan Change 12 process where the proposed overlays over prime developable land (i.e., in the walking catchment around urban centres and public transport). The Submitter considers that much of the HHA mapping is too high-level in nature and assigns significant restrictions to land development entitlements on one property – yet properties which are abutting have not been subjected to the notified HHA overlay. The Submitter specifically opposes HHAs in cases where they consist of less than 10 sites, as these areas will be seen through only fleeting views due to the small area that is protected and thus will contribute little to the perceived historic heritage of the area.	No specific relief requested.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.3a and Policy 19.2.3b to the extent that they acknowledge that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances.	Retain, as notified, Policies 19.2.3a and 19.2.3b.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes objective 19.2.4 and associated policies and specifically policy 19.2.4c. Reasons given include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy is too restrictive (e.g. for the demolition or removal of accessory buildings) • the blanket approach to the preparation of heritage assessments is considered inappropriate and should not necessarily be required for all sites – particularly where such alterations or additions are not visible. 	<p>Seeks amendment to Policies 19.2.4c and 19.2.4d as follows:</p> <p>Policy 19.2.4c</p> <p>“The design, material use and placement of buildings and structures, including relocated buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings, demonstrate consistency<u>compatibility</u> with the physical and visual qualities of the historic heritage area through a Heritage Impact Assessment.”</p> <p>Policy 19.2.4d</p> <p>“The effects of demolition or removal of existing building, including detached accessory building, on a front, corner or through site within a historic heritage area is managed<u>are considered in order</u> to protect the identified historic heritage values.”</p>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the objective and policy set (only to the extent that it acknowledges new development can occur) however, opposes the blanket requirement for a site-specific heritage assessment as being too restrictive and should be determined on a case-by-case basis.	Seeks the deletion of proposed Policy 19.2.5a(iv)
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the blanket requirement for all archaeological features to be physically recorded under Objective 19.2.6f. Rather, the Submitter considers that the wording should be reviewed to allow recording of features on a case-by-case basis as per their significance.	<p>Amend Objective 19.2.6. f as follows:</p> <p>“Where features of significant archaeological and cultural sites are lost, <u>consideration should be given to whether</u> these features must <u>should</u> be recorded and recognised through on-site marking to ensure the historical legibility of Hamilton City.”</p>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement that alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HAAs will need consent. Also opposes the max fence height (1.2) within HAAs as being unnecessarily restrictive.	<p>Amend Rule 19.3.2 a to read:</p> <p>a. Alterations and additions to an existing building on a front, corner or through site within an HHA <u>where the building contributes to the identified characteristics of the HHA</u> (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage): RD</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement that alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HAAs will need consent. Also opposes the max fence height (1.2) within HHAs as being unnecessarily restrictive.	Amend 19.3.2f to read: f. Demolition of existing detached accessory buildings on a front, corner or through site within an HHA <u>where the building contributes to the identified characteristics of the HHA</u> (excluding heritage buildings listed in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage): RD
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the max fence height (1.2) within HHAs as being unnecessarily restrictive.	Amend 19.3.2h to read: h. Fences and/or walls located forward of the front building line of the dwelling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a maximum height of 1.2m: P • Have a maximum height of 1.8m: RD P ...
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.10	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.	Amend 19.3.2 j to read: j. New buildings <u>dwellings</u> : RD
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirement for no fencing at front boundaries on Victoria Street and a maximum height of 1.2m as being unreasonable and excessively restrictive and compromising to privacy and on-site amenity.	Remove the 1.2m max height for fences and walls.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the purpose of Chapter 20 to the extent that <u>all gully</u> systems are considered SNAs. Many sections of gully systems across the City are simply grassed, occupied, and contain no significant vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna. In situations of modified, occupied or ecologically insignificant sections of gully system it is inappropriate to identify them as SNA without verification - and thus to restrict potential development in the vicinity of such areas.	Amend 20.1e to read: e. Significant Natural Areas include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The <u>vegetated</u> Waikato River corridor and gully systems. ii. Peat lakes and wetlands. iii. Remnant indigenous vegetation or trees. iv. Other areas that contribute to indigenous biodiversity
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle the amendments to the objective 20.2.1 and associated policies, to the extent that they promote an effects-based management approach. Specifically, the introduced policies relating to the construction of infrastructure such as walkways in SNAs, pruning and maintenance in SNAs, and the introduction of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation are pragmatic and acknowledge that adverse effects will occur in such situations but can be managed. The submitter is not in favour of proposed Policy 20.2.1b as currently drafted. The submitter considers that inaccurate SNA mapping will unreasonably restrict landowners to undertake land development entitlements to their properties – and hence, it is considered fair and reasonable to expect policy direction to acknowledge the need for accuracy.	Amend Policy 20.2.1b to read: <u>Accurately</u> M map areas of significant indigenous vegetation and, significant habitats of indigenous fauna on the planning maps as Significant Natural Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter supports the amendments to objective 20.2.3 and policies 20.2.3a - 20.2.3e to the extent that they promote an effects-based management system; the amendments acknowledge opportunities for replacement, relocation and trimming of notable trees in some instances but seeks an amendment to Policy 20.2.3b. Many Notable Trees are located where they severely restrict the most basic activities that can occur within residential sites and the removal of such trees should not be prevented from being an option in the District Plan.	Amend Policy 20.2.3b (or similar wording to the same effect) to read: Removal or transplantation of Notable Trees within established urban areas shall be avoided except where: i. Alternative options for the retention of the tree have been exhausted. ii. The extent to which the removal, re-location, or trimming can be mitigated by replacement planting. iii. <u>The tree places unreasonable restrictions on activities that could occur within the residential properties surrounding the tree where the activities would otherwise be permitted in the underlying zoning.</u>
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports the revisions to the activity status table including the recognition that low-risk activities and activities associated with restoration should not require consent. However it seeks removal of the word 'exotic' in Rule 20.3p because a non complying activity status to prune, maintain or remove exotic vegetation in a SNA is too restricted.	Amend Rule 20.3p to read: All other pruning, maintenance, planting or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation in a Significant Natural Area not provided for by another rule in this table.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.17	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter supports proposed Objective 23.2.5 and Policy 23.2.5a to the extent that they use the words avoid, remedy or mitigates adverse effects.	No specific relief stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.18	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 23.3 xi as those matters identified in the proposed new rule are prescriptive to archaeological, heritage and cultural sites. Consequently, a Restrictive Discretionary activity should apply in the context of the General Residential Zone with reference to the appropriate assessment criteria already outlined in Appendix 1.3.	That a Restricted Discretionary activity status apply when the site is zoned General Residential; with reference to the existing appropriate assessment criteria in Appendix 1.3.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes policy 19.2.3f, and considers it too restrictive for new development and seeks that the term 'consistent' be removed and replaced with 'compatible' to allow more flexibility with design.	Amend Policy 19.2.3.f. to read: "The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the setting of a historic heritage building or structure in Schedule 8A, shall be consistent <u>compatible</u> with identified heritage"

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.20	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes HHAs and the requirement for development and subdivision in HHAs to be consistent with the scale, form, bulk and height as the identified heritage values.	Amend Assessment Criteria E1 b. to read: 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.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.21	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 D3.f. if amended to change the emphasis from 'internationally' to 'locally'.	Amend Assessment Criteria 1.3.3 D3. f. to read: Be undertaken in a manner consistent with internationally <u>locally</u> accepted arboricultural standards, practices and procedures
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.22	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of SNAs where the mapped area does not align with the physical feature/s or characteristics of each site. The Submitter seeks amendments to the 'mapped' SNA areas that contain no significant vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna – just grass for example. Because, a blanket SNA overlay will take away significant buildable areas (i.e., making most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all) – which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential or residential medium density particularly where not significant vegetation is present beyond a grass slope.	Remap SNA that contain no significant vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of HHAs and considers that much of the related mapping is inaccurate in nature assigning restrictions on some properties and none on those adjoining the HHA. Submitter considers that properties (e.g. those within walkable catchment of neighbourhood centres) are valuable developable land and that HHA's will restrict development which is contrary to the direction of the NPS-UD. Submitter specifically opposes HHAs where they consist of less than 10 dwellings.	No specific relief stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.24	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of Built Heritage where buildings and structures have been substantially altered or are in such poor structural or physical condition that rehabilitation is not practicable. Demolition or removal and rebuilding may be cheaper or more profitable and should be enabled.	Specific relief not stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.25	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter considers that proposed HHA 17 should not include the residential dwellings located along the eastern side of Claremont Avenue to the north of the Dalmont Place intersection. Submitter considers that these properties are much more dominated in character by their location to the arterial Hukanui Road and that they are considered to be peripheral to the character intent of the HAA and offer little to the overall perception of the HHA.	Seeks that the properties located to the east of Claremont Avenue, and north of the Dalmont Place/ Claremont Avenue intersection are excluded from HHA 17.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd. - Lynne Sun	347.26	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		<p>The submitter supports in principle the amendments to the objective 20.2.1 and associated policies, to the extent that they promote an effects-based management approach.</p> <p>Specifically, the introduced policies relating to the construction of infrastructure such as walkways in SNAs, pruning and maintenance in SNAs, and the introduction of biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation are pragmatic and acknowledge that adverse effects will occur in such situations but can be managed.</p> <p>The submitter is not in favour of proposed Policy 20.2.1c applying the highly restrictive word "Avoid" when considering adverse effects on SNA and seek the inclusion of the words "remedy or mitigate". Alternatively, it is considered that Policy 20.2.1c should adopt pragmatic wording to the same extent as proposed in Policy 20.2.1d whereby a management approach to a SNA overlay.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 20.2.1c applying the highly restrictive word "Avoid" when considering adverse effects on SNA and seek the inclusion of the words "remedy or mitigate".</p> <p>OR alternatively:</p> <p>Policy 20.2.1c adopt the pragmatic wording as Policy 20.2.1d to apply a management approach to a SNA overlay.</p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction of development of its land, 104 Brookfield Street, and associated costs that will arise from it. It is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance. It seems that "moderate value" is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development.</p> <p>The layout of the plan change is very cumbersome and confusing to follow for any lay person. It presents a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. It is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	That Alterations and Additions to an existing building which do not change the street facing façade be a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction of development of its land, 104 Brookfield Street, and associated costs that will arise from it. It is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance. It seems that "moderate value" is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development.</p> <p>The layout of the plan change is very cumbersome and confusing to follow for any lay person. It presents a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. It is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	That demolition of existing detached accessory buildings be a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.3	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements		<p>The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction of development of its land, 104 Brookfield Street, and associated costs that will arise from it. It is difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance. It seems that “moderate value” is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development.</p> <p>The layout of the plan change is very cumbersome and confusing to follow for any lay person. It presents a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. It is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	<p>Amend 1.2.2.8 to read:</p> <p>(a) Any activity requiring resource consent, <u>for a new building or additions, alterations, or relocation of an existing building</u>, relating to a <u>front, corner or through</u> site located<u>located</u> within a historic heritage area shall<u>may be required</u> to include a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the resource consent application. <u>Where an assessment is required to be provided it shall address the matters in (b) – (e) below as relevant to the proposed activity.</u></p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the activity status for new buildings, stating a concern that the presents rule framework is a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals. The effect of Plan Change 9 as is relates to front sites within the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area (and by default all other Historic Heritage Areas).</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.3.2j to accommodate a permitted activity status for new buildings located behind the existing dwelling.</p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.5	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the requirement for any activity requiring a resource consent to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. Stating this requirement automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants.</p>	<p>That requirement for provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment only occurs in relation to construction of new buildings/additions to existing buildings which propose to change the nature of the street frontage and that discretion be given to enable this to be applied on a case by case basis.</p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L M Peake	348.6	General	General	Oppose	<p>That Section 19 be rewritten to be more user friendly and better aligned with National Planning Standards. The submitter provides an example of how this could be achieved.</p>	<p>Apply the National Planning Standards to the format for Plan Change 9.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		<p>Refer to the full Submission, paragraph 13, page 6:</p> <p>Hamilton City Council, as a JMA partner with Waikato-Tainui, have a duty to uphold the objectives of the Waikato Raupatu Land Settlement 1995. Waikato-Tainui seek the addition of a new policy to Chapter 20 to recognise the injustices that occurred through confiscation and to enable the growth of Waikato-Tainui and its people</p>	<p>The addition of a new policy to Chapter 20 to recognise the injustices that occurred through confiscation and to enable the growth of Waikato-Tainui and its people</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.2	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports Policy 7.2.6i, requiring developments within the historic heritage area to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. However, it is unclear what is meant by the term “sympathetic”. This implies the heritage values are not required to be recognised or provided for.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 7.2.6i to read: Developments within the historic heritage area are required to be sympathetic <u>provide for</u> the heritage values and be accompanied with a Heritage Impact Assessment.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.3	Chapter 16 Community Facilities Zone	16.2 Objectives and Policies: Community Facilities Zone	Support in part	The submitter, while supporting in part Policy 16.2.2d state that it is unclear what is meant by the term "sympathetic" in the policy. However, this policy goes further to say, "the development and use within the historic heritage areas shall protect and appropriately be integrated...". To include the term "sympathetic" minimises the recognition for heritage values to be protected and provided for. Waikato-Tainui seek deletion of the term "sympathetic".	Amend Policy 16.2.2d by deleting the words ' <i>and sympathetic</i> ', to read: The development and use within the historic heritage areas shall protect and appropriately be integrated and sympathetic to the identified heritage values of the area.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.1d as notified, however an amendment, the removal of the word <i>has</i> , is requested for clarity.	Amend Policy 19.2.1d by deleting the word <i>has</i> , as follows: "The relationship Mana Whenua have with both the whenua and awa, and the spiritual, cultural and/or historical significance of the whenua and awa has to Mana Whenua shall be recognised and provided for."
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	[The submitter attributes this point to policy 19.2.6c however, this policy does not contain the words "are known to". The submitter is likely referring to policy 19.21a] The submitter opposes the inclusion of the wording "are known to". This may be interpreted as only those sites that have been scheduled and may preclude those Sites of Significance to Maaori that have now been removed from Proposed Plan Change 9. It also may preclude sites that haven't been scheduled but are identified through consultation with mana whenua.	[The submitter attributes this point to policy 19.2.6c however, this policy does not contain the words "are known to". The submitter is likely referring to policy 19.21a] Amend Policy 19.2.6c [Policy 19.2.6a] to delete the words "are known to".
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter considers that activities associated with customary activities have not been included in activity status table 19.3.3.	Add the following activity to activity status table 19.3.3 as a permitted activity: <u>"d. Any activity enabling the practice of customary activities."</u>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter seeks that the same provisions should apply to all archaeological and cultural sites. Therefore, provision 19.4.2b should also apply to Schedule 8C: Group 2.	Amend Rule 19.4.2b as follows: "Applications for earthworks within a site in Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites <u>or Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites</u> , 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."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		<p>The submitter highlights that through RMA Schedule 1 Clause 4A consultation, in the draft version Waikato-Tainui received, an addition to Chapter 19 (included as 19.8 Other Methods) was drafted as follows:</p> <p><u>“Resource user or activity operator to work with Waikato-Tainui to ensure resource use, activity, or site specific methods are agreed to manage adverse effects so as to appropriately protect areas and sites of significance.</u></p> <p><u>Resource user or activity operator to work with Waikato-Tainui through an agreed consultation and management process, to identify areas or sites of significance that are or could be effected by an existing or proposed resource use or activity.”</u></p> <p>Waikato-Tainui provided comments on this stating it is unclear whether this is a requirement or guidance for best practice and that Waikato-Tainui would ultimately support this as a requirement. It is now noted that this has been removed entirely from the Proposed Plan Change 9.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui seek reinsertion of 19.8 Other Methods into Chapter 19 as a requirement. If it cannot be included as a requirement, then as a method.</p>	<p>The reinstatement of 19.8 Other Methods into Chapter 19 as a requirement. If it cannot be included as a requirement, then as a method:</p> <p><i>Resource user or activity operator to work with Waikato-Tainui to ensure resource use, activity, or site specific methods are agreed to manage adverse effects so as to appropriately protect areas and sites of significance.</i></p> <p><i>Resource user or activity operator to work with Waikato-Tainui through an agreed consultation and management process, to identify areas or sites of significance that are or could be effected by an existing or proposed resource use or activity.</i></p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>Refer to the full submission, paragraphs 10 - 12 and page 11, specific decision sought for Significant Natural Areas – Objective 20.2.1</p> <p>Land held by the Waikato-Tainui Land Holding Trustee should not be subject to the SNA provisions if it limits, or prevents, achieving the aspirations of the Iwi Authority.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui seek the inclusion of a separate policy framework pathway to recognise that the return of the lands are to enable the growth of Waikato-Tainui and its people and that the SNA provisions should not inhibit this. This policy framework pathway could provide for development of iwi land while recognising that this can occur subject to ensuring adverse effects to the environment are less than minor.</p>	<p>The inclusion of a separate policy framework pathway to recognise that the return of the lands are to enable the growth of Waikato-Tainui and its people and that the SNA provisions should not inhibit this.</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports 20.1 Purpose, 20.1e Significant Natural Areas, to include the whole of the Waikato River corridor and gully systems, not just specified sites of the Waikato River corridor and gully system.</p>	<p>Retain the reference to the whole of the Waikato River corridor and gully systems in 20.1 Purpose, 20.1e Significant Natural Areas</p>
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	<p>Policy 20.2.1h <i>Recognise the need for essential pruning, maintenance and tree removal in Significant Natural Areas where these have minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, including customary activities and actions necessary to address a high risk to public health and safety, and property</i></p> <p>Waikato-Tainui support the recognition of the need for activities within a Significant Natural Area associated with customary activities.</p>	<p>Retain, as notified the recognition of customary activities in Policy 20.2.1h.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table, subheading - Vegetation pruning, maintenance, planting and removal in a Significant Natural Area, Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9) Waikato Tainui support the permitted pathway for activities that need to be enabled, such as customary activities, activities associated with restoration, and activities where there is an unacceptable risk to public health, safety or property.	Retain, as notified the activities listed under the subheading in Rule 20.3 - Vegetation pruning, maintenance, planting and removal in a Significant Natural Area, Schedule 9C (Volume 2, Appendix 9)
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.13	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3a, Rule 23.3a.xi. requiring consent to be granted for any subdivision of an allotment within an archaeological and cultural site, within any zone identified in Hamilton City Council.	Retain 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3a, Rule 23.3a.xi. as notified.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.14	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter seeks further clarity on the definition of historic heritage areas and how character in the special character zones within the district plan are explained. These are arguably very similar definitions. Therefore, an area that has been identified as being a historic heritage area may hold character values and be unnecessarily included within the provisions relating to HHA. <u>Historic Heritage Areas</u> are defined in the Proposed Plan Change provisions as “Means an identified area with historic heritage value which are representative of their development period, and are consistent in their physical and visual qualities, including street pattern, lot layout and density, natural environment, housing typologies and street frontage treatments”. <u>Special character zones</u> are not defined in the definitions however in Chapter 5 Special Character Zones, it is noted that “Character is influenced by the natural and built environment, architectural styles, the layout of streets and residential lots (and their size), land use, the trees, fences, landscaped areas and open space and the heritage and cultural values”.	Further clarity is provided relating to the definitions of historic heritage areas, character and special character zones.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter considers that it is unclear why archaeological and cultural sites have been identified in two groups. Table 19.3.3 contains two activities status' for earthworks on scheduled sites, one with an RDA status and one with a CA status. All archaeological and cultural sites are threatened by activities such as earthworks and a controlled activity status is not considered adequate protection from damage by earthworks.	Amend Rule 19.3.3d to a restricted discretionary activity status.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports part of Note 1 to Table 19.3.3 that states "The consent holder or proponent must engage with a representative of Mana Whenua to ensure cultural protocols are adhered to and decisions made are culturally appropriate." and considers that it should be included in the specific standards so that it carries statutory weight.	Add the statement from Note 1 to Table 19.3.3 to section 19.4 Rules - Specific Standards, as a rule.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports part of Note 1 to Table 19.3.3 that states "The consent holder or proponent must engage with a representative of Mana Whenua to ensure cultural protocols are adhered to and decisions made are culturally appropriate." and considers that it should be included in the specific standards so that it carries statutory weight.	Add the statement from Note 1 to Table 19.3.3 to section 19.4 Rules - Specific Standards, as a rule.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.18	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a policy recognising the role mana whenua as kaitiaki in protecting and restoring Significant Natural Areas and indigenous biodiversity. This helps to set an expectation at the policy level that mana whenua will be involved in resource consent applications that may impact on the values of SNA.	Retain, as notified Policy 20.2.1j.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.19	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3b, Rule 23.3b.xi. requiring consent to be granted for any subdivision of an allotment within an archaeological and cultural site, within any zone identified in Hamilton City Council.	Retain 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3b, Rule 23.3b.xi. as notified.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.20	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3c, Rule 23.3c.xi. requiring consent to be granted for any subdivision of an allotment within an archaeological and cultural site, within any zone identified in Hamilton City Council.	Retain 23.3 – Rules Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3c, Rule 23.3c.xi. as notified.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.21	General	General	Support	refer to the full submission, Subheading - Te Ture Whaimana O Te Awa O Waikato, paragraphs 14 - 17, pages 6 & 7: Waikato-Tainui support Proposed Plan Change 9 in relation to the manner in which it seeks to give effect to the objectives in Te Ture Whaimana Te Ture Whaimana has significant status and weighting in the RMA planning hierarchy. It is deemed to be part of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. It prevails over any inconsistent National Policy Statement, including the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.	In order to give effect to Te Ture Whaimana, Proposed Plan Change 9 must necessarily reflect and provide for its long-term objectives.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.22	General	General	Support	<p>The submitter supports the inclusion of provisions for engagement with mana whenua. However, with a number of plan changes being developed and more to come with similar provisions, the resourcing of mana whenua to provide feedback/recommendations may be limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Change 9 does not propose to alleviate any of the resourcing issues mana whenua face. • With Hamilton growing and becoming more developed, these issues will only intensify. • If Hamilton City Council are going to include these provisions throughout the District Plan Change Programme, resourcing needs to be provided for and a strategy needs to be discussed on how this can be more efficient for mana whenua, staff and applicants/resource users. 	That Hamilton City Council assists with resourcing needs, and that a strategy on how this can be more efficient for mana whenua, staff and applicants/resource users.
Waikato-Tainui (Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated) - Alana Mako	349.23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>Refer to the full submission, subheading - Overview of Waikato-Tainui concerns regarding PC9, paragraph 19:</p> <p>The executive summary of the Section 32 Evaluation Report notes that due to the extensive identification of Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori [SASMs] within the City, HCC have decoupled SASMs from Plan Change 9. The s32 report states that the decoupling will ensure the rest of the matters in PC9 are not slowed, PC9 notification achieved; and the extensive work done to date on SASMs can continue to be understood in the context of the RMA and through other non-RMA processes.</p> <p>Hamilton City Council are proposing to schedule all 109 archaeological sites recorded by the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA). The process to identify and record an archaeological site with NZAA is similar to the process HCC undertook to identify the SASMs through the development of PC9. Therefore, the identified SASMs shouldn't have been decoupled from PC9. To say that the "work done on SASMs can continue to be understood in the context of the RMA and through other non-RMA processes" goes against Section 5 of the RMA and Section 6(e) as Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori is included in the definition of 'historic heritage', which is the title of this plan change.</p> <p>Waikato-Tainui see the importance in keeping the SASMs and seek to have that progress imminently through another plan change.</p>	The Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori is progressed imminently through another plan change.
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling on the property at 2 Clifton Road.	Delete the Category B Built Heritage item reference H179 (Two Storey Arts & Crafts Dwelling at 2 Clifton Road) from Appendix 8, Schedule 8A - Built Heritage; and delete the built heritage notation for H179 from the planning maps

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	Seeks the amendment of Rule 19.3.1(q) in Chapter 19 - Historic Heritage so that: The rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures ranked A or B in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for accessory buildings and new buildings would be unnecessary and inefficient.	Amend Rule 19.3.1(q) to read: <u>Signs on a site containing buildings or structures ranked A or B</u> (refer also to Chapter 25.10: City-wide – Signs).
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.4	25.10 Signs	25.10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	Seeks the amendment of Rule 25.10.3(q) so that resource consents are not required where heritage buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed from sites identified in Schedule 8A (including by way of resource consent or previously granted certificate of compliance).	Amend Rule 25.10.3(f) to read: Low-intensity on <u>sites containing historic heritage buildings</u> and sites in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A and archaeological and cultural sites in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8B (except within the Major Facilities Zone - Waikato Hospital Campus) where Rule 25.10.5.11 is complied with.
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.5	25.10 Signs	25.10.5 Rules – Specific Standards	Support in part	The submitter opposes, in part, Rule 25.10.5.11 to ensure it is aligned with the changes sought to Rule 25.10.3(f) - refer to Appendix 1, point 10 of the full submission. The rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain historic heritage buildings in Schedules 8A and 8B. If the buildings are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for signs would be unnecessary and inefficient.	Amend Rule 25.10.5.11 to read: Scheduled Historic Heritage Buildings and Sites listed in Schedule 8A and 8B of Volume 2, Appendix 8: Historic Heritage a. All signs shall be associated with the activity on the site. b. Signs on sites <u>containing historic heritage buildings</u> identified in Schedule 8A and <u>on sites in Schedule 8B</u> of Volume 2, Appendix 8: Historic Heritage shall comply with the following standards.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part, Policy 19.2.3c and states:</p> <p>"The policy should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures identified in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values to retain, protect or enhance".</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3c to read:</p> <p>"Subdivision and/or development of the <u>the sites which contain buildings or structures</u> identified in Schedule 8A shall retain, protect and enhance the heritage values of any those buildings or structures listed within Schedule 8A, including by ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposal is compatible with the sensitivity of the heritage building or structure and its setting and surroundings to change and its capacity to accommodate change without compromising the heritage values of the building or structure; ii. The proposal is compatible with the heritage values, including the form, character, scale, proportions, materials and finishes; and iii. Subdivision and/or development of the site identified in Schedule 8A will not adversely affect the visibility of the heritage building or structure from public places; iv. The resulting setting of the building or structure is sufficient to maintain or enhance the heritage values."
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part, Rule 19.3e (noting that in their submission the state 19.3f, however the rule text quoted in the submission is numbered in the district plan as 19.3e), because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures ranked B in Schedule 8A. • If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for accessory buildings and new buildings would be unnecessary and inefficient. 	<p>Amend Rule 19.3e to read:</p> <p>Accessory buildings or new buildings within any scheduled <u>site containing buildings or structures</u> ranked B".</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part, Rule 19.3o, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requiring resource consent for fences and structures is a very onerous requirement which should only be applied to sites containing the most significant heritage buildings and structures in the City (i.e. the buildings and structures ranked A). It is unclear what "structures" the rule is seeking to manage. <p>The rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures ranked A in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for structures or fences would be unnecessary and inefficient.</p>	Amend Rule 19.3(o) to read: "Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site <u>containing buildings or structures ranked A</u> ".
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part Rule 19.6.a.ii, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule should apply to sites containing buildings or structures ranked B in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for accessory buildings and new buildings would be unnecessary and inefficient. The changes sought to this rule would be consistent with the changes sought to Rule 19.3(e). See submission point 350.7/refer to point 4 in the full submission. 	Amend Rule 19.6(a)(ii) to read: Accessory buildings or new buildings within any scheduled site <u>containing buildings or structures</u> ranked B.
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part, Rule 19.6.a.vi, stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures ranked A in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for structures or fences would be unnecessary and inefficient. Requiring resource consent for fences and structures is a very onerous requirement which should only be applied to sites containing the most significant heritage buildings and structures in the City (i.e. the buildings and structures ranked A). It is unclear what "structures" the rule is seeking to manage. The changes sought to this rule would be consistent with the changes sought to Rule 19.3(o). 	Amend Rule 19.6(a)(vi) to read: Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site <u>containing buildings or structures ranked A</u> .

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Eion Hall - Ben Inger, Monocle Consulting Ltd	350.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes, in part, Rule 19.6.a.viii, stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rule should be amended so that it applies where sites contain buildings or structures ranked A or B in Schedule 8A. If the buildings or structures are not extant after being lawfully removed (including by way of resource consent or a previously granted certificate of compliance) then the sites would not have any heritage values and requiring resource consents for signs would be unnecessary and inefficient. The changes sought to this rule would be consistent with the changes sought to Rule 19.3(q). 	Amend Rule 19.6(a)(viii) to read: <u>Signs on a site containing buildings or structures ranked A or B.</u>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.4	General	General	Oppose	<p>The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.</p>	<p>(i) That no resource consent fees be levied for any resource consent application that does not involve the removal or demolition of any Group B Building; and</p> <p>(ii) That Council will meet all costs associated with the preparation of any Heritage Impact Assessment required for any resource consent application that does not involve the removal or demolition of any Group B Building.</p>
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.</p>	Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to enable the undertaking or new landscaping and planting on sites as a permitted activity;

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.	Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to enable the placement and construction of ancillary structures as a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.	Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to enable the construction of new accessory buildings as a permitted activity where these are located behind the scheduled building and have a height that is less than the protected building.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.	Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to enable the construction of an ancillary residential unit as a permitted activity where these are located behind the scheduled building.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.	Amend the development rules applying to Group B Heritage Buildings and sites to enable the demolition and removal of non-scheduled buildings as a permitted activity;
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton S.T Stuart-Jones	351.11	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The existing dwelling is only identified as having heritage value in relation to some of its architectural features. Not only does the listing of the dwelling impose significant restrictions and uncertainty on the development potential of the subject land, it also imposes substantial costs for any development that may be proposed. There is no incentive for the betterment of properties provided by the plan change. The imposition of the Group B Listing of the existing dwelling on the submitters land imposes an unfair and unreasonable constraint to development in an area which already contains and because of its proximity to the city centre is well suited to more intense development. The subject property instead is rendered undevelopable, and will likely be surrounded on all sides by building structures up to 11m in height and up to 1m from its legal boundaries. It is not clear that PC9 gives effect to s 10 of the WRPS. The WSP report does not appear to provide any reference to the objectives and policies which should have been the basis for informing their methodology. In this sense the cart has been put before the horse.	Delete the existing dwelling at 11 Wye Street (H313) from Schedule 8A.
Daniel Roger Thursby	352.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of SNA's on private properties and the need for resource consent to continue the ongoing planting and maintenance that they have been doing for about 15 years. The proposed change will reduce the amenity and enjoyment, and the ability to produce their own food on land they own. If the proposed plan change is approved then 2/3rds of their property will no longer be used or enjoyed without large increase in costs and administration as the plan change imposes large restrictions on their autonomy to use privately owned land.</p> <p>If the submitter is unable to manage the rehabilitation without a resource consent they will be dis-incentivised and will allow the gully to revert to its previous state.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposed change, particularly the approach of identifying the areas with a desktop exercise without any ground-truthing.</p>	<p>Seeks the removal of SNAs on privately owned gully sites;</p> <p>or</p> <p>A fully ground based site assessment of all affected properties and for those properties to receive a rating adjustment to reflect the positive benefit the wider community receives from restricting individual ratepayers within their own gardens.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Daniel Roger Thursby	352.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of SNA's on private properties and the need for resource consent to continue the ongoing planting and maintenance that they have been doing for about 15 years. The proposed change will reduce the amenity and enjoyment, and the ability to produce their own food on land they own. If the proposed plan change is approved then 2/3rds of their property will no longer be used or enjoyed without large increase in costs and administration as the plan change imposes large restrictions on their autonomy to use privately owned land.</p> <p>If the submitter is unable to manage the rehabilitation without a resource consent they will be dis-incentivised and will allow the gully to revert to its previous state.</p> <p>The submitter opposes the proposed change, particularly the approach of identifying the areas with a desktop exercise without any ground-truthing.</p>	Seeks a streamlined resource consent process for normal gardening activities, to reduce the compliance cost to ratepayers
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.1	General	General	Support in part	<p>While the submitter states they are supportive of the general intent of Plan Change 9, they do have a number of comments/concerns regarding; process, likely outcomes, and cost which are set out in detail in their full submission. Their focus relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Built Structures, Character Areas, Notable Trees and Significant Natural Areas'. • process, including commentary on the s.32 analysis. • provisions within the Proposed Rules of PC9 and detail suggested amendments as well as making overall recommendations <p>The submitter does oppose the statement "PC9 does not attract planning provisions that would interfere with the intensification planning instrument, as a result of the amendment to the RMA in December 2021" because they consider this statement is misleading, Development in Residential Areas deemed 'Character Areas' that would otherwise be 'Permitted' without a Resource Consent under the Enabling Housing Provisions will now require a Resource Consent. Many properties within the identified Character Areas do not have the 'Character Value' and are no different from other properties in the wider Hamilton context that will not require Resource Consent for re development opportunities.</p>	Refer to individual submission points.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.a because this rule requires an expensive resource consent whether or not the existing structure has any historic merit or structure.	<p>Amend Rule 19.3.2.a to identify specific buildings within the Historic Heritage Area that warrant scheduling;</p> <p>and/or</p> <p>Remove the Restricted Discretionary Activity assessment where an existing building does not have any merit as identified in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.e. because this rule requires an expensive resource consent whether or not the existing structure has any historic merit or structure.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.e. by identifying specific buildings within the Historic Heritage Area that warrant scheduling; And/or Remove the Discretionary Activity assessment where an existing building does not have any merit as set out in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.f. because this rule requires an expensive resource consent whether or not the existing structure has any historic merit or structure.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.f. by identifying specific buildings within the Historic Heritage Area that warrant scheduling; And/or Remove the Restricted Discretionary Activity assessment where an existing building does not have any merit as set out in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.h. because of a lack of clarity regarding assessment criteria - cost and also negative outcomes where 'permitted' hedges etc can detract from the 'heritage values' of a site to a greater degree than a 1.8m fence.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.h. to remove the Restricted Discretionary Activity status where a fence is of permeable design; and/or Remove the Restricted Discretionary Activity status in its entirety and permit 1.8m high fences.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.j. because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rule does not clarify the situation with existing use rights (RMA s.10) • the rule covers all buildings (accessory or otherwise) • is a needless expense especially for properties that do not have any existing historic character (but which just happen to be within the Historic Heritage Area). 	Amend Rule 19.3.2.j. to provide a permitted activity status for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement buildings • buildings that do not have historic merit.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.k. because this rule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • includes buildings that have no historic merit • requires an expensive resource consent where removal may enable a better replacement more in keeping with the intent of the Historic Heritage Area. 	Amend Rule 19.3.2.k. by identifying specific buildings within the Historic Heritage Area that warrant scheduling; And/or Remove the Discretionary Activity assessment where an existing building does not have any merit as set out in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.l. because shifting a building around on the site does not necessarily detract from the Historic Heritage Area character; and why should an expensive resource consent be required.	Delete Rule 19.3.2.l. Relocated Buildings on the Site.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2.m. because this rule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> covers all buildings being moved onto a sites; does not differentiate between buildings that will not be seen; where the existing site does not have any historic character. 	Amend Rule 19.3.2.m. by: Retaining the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for buildings relocated to sites which are in public view; And Delete the Restricted Discretionary Activity status and replace with a Permitted Activity status where an existing property does not exhibit any of the historic merit as set out in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.4.3.b. because of a lack of clarity with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> activity status the relationship between 19.3.2.g. and 19.3.2.h. whether it is meant to be part of assessment criteria 	Amend Rule 19.4.3.b. to provide greater clarity OR Delete Rule 19.4.3.b.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.u. because the requirement for resource consent or use of a qualified arborist to remove small branches that interfere with buildings, infrastructure or pedestrian/vehicle accesses because of the cost.	Seeks that recourse consents are free and/or provide on demand Council arboriculture input/advice free of charge regarding the maintenance and enhancement of any notable tree.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.12	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes how the identification of built heritage, stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "the identification of '<i>Built Structures, Character Areas</i>' is in part flawed". Built structures of historic or cultural merit have not been identified. 	Review the list of built structures in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.13	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes how the identification of built heritage, stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "the identification of '<i>Built Structures, Character Areas</i>' is in part flawed". Some properties within the Historic Heritage Areas do not merit inclusion. 	Review the extent of properties included in the Historic Heritage Areas in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.14	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the rules relating to Built Heritage, Historic Heritage Areas, Notable Trees and Significant Natural Areas that trigger the need for a Resource Consent, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this can be counterproductive. • the Resource Consent process is expensive, time consuming, and often lacking in certainty. • the result of which is that in many cases people will not go to the expense of doing the work necessary to maintain their 'Notable Tree' or maintain or enhance their 'Historic Built Structure'. The net result of this is that the features that existed when the item was originally scheduled will degrade and no longer be worthy of protection. 	Review the need for resource consents for Built Heritage, Historic Heritage Areas, Notable Trees and Significant Natural Areas.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.15	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the Section 32 analysis for Plan Change 9 because they do not consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the S.32 sets out how PC9 is achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act (RMA), • does not adequately address an analysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed changes, nor • adequately identify other avenues for achieving the purpose of the RMA. Such alternatives includes, but is not limited to, financial incentives for properties that fall within the identified 'Built Structures, Character Areas, Notable Trees and Significant Natural Areas'. 	<p>Further s.32 analysis is undertaken to adequately identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how Plan Change 9 achieves the purpose of the Resource Management Act (RMA) • the benefits and costs of the proposed changes • other avenues for achieving the purpose of the RMA. Such alternatives includes, but is not limited to, financial incentives for properties that fall within the identified 'Built Structures, Character Areas, Notable Trees and Significant Natural Areas'.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.16	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the scheduled list of built heritage in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage stating that the "identified 'Built Structures' is far from inclusive" • the identified 'Character Areas' in many cases are inclusive of items not worthy of inclusion 	Not Stated.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.17	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter considers that Plan Change 9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fails to 'give effect' to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) • it will not be consistent with Policy 10.3 of the WRPS in that the Policies and Rules requiring expensive Resource Consent process to be followed to achieve the objectives of the plan change will, in some cases lead to no maintenance work or property enhancement being undertaken and consequently the loss or destruction of the heritage qualities of the item that RPS Policy 10.3 requires Council to protect. 	Not stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.18	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter raises concern that where Council intends on protecting heritage of natural values for the wider community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the cost of that protection should not fall on individual property owners, but be shared by the wider community. The provisions in Plan Change 9 do not share such costs in this manner. 	Not stated.
Planman Consultants Limited - John Manning	353.19	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the objectives of Plan Change 9, and acknowledge that policies need to align with the overall objectives, remains concerned that in many cases the proposed rules (and Activity Status) that trigger the need for a Resource Consent to achieve the stated Objectives will be counterproductive in achieving the overall objectives.	No specific relief as the specific provisions are identified as separate submission points.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton Cojac Properties Ltd	354.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	It is difficult to understand what heritage values associated with the property and surrounding land Council is trying to protect. It seems that "moderate value" is a very low bar to set for imposing extensive restrictions on development or deeming further development to be inappropriate. The railway cottages are representative of historic heritage from an architectural standpoint. Their non-inclusion in a HHA will not lead to a net loss in this type of heritage. Overall the plan is vague and uncertain. It seeks to preserve a romantic notion of perceived historic heritage significance without giving any specific criteria as to what work or development council will permit. This creates unnecessary and unreasonable uncertainty for owners as to what works, or types of work or development Council may or may not permit.	Delete the Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area from all land fronting Rifle Range Road and the northern side of Pukeko Street and in particular from land described as Lot 2 DPS 86468 (RT: SA68B/862), Lot 3 DPS 86468 (RT: SA68B/863).
Joshua Wood	355.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the Liquidamber styraciflua on Young Street being as a Notable Tree.</p> <p>[Note: there is an editorial error regarding the numbering reference for the Notable Trees in Young Street - the Planning map reference T333 while Schedule 9D states T334]</p>	Do not protect the Liquidamber styraciflua on Young Street as a Notable Tree.
Jason Lee	356.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C35) mapping overlay in its present form, stating it is critical that the mapping of the SNA area is accurate, reflecting only areas that meet the WRPS 11A criteria.	Review SNA (C35) to accurately reflect the extent of C35 cSNA, making it consistent with the WRPS 11A SNA criteria; and remove any incorrect SNA DP feature allocation on Lot 609 DP420752 (Prop. Ref; 04209-300-03).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jason Lee	356.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments to Rule 20.3.b to clarify that both plant pests and Fauna pest control are permitted activities within a SNA, perhaps by adding “Flora and Fauna” pest species, stating, "this being clear in the DP rules is imperative if our Gully restoration work is to continue within SNA's".	Amend Rule 20.3.b to clarify that both plant pests and Fauna pest control are permitted activities within a SNA, perhaps by adding “Flora and Fauna” pest species. Noting that Rule 20.3.b: -Overrides 50m2 limit and 150mm specification on “exotic” clearance in 20.5.6. -Overrides the 15% and 50mm limits in rule 20.5.1. -Overrides 15% and 50mm limits in 25.2.4.3.
Jason Lee	356.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter fully supports rule 20.3g allowing earthworks associated with maintenance and upgrading of restoration tracks. These tracks are vital to our restoration work.	Retain Rule 20.3.g as notified.
Jason Lee	356.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.1 because 15% limit is too low if regular maintenance is missed on many exotic trees.	Amend Rule 20.5.1 - exotic maintenance limits within SNA's should be specified separately at 25% and 100mm.
Jason Lee	356.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of a new rule that enables the ability to undertake restoration track creation within the SNA without a RC as long as it has prior approval by HCC Parks and Reserves. The need for RC will mean new tracks which enable further restoration, may not be constructed, and the subsequent restoration will therefore not occur.	Add a rule to undertake restoration track creation within the SNA without a RC, if prior approval is obtained from HCC Parks and Reserves.
Jason Lee	356.8	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.4 Rules – General Standards	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 25.2.4.3 because maintenance of trees in a SNA but overhanging a property (Dripline) should have separate standards for indigenous and exotic trees.	Amend Rule 25.2.4.3 to provide separate standards for indigenous and exotic trees: -The indigenous maintenance limits within the dripline zone could remain at 15% and 50mm. -The exotic maintenance limits within the dripline zone should be 25% and 100mm.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kiri Crossland	358.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.1 Heritage Themes that Historic Heritage Significance to the City	Oppose	The protection of "dominance of the private car and changing suburban form" is inconsistency with Central Government direction to produce urban areas which are less reliant on private cars.	Remove the heritage theme " <i>dominance of the private car and changing suburban form</i> " from the district plan.
Kiri Crossland	358.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The protection of "dominance of the private car and changing suburban form" is inconsistency with Central Government direction to produce urban areas which are less reliant on private cars.	Remove all areas protected under the HHA theme "the dominance of the private car and changing suburban form" from Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas.
Catherine McBride	359.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter opposes the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottages HHA and suggests it is removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D. The submitter has intentions to redevelop their property to incorporate all family members and if adopted, they will face severe financial, safety and stress impacts. The submitter feels the area has inconsistent heritage (some parts included and some not) and feels the area is not attractive to anyone that doesn't live there. There are costs involved with owning a property within a HHA i.e. consent fees for works done to comply with health homes standards. The submitter agrees with the Whyte/Dorrell submission being not representative of the two historical heritage themes.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Catherine McBride	359.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell Submission.	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.
Catherine McBride	359.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell Submission.	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
Catherine McBride	359.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The homeowner will have enough extra cost burden and loss of decision making without the extra fees.	If the plan goes through, HCC should pay the heritage and architect fees and waive resource consent fees.
Favor Properties Limited - Eddie (Mammoud) Eid	360.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	There is no vegetation on 22 Normandy Road (Lot 4 DPS 433); this rule should not apply to this property	Delete the SNA [C39] from 22 Normandy Road.
Favor Properties Limited - Eddie (Mammoud) Eid	360.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	There is no vegetation on 22 Normandy Road (Lot 4 DPS 433); this rule should not apply to this property	Delete the SNA [C39] from 22 Normandy Road.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Favor Properties Limited - Eddie (Mammoud) Eid	360.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	There is no vegetation on 22 Normandy Road (Lot 4 DPS 433); this rule should not apply to this property	Delete the SNA [C39] from 22 Normandy Road.
Favor Properties Limited - Eddie (Mammoud) Eid	360.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	There is no vegetation on 22 Normandy Road (Lot 4 DPS 433); this rule should not apply to this property	Delete the SNA [C39] from 22 Normandy Road.
Favor Properties Limited - Eddie (Mammoud) Eid	360.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter has stated that there is no vegetation on their property and that the overlay should therefore not apply.	Remove the SNA [C39] from 22 Normandy Road.
Gabrielle Hoffman	361.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>Oppose 19 Claremont Avenue being included in the HHA.</p> <p>19 Claremont Avenue does not enhance or maintain the amenity of the Lamont, Freemont, Egmont & Claremont Avenue HHA (#17 HHA);</p> <p>Adjoining properties such as 26, 24 & 22 Claremont Avenue are not subject to the HHA. As well as this, properties adjoining 19 Claremont Avenue who are not part of the HHA will be able to construct at a much larger scale as there are more activities that are permitted in the residential zone.</p>	Remove 19 Claremont Avenue from the Lamont, Freemont, Egmont and Claremont Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA17, Schedule 8D - Historic Heritage Areas.
Gabrielle Hoffman	361.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	There is no associated scoring to demonstrate how Claremont Avenue properties meet the requirements of the physical and visual qualities that attribute to heritage values and the HHA.	Seeks the reclassification from Restricted Discretionary Activity to Permitted Activity status in Rule 19.3.2a for sites that don't meet all the specified physical and visual qualities of the HHA.
Gabrielle Hoffman	361.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	There is no associated scoring to demonstrate how Claremont Avenue properties meet the requirements of the physical and visual qualities that attribute to heritage values and the HHA.	Seeks amendment to Rule 19.3.2e to change the activity status from Discretionary to Permitted.
Gabrielle Hoffman	361.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	There is no associated scoring to demonstrate how Claremont Avenue properties meet the requirements of the physical and visual qualities that attribute to heritage values and the HHA.	Seeks amendments to Rule 19.4.3 to remove the restrictions relating to the materials and design of fencing; and replace with multiple options for materials that a fence or wall can be made of.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jacqueline Hazel Bates	362.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submission opposes the placement of Archaeological Areas over properties at 214 Peacockes, 230 Peacockes and 240 Peacocokes Road. The submission refers to earlier Council investigations of the area which they claim found nothing of significance before a road was put through. The submitter considers that their own site investigations found no significant archaeological sites.	Remove archaeological sites from 214, 230 and 240 Peacockes Road.
Jacqueline Hazel Bates	362.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes all rules in relation to archaeological sites. Specifically Rule 19.1, 19.2 and 19.4 and appendix 8.	Remove archaeological sites from 214, 230 and 240 Peacockes Road.
Anneliese Ginnaw	363.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the exclusion of the buildings and properties, built before 1940 presently located within the Special Character Zone - Claudelands West from the proposed Claudelands Historic Heritage Area as part of Plan Change 9.	Include buildings and properties which were built before 1940 within the Special Character Zone - Claudelands West as part of the new HHA [Claudelands Historic Heritage Area, HHA 8].
Anneliese Ginnaw	363.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the exclusion of the buildings and properties, built before 1940 presently located within the Special Character Zone - Claudelands West from the proposed Claudelands Historic Heritage Area as part of Plan Change 9.	Retain the entire current Special Character Zone - Claudelands West Zone boundary for the new HHA [Claduelands Historic Heritage Area, HHA8]
Mactan Property Trust - Nancy Caiger	364.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA [cSNA, C54 - Tauhara Park - Kirikiriroa Stream] over 5/5A Tauhara Drive as there is no justification for the proposed mapping, it was never ground truthed, the gully has not been maintained by council and has little to no native fauna, there is no funding available to landowners for maintenance, and the current building setbacks offer enough protection to the gully.	Remove the extent of the proposed SNA from 5/5a Tauhara Drive; as shown in Map 2 attached to the submission. [cSNA, C54 - Tauhara Park - Kirikiriroa Stream]
Dianne Yates	365.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter seeks to have the dwelling at 59 Cook Street scheduled as a built heritage item. Houses in Hamilton East, particularly in my block in Cook Street, are the "soldiers cottages" and were part of the land promised to soldiers recruited from Australia in the 1860s to fight in the NZ wars....Although our houses were not built until the early twentieth century the name "soldiers cottages" has carried over. These houses have distinct historic value.	Schedule 59 Cook Street as a built heritage item in Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Dianne Yates	365.3	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter seek the conservation, classification and maintenance of historical housing in Hamilton East, because:</p> <p>Lifestyles - the section s in Hamilton East all for gardens and play areas for children - "if Council allows three storied blocks of flats to be built alongside the cottages the amount of sunshine will be restricted and will prevent the growing of gardens and will mean dampness and lack of light and sunshine for existing homes"</p> <p>Developers - there is evidence of continuing pressure by developer on local owners to sell their homes, Wellington Street being an example of this.</p> <p>Inner suburbs and community - the variety of housing in a suburb is important, forcing older people and families on moderate incomes into outer suburbs is counter productive - "A vibrant community needs a variety of peolpe of different age groups, ethnic groups, and family sizes"</p>	The conservation, classification and maintenance of historic housing in Hamilton East.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Emily Hunt	366.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Waka Kotahi seeks the removal of Archaeological Site A163 (S14/335) - ' sod fence' from Schedule 8C: Group 2. The submission includes supporting documentation prepared at the time of the Waikato Expressway's construction that found no evidence of a 'sod fence'.	Remove Archaeological Site A163 (S14/335) from Schedule 8C: Group 2.
Jamie and Kieran Lomas	367.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of A1/A105 into Schedule 8C, Group 2, Archaeological and Cultural Sites, "given the highly modified area that comprises A001/A105 and likelihood that most archaeological sites of significance have been destroyed or disturbed as result of development.	Delete A1/A105 from Schedule 8C
Jamie and Kieran Lomas	367.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of Rule 19.3.3d into the district plan because the archaeological site has been extensively modified and including this area as an archaeological site will provide restrictions and additional costs to landowners in terms of earthworks on their properties.	<p>Delete Rule 19.3.3d in its entirety; or modify the rule to allow earthworks, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for fixing, repairs or maintenance to be a permitted activity • up to a certain cubic volume (that would allow for repair and maintenance) • associated with removing a building and rebuilding using the existing building's footprint on a Group 2, Schedule 8C Archaeological sites

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Jamie and Kieran Lomas	367.3	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control	Oppose	Opposes the notified wording of 1.3.2E.b, Assessment Criteria 1.3.2E: Historic Heritage and Special Character relating to earthworks on Schedule 8C, Group 2 Archaeological Sites.	<p>That Assessment Criteria 1.3.2E.b is amended to provide greater recognition for private property owner's rights to carry out earthworks on their properties for repairs, fixing and maintenance.</p> <p>Or, In the alternative, the criteria be amended to allow for earthworks up to maximum cubic volume before resource consent is required.</p> <p>And, further amendments are made that will reduce the costs associated with carrying out earthworks on a Scheduled 8C, Group 2 archaeological site.</p>
Renee Watchorn	368.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is concerned about the heritage status of Hamilton East, believing that by carving out the section of central Hamilton East (Brookfield) and removing the heritage status will be detrimental to the whole area over time.	Include Brookfield Street and surrounds in the heritage status area.
Renee Watchorn	368.2	General	General	Oppose	The submitter has found the process for submitting feedback far too complicated, and raises concerns over a lack of clear information and impacts provided through consultation.	<p>That there is a review of the consultation process and information.</p> <p>Those being consulted provided with assurances that this is more than a tick box exercise and residents feedback will be seriously considered.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Deborah Field 23 Fifth Trust	369.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, being part of Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area. The houses do not sit within a collective grouping of like heritage houses and is adjacent a busy Collector Road surrounded by a range of non-residential land uses. The area is suitable for more intensive residential development in accordance with several policies and strategies, including the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, from the proposed Railway Village Historic Heritage Area; OR 2. Replace Rule 4.3.1ss with the requirement that demolition is permitted for those properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road between Railside Place and Pukeko Street (including 29 Rifle Range Road) provided that Council is notified of the intention to remove the existing dwelling 90 days prior to demolition of the dwelling so that Council is afforded the opportunity to enter into a private agreement with the landowner to remove the dwelling at no cost to the landowner. The intention being that Council can relocate the dwelling to a site within the Frankton Village HHA or an alternative site of its choosing; and 3. Rule 4.3.1 tt, Rule 4.3.1uu, and Rule 4.3.1 w shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and other properties along Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street; and 4. Rule 4.4.8(a) Fences and Walls - shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and those other properties on Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Deborah Field 23 Fifth Trust	369.3	4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	4.3.1 Activity Status Table – General Residential Zone, Residential Intensification Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, being part of Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area. The houses do not sit within a collective grouping of like heritage houses and is adjacent a busy Collector Road surrounded by a range of non-residential land uses. The area is suitable for more intensive residential development in accordance with several policies and strategies, including the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, from the proposed Railway Village Historic Heritage Area; OR 2. Replace Rule 4.3.1ss with the requirement that demolition is permitted for those properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road between Railside Place and Pukeko Street (including 29 Rifle Range Road) provided that Council is notified of the intention to remove the existing dwelling 90 days prior to demolition of the dwelling so that Council is afforded the opportunity to enter into a private agreement with the landowner to remove the dwelling at no cost to the landowner. The intention being that Council can relocate the dwelling to a site within the Frankton Village HHA or an alternative site of its choosing; and 3. Rule 4.3.1 tt, Rule 4.3.1uu, and Rule 4.3.1 w shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and other properties along Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street; and 4. Rule 4.4.8(a) Fences and Walls - shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and those other properties on Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Deborah Field 23 Fifth Trust	369.7	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	4.4.8 Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, being part of Frankton Railway Village Historic Heritage Area. The houses do not sit within a collective grouping of like heritage houses and is adjacent a busy Collector Road surrounded by a range of non-residential land uses. The area is suitable for more intensive residential development in accordance with several policies and strategies, including the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road, between Railside Place and Pukeko Street, in particular 29 Rifle Range Road, from the proposed Railway Village Historic Heritage Area; OR 2. Replace Rule 4.3.1ss with the requirement that demolition is permitted for those properties along the eastern side of Rifle Range Road between Railside Place and Pukeko Street (including 29 Rifle Range Road) provided that Council is notified of the intention to remove the existing dwelling 90 days prior to demolition of the dwelling so that Council is afforded the opportunity to enter into a private agreement with the landowner to remove the dwelling at no cost to the landowner. The intention being that Council can relocate the dwelling to a site within the Frankton Village HHA or an alternative site of its choosing; and 3. Rule 4.3.1 tt, Rule 4.3.1uu, and Rule 4.3.1 w shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and other properties along Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street; and 4. Rule 4.4.8(a) Fences and Walls - shall not apply to 29 Rifle Range Road and those other properties on Rifle Range Road between Railside Avenue and Pukeko Street.
Sue Burbage Salon - Susan Burbage	370.1	General	General	Oppose	Opposes Plan Change 9 in its entirety.	<p>Seeks the removal of Plan Change 9, and that Council focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the things not yet done, such as the walking bridge over the river • the town being attractive, e.g. remove the ugly empty buildings • parking buildings, because no one is hopping on the bad transport • transport and good cycling paths
David Platts	371.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the SNA (C49) at 70 Berkley Avenue because the boundary of the cSNA captures a deck that is elevated above ground which cannot be seen in the aerial imagery. The extent of the SNA is not intended to capture existing built environment, as discussed in Appendix 12 Significant Natural Areas – refer approach in Appendix H of the report prepared by 4Sight.	Amend the boundaries of the SNA (C49) to reflect existing man-made structures that are onsite as part of the developed area on the property by moving the boundary further to the south away from the property by at least 2m from existing edge of deck/retaining.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David Platts	371.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Policy 20.2.1g because the policy appears to support the creation of public walkways only and not private walkways that provide the same benefits.	Amend policy 20.2.1g as follows: Enable infrastructure and walkways and cycleways to be located near or within Significant Natural areas where they: i. have an operational and functional need for that location ii. provide benefits for public access iii. contribute to the economic, social cultural and environmental wellbeing of people and communities
David Platts	371.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.3(a)(ii) but more clarity on wording or partial amendment is requested because the terms “unacceptable” and “public” do not provide clarity around what is classified as a permitted activity.	Amend Rule 20.3(a)(ii) as follows: <u>ii. There is a moderate risk to property or the health and safety of people</u>
David Platts	371.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter request a wording clarification on Rule 20.2.1h because it is not clear that owners are covered by “including customary activities and actions necessary to address a high risk to public health and safety, and property”.	Amend Rule 20.2.1h to insert the word ‘ private ’ to protect owner and others on the property to ensure they are covered and not precluded by the use of the word “public”.
David Platts	371.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter request wording clarity on Rule 20.3 a iii because the word public needs to cover owner occupiers.	Amend Rule 20.3a iii to insert the word ‘ private ’ to protect owner and others on the property to ensure they are covered and not precluded by the use of the word “public”
David Platts	371.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter requests further clarification/addition to Rule 20.3 b because pest species is not specific.	Amend Rule 20.3b: add including pest control “ and noxious flora ” or similar.
David Platts	371.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.3 e ii because it is unsure about what the word 'links' refer to	Clarify Rule 20.3 e ii and remove if not required.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David Platts	371.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3 g because pathways extensions are necessary to appropriately improve access to the difficult terrain and rehabilitate the gully flora.	Amend Rule 20.3 g to add word as follows to sentence “or upgrading and or extending existing walking tracks used for restoration”
David Platts	371.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3 n because the rule as it is written means new structures such as new pathways could require non-complying consent.	Amend 20.3 n to add the following exception: <u>Construction of new private infrastructure and accessways in a significant natural area, including associated pruning maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees and associated earthworks that meet with the following standards:</u> <u>- is for the purposes of supporting regeneration of the SNA</u> <u>- involves the formation of an access no greater than 1.5m wide</u> <u>- involves less than 0.5m of vertical ground alteration</u> <u>- rehabilitated within 6 months</u> <u>is a permitted activity</u>
David Platts	371.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3(p) because the current wording does not appear allow for the removal of invasive species within the SNA as a permitted activity.	Amend Rule 20.3(p) to remove the word exotic is preferred OR allow for this to be permitted subject to a range of conditions.
David Platts	371.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.3.q because it is precluding one from having a greenhouse, conservatory or garden room or plant nursery area and could limit regeneration options.	Amend Rule 20.3.q or add a new provision to allow structures that do not detract from the overall SNA. Suggested text: <u>“Exception: No more than one structure that is not required to connect to services that is “off grid” where it is less than 30m2 in area and less than 3% of the site area affected by the SNA may be constructed as a permitted activity”.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David Platts	371.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.5.6(a)(i) because to continue to improve the environment in line with the gulley restoration plan an ability to extend tracks to facilitate this rehabilitation is required.	Amend Rule 20.5.6(a)(i) to add the following: The works required to maintain or extend an existing walking access track used for restoration activities:
Hamish Crequer	372.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA. The properties that have been selected for the HHA do not create any form of consistent heritage area.	Delete the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA.
Hamish Crequer	372.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	Agrees with the essence of the plan change to protect low density character areas that are nice to live in, but seeks a middle ground to protect the area while not introducing excessive levels of restrictions with the goal of maintaining uniformity when there is currently no uniformity in place.	Seeks that the area and the properties be protected from overall high density housing but without the large restrictions when it comes to smaller modifications and quality of life improvements to houses (new fences, garages, aluminum joinery etc) as long as the changes remain within the current level of use of the property.
Benjamin Alexander Senior	373.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 94 Lake Road as a built heritage item.	Removal H232, 94 Lake Road, Frankton from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Benjamin Alexander Senior	373.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the specific provisions and the designation of Built Heritage for proposed additional 182 structures, because the process of identifying the proposed structures was rushed to be in place before required NPS-UD plan changes were made.	Seeks a more thorough, consistent Built Heritage assessment to be undertaken city wide and the removal of the current proposed Built Heritage listings until a new assessment process has been completed.
Rob Powell	374.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports the retention of historic heritage but would like guidance that emphasise that in maintenance or upgrading, owners enhance the heritage home.	Seeks Council to provide guidance on how to achieve modernisation, maintenance of homes of built heritage without compromising the character.
Cerno Group Ltd - Megan Lyon and Fraser Smith	375.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of Historic Heritage Areas and the move to alter the threshold from the current special character of Hayes Paddock to HHA.	No relief sought stated.
Cerno Group Ltd - Megan Lyon and Fraser Smith	375.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part of rule 19.3.2.a, but seeks amendments to allow for alterations and additions at the rear of the properties without a resource consent, with the exception of properties adjoining parks and Waikato River.	Amend Rule 19.3.2.a to permit alterations and additions to the rear of the properties, with the exception of properties adjoining parks and Waikato River.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Robbie Pasley	376.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the desktop assessment used to identify the SNA (including the one at their property at 5 Roberts Way - C78), because the site is landscaped and there is no significant fauna or flora that requires protection.	Undertake a specific site visit to assess the significance of the area.
Lovell Family Trust - Mike and Sandra Lovell	377.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes their property at 243 Ulster Street being scheduled H297 in Appendix 8A: Built Heritage	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, by deleting H297 to remove the heritage protection over the dwelling at 243 Ulster Street.
Lovell Family Trust - Mike and Sandra Lovell	377.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes their property at 243 Ulster Street being scheduled H297 in Appendix 8A: Built Heritage.	Confirmation that the dwelling at 243 Ulster Street can be relocated should the land be required for housing development.
Lovell Family Trust - Mike and Sandra Lovell	377.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes their property at 243 Ulster Street being scheduled H297 in Appendix 8A: Built Heritage	Confirmation that, if relocation is not possible the dwelling at 243 Ulster Street could be demolished for housing development.
Lovell Family Trust - Mike and Sandra Lovell	377.4	General	General	Oppose	Submitter raises concerns and issues regarding rates: "Our property is deemed commercial residential and has had a significant recent rates increase to match the increase in land value - a direct reflection of its suitable location to meet the demand for housing intensification schemes".	No relief stated.
Edward Hardie	378.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter partially oppose of the extent of the SNA (C13) affecting the properties at 65 Crosby Road and 9 Sussex Street because most of the mapped area have low ecological values and it is covered by exotic vegetation. The submitter is concerned that existing use and property rights will be adversely affected by the proposed SNA and wish to work with the HCC to better define SNA areas on their property so they can progress with plans to enhance the property.	Amend the extent of SNA (C13) that affect the properties at 65 Crosby Road and 9 Sussex Street, in consultation with landowners.
Dianne Ogle	379.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes HHA provisions as too restrictive for homeowners who need to maintain their properties and does not think it is fair to be subjected to extra costs for consents to do property maintenance.	Amend provisions to provide greater ability for land owners to maintain their properties without the need of resource consent.
Holly Dark	380.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to a proposed SNA (C36) at 3A Waterford Road.	Remove the SNA (C36) from 3A Waterford Road.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(a) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (a) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarifications of the current wording for the measurement point for Rule 20.3.(v) as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree; or 3m from the protected root zone.	Seeks clarification in relation to the measurement points for Rule 20.3.(v) as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree; or 3m from the protected root zone.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) and seeks clarification on how existing use rights for private property owners are going to be maintained; and seeks amendments to the wording in line with Rule 9.4.5(b) to protect the existing use rights of private property owners affected by Schedule 9D.	Seeks to amend Rule 20.3(w)(ii), by adding the following exemption, to read: <i>ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface.</i> <i><u>Exemption:</u></i> <i><u>The minimum permeable surface area shall not apply in the following circumstances:</u></i> <i><u>a) For any change of use that would otherwise be a permitted activity and does not reduce the area of permeable surfaces below what already exists at [insert notification date].</u></i>
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.4	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the implementation of the protected root zone calculation methodology, and the effect of this methodology in relation to tree growth over time.	Clarification as to whether the protected root zone of notable trees will expand over time as notable trees grow, including how this managed through the current rule framework.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	We seek clarification as to whether the storage of vehicles includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone.	Seeks clarification on whether ' <i>the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment</i> ' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(c) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (c) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Hillsborough Properties Limited	381.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(d) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (d) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Sanjil & Sonal Mistry	382.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support	The submitters support the extent of the SNA (C78) as proposed.	No relief sought.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Sanjil & Sonal Mistry	382.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter seek an amendment to Objective 20.2.1 because it needs to recognise and better account for the upkeep of a private boundary edge where an cSNA adjoins privately owned land.	Amend Objective 20.2.1 to better recognise and account for the upkeep of a private boundary edge where an cSNA adjoins privately owned land.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Sanjil & Sonal Mistry	382.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 20.2.1h, but seeks an amendment to the policy to recognise and better account for the upkeep of a private boundary edge where an cSNA adjoins privately owned land.	Amend Policy 20.2.1h to better recognise and account for the upkeep of a private boundary edge where an cSNA adjoins privately owned land.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Sanjil & Sonal Mistry	382.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Rule 20.3(a)(iii), but seeks further clarification on whether Rule 20.3(a)(iii) as proposed, would cover the upkeep of a private boundary edge where a land owner adjoins a cSNA. This could include but is not limited to the maintenance and upkeep of fencing.	Amend Rule 20.3(a)(iii) to read: The pruning or maintenance work is necessary to maintain or upgrade existing private tracks <u>and the maintenance and upkeep of Record of Title boundaries that adjoin SNA including fencing</u> where Standard 20.5.1 is complied with; or "
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees		The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(a) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (a) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarification on the current wording for the measurement point in Rule 20.3.(v), as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree, or 3m from the protected root zone.	Clarification in relation to the measurement points for Rule 20.3.(v), as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree, or 3m from the protected root zone.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) and seeks clarification on how existing use rights for private property owners are going to be maintained, and seeks amendments to the wording in line with Rule 9.4.5(b) to protect the existing use rights of private property owners affected by Schedule 9D.	Amend Rule 20.3(w)(ii), by adding the exemption, to read: <i>ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface.</i> <u>Exemption:</u> <u>The minimum permeable surface area shall not apply in the following circumstances:</u> <i>a) For any change of use that would otherwise be a permitted activity and does not reduce the area of permeable surfaces below what already exists at [insert notification date].</i>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.5	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the implementation of the protected root zone calculation methodology, and the effect of this methodology in relation to tree growth over time.	Clarification as to whether the protected root zone of notable trees will expand over time as notable trees grow. If so, how is this managed through the current rule framework.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification on whether the definition of ' <i>the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment</i> ' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone.	Clarification on whether ' <i>the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment</i> ' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(c) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (c) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Pragma Commercial Limited	383.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(d) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (d) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(a) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (a) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Seeks clarification in relation to the measurement points for Rule 20.3.(v) as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree; or 3m from the protected root zone.	Seeks clarification in relation to the measurement points for Rule 20.3.(v).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) and wishes to seek clarification on the existing use rights and private property rights for private property owners are going to be maintained, including the existing situation of having landscaping within the front yard and parking of vehicles within the Protected Root Zones. The submitters seeks amendments to the wording in line with Rule 9.4.5(b) as to protect the existing use rights of private property owners who of which are affected by Schedule 9D.	Seeks to amend Rule 20.3(w)(ii) as follows; <i>ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface.</i> <i>Exemption:</i> <i>The minimum permeable surface area shall not apply in the following circumstances:</i> <i>a) For any change of use that would otherwise be a permitted activity and does not reduce the area of permeable surfaces below what already exists at (insert notification date).</i>
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.5	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter seeks clarification regarding the implementation of the protected root zone calculation methodology, and the effect of this methodology in relation to tree growth over time.	Clarification as to whether the protected root zone of notable trees will expand over time as notable trees grow, including how this managed through the current rule framework.
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter seeks clarification on whether the definition of 'the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone.	Clarification on whether 'the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(c) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (c) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Andrew King - AW King & AM King	384.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(d) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (d) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>the submitter seeks to understand the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasons for including 185 Victoria Street, 171 Victoria Street, 145 Victoria Street, 117C Victoria Street and 28 Alexandra Street within the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) • intention of including the site as a Historic Heritage Area. We do not sight a strong evidence basis to enable 'Historic Heritage Area' <p>Stating they do not sight a strong evidence basis to enable 'Historic Heritage Area' rather the submitter seek Council to further protect existing Built Heritage and not propose new restrictions over existing, modified buildings, hindering future development potential.</p>	The removal of the Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) from 185 Victoria Street, 171 Victoria Street, 145 Victoria Street, 117C Victoria Street and 28 Alexandra Street, and rely on the relevant historic notations for buildings and the existing CBD provisions that enable new buildings downtown that promote and manage the aesthetics of new buildings.
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	The submitter opposes the reference in Policy 19.2.1c to the external international document 'International Council on Monuments and Sites' (ICOMOS); stating that this document is subject to change outside of the Schedule 1 plan process, and that this document has not been notified as part of this Plan Change.	The removal of the reference to 'ICOMOS' in the objectives and policies. This is better reference as an advisory document in a design guide, or particular elements of the ICOMOS be used as Assessment Criteria.
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of wording 'setting' under Objective 19.2.3 and relevant policies as it will restrict future development of the site as it is contained within the setting of Built Heritage H39. In particular Policy 19.2.3f requires new development to be consistent with identified heritage (in this instance H39) with specific note to the form, scale, character and location of the setting.	Seeks amendment of Objective 19.2.3 and the related policies to remove the wording of 'setting' and rely on the existing character of the 'surrounds' to retain heritage values of recognised heritage items.
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The objective and related policies seek to protect the values attributed to a historic heritage area through sympathetic design and the inclusion of a Heritage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Policy 19.2.4c states that the design, material use and placement of buildings shall demonstrate consistency with the physical and visual qualities of the historic heritage area. As mentioned above, the Victoria Street frontage (within the HHA) has a variety of colours, materials, heights and styles used on the buildings, creating inconsistencies with the existing physical and visual qualities.</p> <p>There are varying materials, lot layout/designs, densities and styles already prevalent in the area, creating inconsistencies which is generally not present within a recognised heritage area.</p>	The removal of the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) overlay and for this area to be a recognised special character area, as opposed to heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to the wording of provisions in 19.3 to identify the proposed Victoria Street HHA as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards. Because, "the Victoria Street HHA is recognised as having "of at least moderate heritage value". The standards should recognise the area as a special character area and provide specific criteria related to maintaining and enhancing the character of the area, opposed to the heritage. We agree with the current development restrictions and current design guides for the CBD, which we think is adequate to rely on when proposing new development within the CBD to ensure a positive contribution to the street front is generated".	Amend the wording to identify the proposed Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a special character area and reflect this within the appropriate design guides and development standards.
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.7	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non- Complying Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes the requirements for developments to be consistent with heritage values of an area which already has a variety of styles is putting further, unnecessary restrictions on future developments on key sites within the CBD which could be sufficiently addressed through existing design guides and assessment criteria. Their reasoning being that "the assessment criteria relating to Heritage Values ensures existing and new buildings are consistent with the heritage values attributed to an area. Specifically, E1 uses 'consistent and compatible' with heritage values attributed to an area when referring to alterations to existing and new buildings. As reiterated throughout this submission (refer to Appendix A), the Victoria Street frontage currently does not exhibit a consistent street front which would typically be seen in a heritage area (e.g. Napier City heritage)."	Remove the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a recognised heritage area and provide specific criteria for this area, not as a heritage area but as a special character area.
Fraser McNutt John Lawrenson - The Lawrenson Group	385.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to the wording of provisions in 19.4 to identify the proposed Victoria Street HHA as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards. Because, "the Victoria Street HHA is recognised as having "of at least moderate heritage value". The standards should recognise the area as a special character area and provide specific criteria related to maintaining and enhancing the character of the area, opposed to the heritage. We agree with the current development restrictions and current design guides for the CBD, which we think is adequate to rely on when proposing new development within the CBD to ensure a positive contribution to the street front is generated".	Amend the wording to identify the proposed Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards.
Sam and Candace Hood	386.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 8 Marama Street as a built heritage item (H240).	Remove all reference of H240, 8 Marama Street from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.
Sam and Candace Hood	386.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Historic Heritage Area over 8 Marama Street that will impose rules that would require a resource consent.	Amend Marama Street Historic Heritage Areas to exclude 8 Marama Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Donovan Caithness	387.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as notified, including Galloway Street.	Retain Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as notified.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.1	General	General	Oppose	PC9 represents a significant shift in HCC's approach to matters of heritage, the environment and archaeological sites; and imposes significant restrictions on intensification and development across broad swathes of Hamilton.	That a more targeted and tailored approach to historic heritage to reduce unintended consequences; and greater consideration to the impact on development capacity, is applied.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The methodology used to identify and schedule built heritage is flawed.	That the methodology used to identify historic heritage structures is revised.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.3	General	General	Oppose	There will be significant pressure on the resource available to support owners of genuine heritage buildings and structures.	Not stated.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		The Property Council raises concern regarding the impact of poorly targeted heritage buildings and structures on Hamilton's development capacity. Structures that are listed as built heritage face significant development restrictions and require additional resource consents for a range of common activities. For otherwise developable sites, these factors will often prove to be significant barrier to development and will restrict Hamilton's long-term development capacity.	The adoption of a far more targeted and tailored approach to historic heritage to reduce unintended consequences such as reducing ongoing maintenance of existing buildings, and urge that greater consideration is given to the impact on development capacity.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.2 Historic Heritage Area Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The metrics that comprise the methodology in identifying historic heritage areas are flawed; a broad brush approach has been applied causing significant development restrictions to properties of little to no heritage value.	Limit the Historic Heritage zoning to the five existing areas.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Do not support the addition of 32 additional historic heritage areas in Hamilton. Instead, the HHA areas should be limited to the existing five areas: Frankton Railway Village, Hamilton East, Hayes Paddock, Claudelands West and Temple View.	HHA areas should be limited to the existing five areas: Frankton Railway Village, Hamilton East, Hayes Paddock, Claudelands West and Temple View.
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter, the Property Council, questions the need for additional Archaeological site provisions when Heritage NZ requirements already exist. In addition, the Property Council has concern where archaeological areas have been added to developed sites which, therefore, would have less archaeological value. The submitter considers archaeological areas a barrier for property owners where time and money is required for resource consenting.	Do not apply archaeological overlays to areas that have already been developed on.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Property Council New Zealand - Logan Rainey Brian Squiar	388.8	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	Property Council raises concerns regarding the methodology used to identify new SNAs. They are worried that the methodology has resulted in the addition of new SNAs that might not meet the legislative requirements to be considered as such. This will place a major onus on private landowners to generate expert reports and assessments after notification; and this investment should have been made prior to public notification.	That the methodology is reviewed, including 'ground test' work.
Wayne Graham and Ann Kathleen Joseph and Kelly	389.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	That higher growing trees (deeper rooted) especially those planted by owners for erosion control and in order to protect present views of owners and neighbours, can be carefully pruned from time to time without Council consent/approval.	Seeks the ability to prune higher growing trees (deeper rooted) without the need apply for a resource consent.
N W and S Merrilees and Ford	390.1	General	General	Oppose	Oppose the plan change 9 in its entirety.	No relief sought stated.
N W and S Merrilees and Ford	390.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and implication of cSNA (c39) over 32 Demont Street.	Remove cSNA (C39) from 32 Demont Street.
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission]. And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve".
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (C7) that adjoins the property at 48 Amanda Avenue because the vegetation on the area were planted by humans with native and exotics and has not resulted naturally.	Review the extent of SNA (C7) as per Image 6, Section 4 of the full submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.2. And, if the above is not obliged, that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve.	For the purpose of the upper portion of the Bremworth Park bush as described [refer to Section 4 of the full submission] is deleted in its entirety in relation to the upper portion of the Bush in Bremworth Park. And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.3 being applied to the area of Bremworth Park.	Remove applicability of Rule 20.3 in relation to the area of Bremworth Park notated in Image 6, Section 4 of the full submission. And, if the above is not obliged, that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve.
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.1 in relation to the area of Bremworth Park (Refer to image 6, Section 4 of the full submission).	Do not apply Rule 20.5.1 in relation to the area of Bremworth Park (Image 6, Section 4 of the full submission). "And, if the above is not obliged, that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.6 in relation to the area of Bremworth Park (Refer to Image 6, Section 4 of the full submission).	<p>That Rule 20.5.6 is not applicable in relation to the area of Bremworth Park (Refer to Image 6, Section 4 of the full submission).</p> <p>"And, if the above is not obliged, that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve."</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	<p>Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission].</p> <p>And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	<p>Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission].</p> <p>And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	<p>Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission].</p> <p>And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	<p>Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission].</p> <p>And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks the removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission], the reasoning being that this area is not naturally occurring but planted via planting programs.	<p>Removal of the portion of the Significant Natural Area, C7 (cSNA) located between the rear property boundaries of 4, 6, 8 Deborah Place and 48 & 50 Amanda Avenue and the clubrooms within Bremworth Park [as identified in Section 4 of the full submission].</p> <p>And, if the above is not obliged, "that we are not saddled with enormous costs for a request to have a tree trimmed or portions removed if it has potential to strike our dwelling if it fell for any reason. There needs to a simple non-resource consent that is free to landowners to address this aspect. Our rates currently pay for the management of the reserve"</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.12	General	General	Oppose	<p>With regard to Significant Natural Areas -</p> <p>The submitter states that while "it is accepted by us that a tree could fall and part of it could land in our property, this aspect is not part of our submission/request. This is an accepted and not unreasonable risk when living near bush, we are only concerned with the safety and security and prevention of potential damage to the dwelling. The proposed Plan change lumbers us with tens of thousands of costs for what should be occurring now, by Council, to respect the safety of our dwelling and others immediately adjoining the park, that is trees should be trimmed not to have potential to strike a habitable building on adjoining residential property".</p>	<p>That Council ensure its conduct as a responsible neighbour and that trees in the bush area be trimmed and thereafter maintained near residential boundaries so that they do not grow to a height that has potential to strike a habitable building such that their height is not greater than the horizontal distance to such a building. This is an essential safety and living requirement, and hence so is a cost effective and minimum-hassle process to achieve that outcome.</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.13	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter wishes to maintain the right to request and have actions taken to protect the safety and value of our property from potential or actual vegetation nuisance, because "We currently have this right, subject to checking of the actual specimen in terms of its risk".</p>	<p>That a clause added to Plan Change 9 that (as a minimum for the General Residential Zone, but should apply to all Zones) that requires Council to assess, make alteration, and remove, (with a formal written request) at Council's own cost, with a Council right to agree or disagree, any specimen in an SNA or for any notable/listed tree (and could further apply to reserve trees).</p> <p>This is the context where no development is proposed by that adjoining property, and the request is in writing and for health and safety reasons, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is higher at its maximum height than the horizontal distance to the edge of a habitable building on adjoining property, it shall be shortened to be less than, unless it is proven by ecological assessment to be diseased and/or in immediate danger of falling. • Whose canopy prevents solar access to a dwelling such that the canopy shall be cut back to be not be greater than half the horizontal distance to any habitable building on adjoining property. • Whose root structure occurs more than 3m into any adjoining property, the root structure can be cut back to be less than this distance. <p>That removal or alteration, at Council discretion, will occur in those situations without resource consent application as a Permitted Activity.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.14	General	General	Oppose	The submitter seeks that all reserve and SNA specimens be managed by Council within a defined management plan that is referenced within Plan Change 9.	<p>That a clause added to Plan Change 9 that (as a minimum for the General Residential Zone, but should apply to all Zones) that requires Council to assess, make alteration, and remove, (with a formal written request) at Council's own cost, with a Council right to agree or disagree, any specimen in an SNA or for any notable/listed tree (and could further apply to reserve trees).</p> <p>This is the context where no development is proposed by that adjoining property, and the request is in writing and for health and safety reasons, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is higher at its maximum height than the horizontal distance to the edge of a habitable building on adjoining property, it shall be shortened to be less than, unless it is proven by ecological assessment to be diseased and/or in immediate danger of falling. • Whose canopy prevents solar access to a dwelling such that the canopy shall be cut back to be not be greater than half the horizontal distance to any habitable building on adjoining property. • Whose root structure occurs more than 3m into any adjoining property, the root structure can be cut back to be less than this distance. <p>That removal or alteration, at Council discretion, will occur in those situations without resource consent application as a Permitted Activity.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.15	General	General	Oppose	<p>This submission is concerned with protection of dwellings/habitable buildings from tree fall and the private right to be able to prune (with Council permission) within private property, within a defined scope, of specimens within the reserve, without any unreasonable procedural or cost barriers.</p> <p>Also the integrity of the claim the bush is a Significant Natural Area when it is not so. It has been planted by humans with natives and exotics and simply mimics such. It has not resulted naturally.</p>	<p>That Council maintain, prune and/or remove specimens within striking distances of residential dwellings.</p> <p>"Part of our concern is the total shift of emphasis of the legal principle of onus, from Council to landowners. There is no clear expectation set out that Council will manage its own property and reserves, to ensure health and safety obligations on landowners are upheld and risks mitigated to a reasonable extent. The impacts of the changes being proposed land solely on the private landowner. The current approach is unethical, legally incorrect, and long term will trend to undermine and discourage ecological sustainability, not enhance it".</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.16	General	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter is opposed to the current Plan Change 9 proposals, while supporting greater protections for biodiversity in principle, but within a clearer scope of onus and obligation, including sensible cost - effective measures to address basic human needs, that is balanced and cognisant of the principles of onus, obligations, and of costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan Change 9 core emphasis is inconsistent with the RMA, lacking clarity of scope and limiting definition, lack of cognisance of onus and of responsibility, and utterly inadequate consideration of the hugely significant costs on adjoining landowners potentially being imposed. 	<p>A clearer scope of onus and obligation, including sensible cost - effective measures to address basic human needs, that is balanced and cognisant of the principles of onus, obligations, and of costs is provided.</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.17	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The extent of change of size, growth, and area, occurring prior to SNA assessment and implementation within those identified bush areas, does not appear to have been given adequate regard as to the consequences of impacts on private property rights if that situation is continued without adequate reserve and SNA maintenance plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the Bremworth Park reserve is not naturally occurring but planted. The expectations of the eventual extent of such growth should be consistent with the occurrence of residential development in that same time period in relation to private property rights expectations. This aspect includes the impacts and limits of intended or natural default extension of an SNA into private property and encroachment of current and future private property rights if an existing tree/s has/have grown to, or, will likely become a nuisance or potential risk to private property safety and buildings. 	<p>Much of the Bremworth Park reserve is not naturally occurring but planted.</p> <p>The expectations of the eventual extent of such growth should be consistent with the occurrence of residential development in that same time period in relation to private property rights expectations. This aspect includes the impacts and limits of intended or natural default extension of an SNA into private property and encroachment of current and future private property rights if an existing tree/s has/have grown to, or, will likely become a nuisance or potential risk to private property safety and buildings.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.18	General	General	Oppose	<p>Plan Change 9 is inconsistent with the key principles of the RMA. While the planted bush may deserve better protection and management, the safety needs of residents and the right to reduce or remove trees immediately adjoining their property for safety needs without undue cost and process hassle, needs to be weighted, as that approach accords with the enabling intent of Section 5, Part 2 of the Act, and also avoids adverse effects as it also preserves most of the bush, it is just the edges of the SNA that would require some attention.</p> <p>When the full Section 6 RMA text is read, the Section 6(c) clause only applies to natural resources, not planted resources, which are/were not naturally occurring even if that activity planted some native specimens. Even if the bush mimics an SNA in its physical function and appearance, the point is that it is not. That and the content of Plan Change 9 is of concern given the overall implications of Plan Change 9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact is that the bush is not a natural resource under the meaning of Section 6(c) of the Act and it should not be included or mapped as an SNA, and should be removed from the District Plan maps as such. <p>The above gives weight to the content of this submission. While the planted bush may deserve better protection and management, the safety needs of residents and the right to reduce or remove trees immediately adjoining their property for safety needs without undue cost and process hassle, needs to be weighted, as that approach accords with the enabling intent of Section 5, Part 2 of the Act, and also avoids adverse effects as it also preserves most of the bush, it is just the edges of the SNA that would require some attention.</p>	<p>The character of a SNA in relation to human and property safety and protection of property pursuant to Part 2, Section 5 of the Act, and costs or resolution and the need for effective non - resource consent solutions to address minor matters associated with such.</p> <p>"We have concern that the combined vested interest of Council debt and ecologist's and planning sector economic interests that SNA's will become an unfair, costly and unjustified compliance exercise, at the expense of the basic and decent principle of ensuring basic health and safety requirements of residential activity are upheld. That outcome, and the current Plan Change 9 recommendations will undermine the goodwill of private property owners who fund Council to maintain reserves and, in due course, the proposed SNA's. As private landowners, we also have a self - interest in the protection and maintenance of these areas due to the amenity they afford to our lifestyle, enjoyment and long - term property value. Affordability being the key word."</p>
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.19	General	General	Oppose	<p>Refer to section 2.3 of the full submission -</p> <p>Improved protection of natural and exotic biodiversity in listed areas while providing a balancing of the important legal principle of 'onus' that underpins the RMA and most law. That is, clarity of obligations of Council to maintain SNA's to ensure such risk is reasonably mitigated by maintenance of an SNA within Council jurisdiction, compared to development onus to reduce and mitigate effects on listed SNA areas. Therefore, the legal principle of onus is important. If a landowner is proposing development, the RMA places the onus on the developer to mitigate effects. However, the onus to maintain property not to be a nuisance and safety concern to other property and persons is and should remain the responsibility of the landowner/leaseholder/manager, including that of Council.</p>	<p>Plan change 9 unfairly and inequitably divests that cost and effects of under-managed reserves/SNA's solely to landowners.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.20	General	General	Oppose	Refer to section 2.3.1 in the full submission - The implications of Plan Change 9 is that an SNA, without any defined limits physically, will mean that proposed regulatory requirements as a result of the natural consequence of vegetation growth will ever increasingly encroach into private land and private property rights, and at present takes away the basic human right to have a cost-effective measure to protect the safety of a dwelling and its occupants from encroached vegetation nuisance. While we are to an extent concerned about the leaf overhang physically if it causes shade, and lack of solar access to the dwelling, or is a physical nuisance, we are more concerned about the cost to have it removed if it becomes a nuisance, or if it falls on our dwelling or injures/kills someone.	Plan Change 9 provides no clear onus of obligation for Council to manage its reserves and potential for adverse effects on landowners from ongoing growth and lack of maintenance of such vegetation, when such should already be occurring as charged for in rates.
Sharp Planning Solutions - Kevin and Alison Sharp	391.21	General	General	Oppose	Cost to Landowners , Refer to Section 2.3.2 of the full submission - Nothing in the Appendix 12 report, mentions the costs of its recommendations on landowners, where SNA vegetation impacts safety and health. No regard is given to the fact most people simply cannot afford the unreasonable costs involved. The report does not mention the 4-5k of a resource consent application, (or a similar cost to prove a permitted activity status via Section 87BB of the Act or proving vegetation measurements via ecologist report) the requirement to present a likely ecology report at 8 to 10k, then a likely Council peer review with another ecology report at the Applicant's cost, or the strict qualification requirements, or the requirement of the landowner to pay for the works or the mitigation. In other words, to have a tree removed that has grown so large near a house it could fall on the house, is potentially a 25k+ exercise just so one can sleep at night having a tree that has grown inappropriately large near a house, that occurred prior to the tree overgrowing it, removed	Council needs to take on board reserves maintenance is already paid by rates and development contributions keeping simply resolvable matters simple and cost – effective, not adding undue complexity and significant costs, is what is being requested, while recognising the need to preserve our natural bush.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Steven Perdia	392.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the communications and engagement from staff poor and that property owners should have had an opportunity to participate in co-designing this plan change.	<p>Pause the Plan Change and instruct staff to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Engage private property owners, by mail not a FaceBook post, in a co-design process for the Heritage Zone. It is an important policy to get right. This engagement process would recognise private property owners as key stakeholders in this process, educate and inform both staff and private property owners, help owners understand cause and effect relationships and enable property owners to be part of developing goals for their suburb. b. Obtain a report that analyses the impact on property values of the NPS-UD and the Heritage Zone and make the report available to all affected property owners. This is a critical piece of information for the policy design and property owner's decision-making process. c. Develop a definition for a 'character area', that would likely be based on the year a house was built and the number of character homes in an area. This definition should be consulted on, unless an accepted definition already exists.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Steven Perdia	392.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the communications and engagement from staff poor and that property owners should have had an opportunity to participate in co-designing this plan change.	<p>If the Council proceeds with the Plan Change then I propose that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Council requests a report analysing the impact on property values as this information is critical in the decision-making process. There is a potential loss of value to private property owners and Council needs to weigh up the cost of compensation to retain the amenity they think is important. b. The Heritage Zone policy be restricted to requiring a Resource Consent to remove or add a dwelling only to a section, as the intent of the plan change is to stop intensification. c. The Special Character Overlay rules be retained for housing maintenance and alterations, as they already have a high level of requirement/rules to preserve the amenity and character, people have a good understanding of them and they have done a good job so far. d. The splitting of these functions has the additional benefit of removing the threat that it becomes too difficult and costly for property owners to do property improvements.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Arthur Giffney	393.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the inclusion of privately owned land and the associated rules for SNAs because they inhibit landowners from managing their own garden and intrusion on property rights. The privately owned gully areas included in the SNA do not need the 'protection' provided by the proposed SNA rules.</p> <p>The vegetated areas assessed for inclusion in the SNA existed long before the SNA boundaries were determined demonstrating that these areas will continue to exist without SNA rules intended to force the outcome desired.</p> <p>The SNA boundaries have been determined without taking into account the detrimental effects of shading caused by large trees, including shading of vegetable gardens and fruit trees; and house and living areas. The proposed rules will condemn landowners to living in a shady environment as they are unable to manage their trees as they see fit.</p> <p>The SNA boundaries and related rules have not taking into account the detrimental effects of large trees dominating the canopy and preventing establishment of more desirable plants. Other detrimental effects from large trees include leaf litter, seeds, pollen and fern spore and bird droppings.</p> <p>The proposed rules and consenting make it too hard to continue.</p> <p>Often trees grow in a way that becomes less stable as they get bigger. The potential to fall on fences, garden structures and indeed your own or a neighbouring house needs to be something landowners can deal with; when your own trees outgrow their desirability they need to be cut down and this shouldn't need a resource consent or to involve planners, ecologists and an arborist.</p>	Seeks the reassessment of SNA boundaries to exclude privately owned land
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.1	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the implementation of the protected root zone calculation methodology, and the effect of this methodology in relation to tree growth over time.	Clarification as to whether the protected root zone of notable trees will expand over time as notable trees grow, including how this managed through the current rule framework.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter opposes the current wording of Rule 20.3.w (ii) and seeks clarification on how existing use rights for private property owners are going to be maintained; and seeks amendments to the wording in line with Rule 9.4.5(b) to protect the existing use rights of private property owners affected by Schedule 9D.	<p>Seeks to amend Rule 20.3(w)(ii), by adding the following exemption, to read:</p> <p>ii. The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface.</p> <p><u>Exemption:</u> <u>The minimum permeable surface area shall not apply in the following circumstances:</u> a) <u>For any change of use that would otherwise be a permitted activity and does not reduce the area of permeable surfaces below what already exists at [insert notification date].</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(a) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (a) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarifications of the current wording for the measurement point for Rule 20.3.(v) as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree, or 3m from the protected root zone.	Seeks clarification in relation to the measurement points for Rule 20.3.(v) as whether it is measured 3m from the base of a notable tree, 3m from any exposed root of a notable tree, or 3m from the protected root zone.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks clarification as to whether the ' <i>the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment</i> ' as per current wording of Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within a driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the Protected Root Zone.	Seeks clarification on whether ' <i>the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment</i> ' as stated in Rule 20.3.w (viii) includes the parking of cars within the driveway of private properties of which are overlaid by the protected root zone
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(c) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (c) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Fraser McNutt Sanjil Mistry - Rentrezi Limited	394.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part the current wording for Policy 20.2.3(d) as it does not account for the maintenance and upkeep of a private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.	Seeks amendments to Policy 20.2.3 (d) to provide for and recognise the maintenance and upkeep of the private boundary edge or the upkeep of private property rights where the Protected Root Zones traverses onto private property.
Christine and Robert Coombes	395.1	General	General		Not stated	No relief sought stated.
Phil Handford	396.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T40 at 104 Lake Road.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T40 from Schedule 9D.
C K Reddy Ltd - Chandra Kumar Reddy 242 Grey Street	397.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T8.10 by 242 Grey Street due to the following reasons as stated by the submitter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree can lead to risks for safety and accessibility of the driveway at 242 Grey Street, which has resulted in damage to vehicles multiple times, when entering or exiting the property. The tree has grown so big that the driveway entrance cannot be used safely. The tree is also obstructing the view of on coming traffic from the south end of Grey Street. Big branches of tree can fall onto the property by strong winds and rain, which can potentially kill people. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T8.10 from Schedule 9.
Anthony Shadrock	398.1	General	General		Submission made in relation to PC9 in its entirety.	No relief sought stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Manga Waitawhiriwhiri Kaitiaki - Te Kopa King	399.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-2 Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP): Archaeological Sites, Archaeological Areas, Historic Areas or Waahi Tapu	Support in part	<p>The submitter is concerned about:</p> <p>(i) consultation with the right tangata whenua about archaeological sites;</p> <p>(ii) modification or destruction of archaeological sites without an authority to do so from HNZPT.</p> <p>(iii) the lack of identification of the correct hapu in order to obtain resource consent and not from an individual being non transparent with the tribe about it</p> <p>(iv) If anyone were to look at the signboard structured at Pukete paa why is the hapu that were invited here for the past few decades given a say over ours in our indigenous tribal lands and territory? Is there some status quo or narrative not right here and how to correct that so our future generations as well are not mixed up about where they come from, belong, to be proud of and where theyre going?</p> <p>(v) lack of engagement of hapu or the uri when and before archaeologists do their work</p>	<p>Hamilton City Council to review and change its consultation and engagement process where all indigenous Tribal Traditional land owners, restoration projects including those not crown or non govt profit organisations and tribes not registered with waikato tainui iwi corp, Te haa o te whenua o Kirikiriroa and any other corporations and stake holders can make sincere amendments or changes together for restoration and to prevent future or repetitive mistakes and trespasses.</p> <p>The submitter seeks amendments to all the provisions and rules, including:</p> <p>1.4 Limitations</p> <p>2 Legislative Framework</p> <p>2.1 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014</p> <p>2.2 Resource Management Act 1991</p> <p>3 Gardening Soils Overlay 3.1 and 3.2</p> <p>4 1.2 Significance Criteria</p>
Chris Dillon Jason and Julia Waugh - 59A Harrowfield Drive, Hamilton, 3210	400.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of 89 Albert Street as built heritage because the dwelling identified as H142 in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage was removed from the site on the 5 May 2022, prior to the notification of PC9.	Removal of all reference to H142, 89 Albert Street from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Robyn and Dennis Lee	401.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers nine properties within the Lamont, Freemont, Egmont and Claremont Avenue HHA to be indefensible against Heritage assessment criteria.	Amend the Lamont, Freemont, Egmont and Claremont Street Historic Heritage Area to exclude the following properties: 1) 54 Bellmont Avenue 2) 2 Lamont Street 3) 48 Bellmont Avenue 4) 1 Freemont Street 5) 2 Freemont Street 6) 40 Bellmont Avenue 7) 38 Bellmont Avenue 8) 1 Egmont Street 9) 2 Egmont Street
Robyn and Dennis Lee	401.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support in part	The submitter considers the methodology used to assess HAAs too broad and inconsistently applied. In particular, the assessment criteria relating to construction company era and the dominance of the private car. In addition, the submitter considers the introduction of HHA standards an erosion of private property rights concerning consenting requirements.	Remove two themes for HHA identification: 1) - The construction company era, and 2) - The dominance of the private car.
Korris Ltd - Vinal Mistry	402.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter seeks removal of Archaeological Site A15 (S14/3) at 677 River Road. The submitter refers to the archaeological study indicating no significance remaining on the site, and the developed nature of the site. The submitter considers the application of an Archaeological Site to the property will make future development onerous.	Remove Archaeological Site A15 (S14/3) from 677 River Road
Korris Ltd - Vinal Mistry	402.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (C66) on the property at 677 River Road because detailed study of 677 River road has not identified any significant natural areas on site, or species. The trees currently located on site, pose a safety risk and this risk should be managed proactively by land owners not HCC.	Remove the SNA (C66) from the property at 677 River Road.
Korris Ltd - Vinal Mistry	402.3	General	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Plan Change 9.	Delete PC 9 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Korris Ltd - Vinal Mistry	402.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to part of the SNA (F59) on the property at 1905 River Road because 1905 River Road currently has an SNA overlay for areas which are predominantly gorse and other weeds. Removing the SNA will enable future development to replant the area without requiring a resource consent.	Remove the SNA (F59) from the property at 1905 River Road.
Edward Owen Hall	403.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter seeks to include areas between north of Albert Street to Clyde Street, and between Nixon Street and Grey Street, as part of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area to preserve the historic values of the area from intensification and inappropriate building design, because historically it is the first Hamilton East residential blocks surrounding our oldest City Park (as currently known as Steele Park).	Seeks inclusion of areas between between north of Albert Street to Clyde Street, and between Nixon Street and Grey Street, as part of Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area.
Keith Robert Houston	405.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes Archaeological Site A176 (S14/325) applying on their property at 142 Riverlea Road. The archaeological area that covers the property is relatively small and has been altered overtime to form a paved parking area.	To remove Archaeological Site A176 (S14/325) applying on 142 Riverlea Road.
Incredible Gadgets Limited - Kevin Ma	406.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Oppose	The submitter opposes Historic heritage areas as limits property owners rights to make alterations and renovations and believes it will negatively impact house values.	Remove all Historic Heritage Areas as notified.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the Marama Historic Heritage Area (HHA18).	Removal of the high density zoning over Marama Street and the remaining villas on Seddon Street; and that the historic heritage villas are protected from demolition and development.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the level of protected being proposed through PC9 and seeks protections of villas and pre1930's homes and gardens. The submitter also states "Hamilton Council must protect and preserve the remaining built heritage houses pertaining to the founding of Hamiltons colonial history".	Protection is provided for the heritage villas of Marama Street, Moana Street and surrounding pre 1930's homes and gardens.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Policy Framework of the Chapter	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the manner in which Hamilton's history is presently being undertaken, however is concerned that: "archaeological and cultural sites do not relate to Maori alone. European settlement is neglectfully absent. Hamilton City Council has failed to preserve much of Hamilton's European history"	Hamilton City Council to be more aligned to the importance of preservation of our European history in the architecture of old houses/buildings and historic sites.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part the application of Significant Natural Areas because there is the need to preserve all remaining natural areas	Preserve all remaining natural areas.
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the protection of Notable Trees because not enough is being done to protect the environment from the elements of global warming and whether natuve or exotic they do the same thing.	Retain tree preservation legislation.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Kathleen Heather McCaughtrie	407.6	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Plan Change 9 because they "strongly oppose condensed intensified housed suburbs".	Bring in tree preservation law.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA 8) over 4 Kitchener Street Claudelands, because the existing brick house is of poor quality and should not be protected.	Remove the proposed Claudelands Historic Heritage Area (HHA8) from 4 Kitchener Street, Claudelands.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter supports the revised Policy 19.2.3a to the extent that they acknowledge that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances.	Retain as notified Policy 19.2.3a to the extent that it acknowledges that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2a because of the requirement for any alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HAAs to require consent, opposing the RD activity status, unless the features contribute to the HHA. Minor 'buildings' as such garden sheds, decks, or roofed pergolas are often insignificant features and their construction, alteration, or removal should not require consent unless the features contribute to the HAA, particularly where they are not visible from the street. The activity status table should be amended to reflect this.	Amend Rule 19.3.2a to read: 19.3.2a. Alterations and additions to an existing building on a front, corner or through site within an HHA <u>where the building contributes to the identified characteristics of the HHA</u> (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage): RD
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T223.2 and its protected root zone at 4 Kitchener Street due to the following reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protected root zone extends over the majority of the site, which will trigger the resource consent for developments. The s32a appendices indicates that the trees themselves are poor quality. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T223.2 from Schedule 9D and any consequential amendments.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T223.3 and its protected root zone at 4 Kitchener Street due to the following reason: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protected root zone extends over the majority of the site, which will trigger the resource consent for developments. The s32a appendices indicates that the trees themselves are poor quality. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T223.3 from Schedule 9D and any consequential amendments.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter oppose rule 20.3(w) to the extent that it requires resource consent for the planting of all trees; the storage of materials, vehicles and equipment; laying, sealing, and paving; alterations to buildings; and the construction of new ones.</p> <p>These requirements are far too restrictive considering how many properties are now affected by the protective root zone overlays. The rule as written indicates that resource consent will be required from Council to park cars, repair driveways, and build garden sheds where these overlays are present.</p> <p>For example the brick house at 4 Kitchener Street Claudelands has underground piles the age of the building and many costly repairs are required. To minimise damage and inconvenience to tenants repairs need to be quickly attended to.</p>	Seeks the reconsideration and additional explanation or further details of Rule 20.3(w) to improve clarity and better achieve its intent.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the imposition of HHAs in general.	Amend the relevant policies related to Historic Heritage Areas to allow for considerate development.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter supports the revised Policy 19.2.3b to the extent that they acknowledge that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances.	Retain as notified Policy 19.2.3b to the extent that it acknowledges that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks the term consistent in Policy 19.2.3f be removed and replaced with compatible to allow more flexibility with design.</p> <p>“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 compatible with identified heritage”.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3f, to read:</p> <p>The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the setting of a historic heritage building or structure in Schedule 8A, shall be consistent <u>compatible</u> with identified heritage.</p>
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.10	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter supports the revised policies 19.2.3a and 19.2.3b to the extent that they acknowledge that demolition or relocation can be appropriate in certain circumstances, but seeks to broaden the definitions for demolition to allow for development.	Broaden the existing definition for demolition to allow for development.
Graham Family Trust - Vanessa Bailey	408.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2f because of the requirement for any alterations, additions, removal or construction of all buildings on front sites in HHAs to require consent, opposing the RD activity status, unless the features contribute to the HHA. Minor ‘buildings’ as such garden sheds, decks, or roofed pergolas are often insignificant features and their construction, alteration, or removal should not require consent unless the features contribute to the HAA, particularly where they are not visible from the street. The activity status table should be amended to reflect this.	<p>Amend Rule 19.3.2f to read:</p> <p>Demolition of existing detached accessory buildings on a front, corner or through site within an HHA <u>where the building contributes to the identified characteristics of the HHA</u> (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage): RD</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Conservation Board - Waikato Conservation Board	409.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports the proposed provisions and which includes the sustainable management of natural resources and the protection of significant indigenous vegetation.	Subject to related submission relief, adopt the provisions as notified.
Waikato Conservation Board - Waikato Conservation Board	409.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the provisions and considers that threats to SNA's include reduction or loss of habitats due to contamination, disturbance, destruction, invasive weeds, vertebrate pests and land development and further that the protection of SNA's will help with providing habitats for indigenous plant and animal species.	Adopt the provisions as notified.
Waikato Conservation Board - Waikato Conservation Board	409.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the provisions and considers that there needs to be information and advice available to landowners (who have SNAs in private ownership) to assist with enhancing and promoting of their own SNAs. The submitter is extremely supportive of the policies 20.2.2a and 20.2.2b, and further consider that the public needs access to education and funding to maintain and restore SNA's. A fund (similar to the heritage fund) should be adopted to assist properties that are planting and maintaining these areas.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt the words "protection and restoration" to implement the Waikato Conservation Management Strategy. 2. Establish a fund (similar to the heritage fund) to assist properties that are planting and maintaining SNA's
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret Wise Trust - PO Box 307 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton	410.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	Concerning 319 Grey Street, Wise Group notes the different consent requirements for the demolition of buildings within the District Plan and considers any demolition standards for Archaeological sites to be unclear. And seek clarification that work on Schedule 8C sites is permitted if it does not include earthworks. Or as an alternative remove the archaeological site notation from the entirety of 319 Grey Street, because "the site has little to distinguish it from other sites in Hamilton East, Central City or Frankton where there were previously buildings that pre-dated 1900".	<p>Amend: Rule 19.3.3 to clarify that work on Schedule 8C sites is permitted if it does not include earthworks as follows:</p> <p>a) Minor work on all sites in Schedule 8B or Schedule 8C P ai) <u>Demolition, alterations and additions to an existing building in Schedule C that does not involve earthworks</u> P</p> <p>Or alternatively;</p> <p>Delete the Archaeological Site Overlay (A180) from the entirety of 319 Grey Street; or</p> <p>Such other amendments that will achieve the outcome sought.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret Wise Trust - PO Box 307 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton	410.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter was advised by the PC9 notification letter (dated 25 July 2022) of the identification of 319 Grey Street as also being subject to a protected root zone of a notable tree. The notification includes a 'Hamilton City Council Stem Review' assessment in relation to a tree opposite on Steele Park described as a 28m Ulmus procura. The PC9 map shows several protected root zones from notable trees on Council property in the vicinity. None of those root zones is shown over the boundary onto 319 Grey Street.	Confirmation that no Protected Root Zone of either the Ulmus procera described in the Stem Review report, or any notable trees extend onto 319 Grey Street.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret Wise Trust - PO Box 307 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton	410.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The Trust's head office is at 293 Grey Street. The PC9 mapping tool shows a Notable Tree listed in Schedule 9D as "T8.6" located on the verge outside the Property. The Trust received no notification regarding 293 Grey Street. The proposed Protected Root Zone of T8.6 extends over the eastern boundary and onto the Property.</p> <p>There is a network utility power transformer on the ground inside the boundary of 293 Grey Street. That transformer supplies power to the Trust's building and to other properties nearby. The transformer is within the Protected Root Zone. There are other network utility services along the footpath that service businesses and homes in the vicinity. Those services are also within the Protected Root Zone.</p> <p>Rule 20.3(v) permits certain earthworks within the Protected Root Zone so long as they are not closer than 3m to the protected tree. Those earthworks include non-mechanical/hand digging for network utility purposes, gardening and holes/fence posts etc. Rule 20.3(w) requires that other activities within the Protected Root Zone (except earthworks already allowed under 20.3(v)) will need a Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent. This includes earthworks for alterations to buildings where the footprint will change. Also controlled are: the storage of materials, vehicles and equipment; pipe installation less than 800mm below ground surface; sealing or paving; planting of trees.</p>	Clarification on the location and extent of the Protected Root Zone for the notable tree (T8.6) in from of 293 Grey Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret Wise Trust - PO Box 307 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton	410.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	<p>The Trust's head office is at 293 Grey Street. The PC9 mapping tool shows a Notable Tree listed in Schedule 9D as "T8.6" located on the verge outside the Property. The Trust received no notification regarding 293 Grey Street. The proposed Protected Root Zone of T8.6 extends over the eastern boundary and onto the Property.</p> <p>There is a network utility power transformer on the ground inside the boundary of 293 Grey Street. That transformer supplies power to the Trust's building and to other properties nearby. The transformer is within the Protected Root Zone. There are other network utility services along the footpath that service businesses and homes in the vicinity. Those services are also within the Protected Root Zone.</p> <p>Rule 20.3(v) permits certain earthworks within the Protected Root Zone so long as they are not closer than 3m to the protected tree. Those earthworks include non-mechanical/hand digging for network utility purposes, gardening and holes/fence posts etc. Rule 20.3(w) requires that other activities within the Protected Root Zone (except earthworks already allowed under 20.3(v)) will need a Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent. This includes earthworks for alterations to buildings where the footprint will change. Also controlled are: the storage of materials, vehicles and equipment; pipe installation less than 800mm below ground surface; sealing or paving; planting of trees.</p>	Clarification on the financial obligations on the landowner where damage is caused to the property from roots of a protected tree that is located outside the boundary and is owned by another party, for example HCC.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Joan Forret Wise Trust - PO Box 307 Waikato Mail Centre Hamilton	410.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The Trust's head office is at 293 Grey Street. The PC9 mapping tool shows a Notable Tree listed in Schedule 9D as "T8.6" located on the verge outside the Property. The Trust received no notification regarding 293 Grey Street. The proposed Protected Root Zone of T8.6 extends over the eastern boundary and onto the Property.</p> <p>There is a network utility power transformer on the ground inside the boundary of 293 Grey Street. That transformer supplies power to the Trust's building and to other properties nearby. The transformer is within the Protected Root Zone. There are other network utility services along the footpath that service businesses and homes in the vicinity. Those services are also within the Protected Root Zone.</p> <p>Rule 20.3(v) permits certain earthworks within the Protected Root Zone so long as they are not closer than 3m to the protected tree. Those earthworks include non-mechanical/hand digging for network utility purposes, gardening and holes/fence posts etc. Rule 20.3(w) requires that other activities within the Protected Root Zone (except earthworks already allowed under 20.3(v)) will need a Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent. This includes earthworks for alterations to buildings where the footprint will change. Also controlled are: the storage of materials, vehicles and equipment; pipe installation less than 800mm below ground surface; sealing or paving; planting of trees.</p>	Clarification that works to maintain and protect network utility services will not be delayed where they are located within a Protected Root Zone.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is of the opinion that the methodology used in the identification of HHA's is not as robust as it should be and that it has not been applied consistently (see full submission for details)	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is of the opinion that the methodology used in the identification of HHA's is not as robust as it should be and that it has not been applied consistently (see full submission for details)	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHAs, the submitter is of the opinion that the assessment and scoring is neither robust or consistent. Concerns relate to the assessment of the following elements and the scoring applied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood Streets • Pre-1930s Service Town Theme • Railway Worker Suburb Theme • Typology of a Railway House: 1923-1928 • Typology of a Railway House: 1930s-1950s • Typology of Houses in Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street • Consistency for Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA • Street/Block Layout • Street Design • Lot size, dimensions and density • Lot Layout • Topography and Green Structure • Architecture and Building Typology • Frontage Treatments 	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Regarding the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHAs, the submitter is of the opinion that the assessment and scoring is neither robust or consistent. Concerns relate to the assessment of the following elements and the scoring applied: <p>Neighbourhood Streets Pre-1930s Service Town Theme Railway Worker Suburb Theme Typology of a Railway House: 1923-1928 Typology of a Railway House: 1930s-1950s Typology of Houses in Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Consistency for Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA Street/Block Layout Street Design Lot size, dimensions and density Lot Layout Topography and Green Structure Architecture and Building Typology Frontage Treatments</p>	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter has concerns/issues regarding the assessment and scoring for identifying Frankton Railway Village HHA. These issues have to do with the methodology used for assessing consistency and scoring representativeness.	That the Frankton Railway Village is a nationally, regionally, and locally important heritage area and should be described as having "outstanding historical value".
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter has concerns/issues regarding the assessment and scoring for identifying the Hayes Paddock HHA. These issues have to do with the methodology used for assessing consistency and scoring representativeness.	That the Hayes Paddock Area is a nationally, regionally, and locally important heritage area and should be described as having "outstanding heritage value".
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter has a number of concerns and issues regarding the assessment and scoring for identifying HHAs in PC 9. In particular relating to the Methodology Used for Assessing Consistency and Scoring Representativeness; the comparison with neighbourhood streets scoring and the Story of Hamilton.	That, when reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter generally support the plan to protect those parts of Hamilton City which are of such heritage value locally, regionally or nationally that they should be identified as Historical Heritage Areas (HHA). However, the submitter does not believe the methodology has been as robust as it should be and that it has not been applied consistently.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.9	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter is of the opinion that the definition of HHA's must be amended to include the words "well documented" since in the Heritage Plan it discusses the avoidance of "enhancing the fabric" of assumed historical heritage.	To amend the definition of HHA's to include the words "well documented"
David Edwin and Jean Mary Whyte and Dorrell	411.10	General	General	Oppose	The submitter has concerns and /or issues regarding costs and incentives for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any intention to put up signage and make these HHAs part of a city-wide linked heritage walk • The concern that the imposition of a HHA is effectively a post-purchase covenant being imposed by a third party not involved in the actual purchase process and that if the property has some true historic heritage value (such as being a Schedule 8A, A or B house), the heritage of the house may add to the value of the property or have a neutral effect, but where the property is designated to have a false historic heritage simply because it is old or was a state house, the HHA creates a loss of value on the property. 	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Trust Waikato - Dennis Turton - Melanie Blackmore	412.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.2 Pruning and Maintenance of Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5 2 allowing work to be completed for urgent health and safety, because it does not give an acceptable process for business to be proactive and minimise risk and incidents. The rule as notified restrict the submitter's ability to maintain their notable trees and meet their health and safety obligations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trust Waikato currently have very good a working relationship with the Hamilton City Council to manage the ongoing health and maintenance of our trees. The trees team at the council know our process and work with us as well as the team at Treescape during every aspect of the maintenance. This has worked very well for many years, and we would like this process to continue. 2. Trust Waikato seek a decision from the Hamilton City Council that notable trees on land where a business operates and have obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, that in consultation with the Hamilton City Council can complete the required maintenance work. Consent will not be required where an organisation is completing maintenance for obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015. 3. Trust Waikato also request that Hamilton City Council recognise the importance of maintenance as a way of minimising health and safety risk. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 asks workplaces to take steps to eliminate or minimise risks. Plan Change 9 for notable trees talks about urgent health and safety work but does not provide an acceptable process that encourages mitigations. 4. Furthermore, Trust Waikato would also like consideration be given to the thresholds for pruning and maintenance that considers trees such as ours. Most maintenance that has been completed on our trees would exceed the thresholds that have been proposed.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Trust Waikato - Dennis Turton - Melanie Blackmore	412.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 allowing work to be completed for urgent health and safety, because it does not give an acceptable process for business to be proactive and minimise risk and incidents. The rule as notified restrict the submitter's ability to maintain their notable trees and meet their health and safety obligations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trust Waikato currently have very good a working relationship with the Hamilton City Council to manage the ongoing health and maintenance of our trees. The trees team at the council know our process and work with us as well as the team at Treescape during every aspect of the maintenance. This has worked very well for many years, and we would like this process to continue. 2. Trust Waikato seek a decision from the Hamilton City Council that notable trees on land where a business operates and have obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, that in consultation with the Hamilton City Council can complete the required maintenance work. Consent will not be required where an organisation is completing maintenance for obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015. 3. Trust Waikato also request that Hamilton City Council recognise the importance of maintenance as a way of minimising health and safety risk. The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 asks workplaces to take steps to eliminate or minimise risks. Plan Change 9 for notable trees talks about urgent health and safety work but does not provide an acceptable process that encourages mitigations. 4. Furthermore, Trust Waikato would also like consideration be given to the thresholds for pruning and maintenance that considers trees such as ours. Most maintenance that has been completed on our trees would exceed the thresholds that have been proposed.
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Gaye Bainbridge and Graham Watson - 1335 Victoria Street Beerescourt Hamilton - 3200	413.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitters oppose the scheduling of 1335 Victoria Street as a built heritage item (H308) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Removal of all reference to H308, 1335 Victoria Street from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Harkness Henry Lawyers - Charlotte Muggeridge Jacqui Bennion and Julie Nelson - 36 Anglesea Street, Hamilton - 3204	414.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitters oppose the scheduling of the dwelling at 36 Anglesea Street as a built heritage item (H150) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove all reference to H150, 36 Anglesea Street from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Jacqueline Helen Fitzgerald	415.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter seeks 21 Stanley Street to be scheduled as built heritage because the building is of immense character and history and has significant historical value. The floors and staircase are matai and many of the design elements are of the post-WWI period.	Amend Schedule 8A Built Heritage to include 21 Stanley Street.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the protection of SNAs across the city and acknowledges the massive efforts of volunteers for restoration and pest controls.	No relief stated.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	General	Support in part	Supports the additional 1031 trees proposed to be included in Schedule 9D, but notes that no trees on private land have been added to the schedule under Plan Change 9.	Seeks opportunities to add trees on private land to Schedule 9D, including through a public campaign and informal survey.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support	The submitter supports the protection of archaeological sites.	Maintain protection of archaeological sites.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of additional built heritage in Schedule 8A under Plan Change 9, however is concerned that it does not go far enough to protect these areas. Is concerned about three storied buildings being built on rear sections and heritage buildings surrounded by apartments, other houses or multi-storied dwellings. Without changing the underlying zoning to protect the whole area, the heritage areas will be subjected to intensification and oblivion.	Seeks greater protection for heritage areas within the District Plan, including against intensification.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of additional built heritage in Schedule 8D under Plan Change 9, however is concerned that it does not go far enough to protect these areas. Is concerned about three storied buildings being built on rear sections and heritage buildings surrounded by apartments, other houses or multi-storied dwellings. Without changing the underlying zoning to protect the whole area, the heritage areas will be subjected to intensification and oblivion.	Seeks greater protection for heritage areas within the District Plan, including against intensification.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.6	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	fSNA	Support	The submitter supports the identification and inclusion of Hammond Bush as fSNA (F11).	Retain fSNA (F11) as notified.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.8	General	General	Support in part	Floods should be dealt with in a more natural and effective way. Allow streams and rivers to spread out across floodplains which ensures floodwaters are shallower and less devastating. There will be biodiversity benefits and make the city more beautiful. Fences could be fenced off for safety reasons and makes it easier to test water quality.	Unculvert the natural streams, let them spread out and prevent development in natural flood plain areas. Fence off streams.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	Buildings within the close proximity to the notable trees may damage and/or destroy root systems and lead to the death of the trees. There is a likelihood of greater soil impaction from foot traffic and vehicles parked on berms.	Introduce a buffer zone around notable trees where intensification is not allowed.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.10	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the approach of applying Historic Heritage Areas as an overlay and seeks to apply them as zonings, because it will offer better protections of these areas. The submitter comments that some of the heritage is in high residential areas where intensification is happening rapidly. Therefore it will be better to change the zoning to have more protection.	Change Historic Heritage Areas to zones, as well as the overlay, with tightened rules to maintain the integrity of HHAs.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the requirement for resource consent to authorise the demolition and/or removal of existing buildings within Historic Heritage Areas on the proviso that consents be weighted towards not removing them except in exceptional circumstances.	That the requirement for resource consent for the demolition/removal of buildings and other original features in HHAs be weighted towards not removing them except in exceptional circumstances.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of appropriate standards for new buildings, alterations, fences, and walls with deviations requiring a restricted discretionary consent as recommended in the Historic Heritage Area Assessment Report.	Include appropriate standards for new buildings, alterations, fences, and walls with deviations requiring a restricted discretionary consent.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	Disagrees with development occurring on rear sections even if it does not have a negative impact on the appearance of the street. Any development will impact heritage status and three storied buildings are going to dominate the rest of the area and make a mockery of HHAs.	Seeks that there be the same conditions for rear properties as for the front ones.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter agrees with the recommendations in the Historic Heritage Areas Assessment to include height in relation to boundary and setback standards to manage the development on sites adjacent to Historic Heritage Areas.	Supports inclusion of height in relation to boundary and setback standards.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.18	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as properties at 55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Cook Street are excluded. These properties are five intact cottages in a row which were soldiers' cottages and the exteriors are original.	Amend the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area to include 55, 57, 59, 61 and 63 Cook Street.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.19	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as the block on Cook Street between Wellington Street and Nixon Street is excluded.	Amend the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area to include the block on Cook Street between Wellington Street and Nixon Street.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.20	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as the area from Grey Street to Wellington Street is intact but stops at the Naylor Street roundabout.	Amend the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area so that it includes the block on Grey Street from the Naylor Street roundabout to Wellington Street.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.21	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area as 37, 41, 43, 45, 95 and 103 Albert Street are intact but are excluded from the HHA.	Amend the extent of the Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area to include 37, 41, 43, 45, 95 and 103 Albert Street.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.23	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter raises examples of listed buildings where development has encroached so much that the heritage values are severely compromised.	Seeks that heritage protection be extended to include the surroundings of the properties.
Waimarie: Hamilton East Community House - Jane Landman	416.26	General	General	Oppose	Supports the purpose and intent of PC9 but considers that PC9 does not provide enough protection of heritage. The rules to prevent significant intensification, inappropriate design and certain housing types are inadequate. No changes are proposed to the underlying zonings (Special Character Areas).	Change the underlying zoning for heritage areas to protect the whole area, including against intensification and demolition.
The Harrowfield Club and Dr Bryan Bang - Dr Bryan Bang	417.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection and identification of Historic Heritage Areas in Plan Change 9 and wants Harrowfield area to be identified as one of the Historic Heritage Areas and to be preserved with the relevant rules.	Seek inclusion of Harrowfield area as one of the Historic Heritage Areas with the associated rules in Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submission relates to the proposed Lamont Street HHA which includes 21 Lamont Street. The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction placed on development and associated costs that will arise from it. In terms of the characteristics of the HHA, the submitter is of the opinion that it is "difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance, that are not also present in many other parts of Hamilton". Further that the provisions present "a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals"	That the properties on northern of Lamont Street and the eastern side of Claremont, between Lamont and Dalmont Streets, are deleted from the Lamont, Freemont, Egmont & Claremont Streets Historic Heritage Area (HHA 17).
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submission relates to the proposed Lamont Street HHA which includes 21 Lamont Street. The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction placed on development and associated costs that will arise from it. In terms of the specific characteristics of the HHA, the submitter is of the opinion that it is "difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance, that are not also present in many other parts of Hamilton". Further that the provisions present "a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals"	Amend Rule 19.3.2a to allow alterations and additions to an existing building in a HHA, which do not change the street facing façade, to be a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	That Section 19 be rewritten to be more user friendly and better aligned with National Planning Standards. [An example of how this could be achieved is contained in the full submission].	That Chapter 19 be rewritten to be better aligned with the National Planning Standards.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.4	General	General	Oppose	<p>Section 32 Analysis</p> <p>Despite being aware of the requirements of the Resource Management Enabling Housing Supply and other Matters Amendment Act 2021 and Councils response to it (PC12), Council in assessing the options and identifying the extent of historic heritage areas has failed to identify and evaluate the costs to landowners and occupiers from having General Residential Zoned Land immediately adjoining Historic Heritage Areas.</p> <p>These costs go far beyond the consenting requirements that have been identified as the only cost to landowners in the assessment. These costs, in addition to not being able to develop their land in the same manner as adjoining land, are that they will suffer significant loss of amenity and privacy and potentially health arising from the development of neighbouring land.</p> <p>This is a direct result of the notification strategy employed by Council. PC9 and PC12 should have been notified concurrently so people were able to gauge both the internal and external effects of their land being contained within a Historic Heritage Area and make submissions accordingly.</p> <p>The costs associated with the notified extent of the Lamont Street HHA outweigh the benefits arising to Historic Heritage. In this respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The properties on the northern side of Lamont Street and Claremont Avenue should be removed from the HHA to enable landowners to develop their land in the same manner that adjoining land to the north and east can. • The removal of the HHA as sought will enable better design responses to density in the General Residential Zone though larger and deeper development blocks being available for development and sites being able to be developed in an integrated manner. • The removal of the HHA as sought will not adversely impact the historic heritage values associated with the remainder of the defined HHA. • The removal of the HHA will ensure that landowners will have a market to sell their land to. If the HHA is retained and neighbouring land is developed to its permitted extent the loss of amenity (sunlight, daylight and privacy) and restrictions on development will conspire to degrade the area. • The HHA is within close walking distance of Charwell Square. It is a location where higher density development should be encouraged. 	No specific relief stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submission relates to the proposed Lamont Street HHA which includes 21 Lamont Street. The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction placed on development and associated costs that will arise from it. In terms of the specific characteristics of the HHA, the submitter is of the opinion that it is "difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance, that are not also present in many other parts of Hamilton". Further that the provisions present "a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals"	Amend Rule 19.3.2f to allow for the demolition of existing detached accessory buildings in a HHA as a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submission relates to the proposed Lamont Street HHA which includes 21 Lamont Street. The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction placed on development and associated costs that will arise from it. In terms of the specific characteristics of the HHA, the submitter is of the opinion that it is "difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance, that are not also present in many other parts of Hamilton". Further that the provisions present "a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals"	Amend Rule 19.3.2l to allow for the relocation of existing buildings within a site in a HHA to be a permitted activity.
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submission relates to the proposed Lamont Street HHA which includes 21 Lamont Street. The submitter opposes the broad-brush approach of Plan Change 9 and the unreasonable restriction placed on development and associated costs that will arise from it. In terms of the specific characteristics of the HHA, the submitter is of the opinion that it is "difficult to reconcile what heritage values associated with the subject and surrounding land Council is trying to protect as a matter of national importance, that are not also present in many other parts of Hamilton". Further that the provisions present "a one size fits all approach to heritage management which will result in excessive costs and extensive resource consent requirement for otherwise minor and insignificant development proposals"	Amend Rule 19.3.2j to allow new buildings located behind any existing dwelling in a HHA to be a permitted activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
PRS Planning Services Ltd - Peter Skilton L.R.P Taylor - 21 Lamont Street	418.8	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	<p>The submitter states that it is a secondary requirement that any activity requiring resource consent is required as part of any application submitted to include a Heritage Impact Assessment. This new requirement adds to other similar information requirements already in the plan (e.g. traffic impact assessment, water impact assessment, centres assessments).</p> <p>The requirement to provide any assessment automatically results in significant time delays and costs for applicants. This is because Council staff generally only accept people with recognised qualifications and expertise as being able to undertake these types of assessments.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the requirement for provision of a Heritage Impact Assessment only occurs in relation to construction of new buildings / additions to existing buildings which propose to change the nature of the street frontage and that discretion be given to enable this to be applied on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>Amend Appendix 1 District Plan Administration, 1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements, 1.2.2.8 Historic Heritage Areas, to read:</p> <p>(a) Any activity requiring resource consent, <u>for a new building or additions, alterations, or relocation of an existing building</u>, relating to a <u>front, corner or through</u> site locating <u>located</u> within a historic heritage area shall <u>may be required to</u> include a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the resource consent application. <u>Where an assessment is required to be provided it shall address the matters in (b) – (e) below as relevant to the proposed activity.</u></p>
Kylie O'Dwyer	419.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter considers that there has been insufficient public consultation concerning Plan Change 9.	Conduct further public consultation.
Kylie O'Dwyer	419.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support in part	The submitter notes that HHA assessments have relied solely on the Richard Knott report and has not taken into consideration the previously prepared Lifescapes study.	That earlier heritage assessments undertaken by Lifescapes be used to inform the Plan Change.
Kylie O'Dwyer	419.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes boundaries of the Historic Heritage Areas of Graham Street (HHA11), Hamilton East (HHA12) and Hayes Paddock (HHA13) as notified, because there will not be a comprehensively protect the heritage aspects of the area. The areas presently excluded from these Historic Heritage Areas, being the area west of the Graham Street historic heritage area to the boundary of the Hayes Paddock historic heritage area, north to the boundary of the Hamilton East historic heritage area and south to Cobham Drive contains a number of historic villas and bungalows dating from the early twentieth century.	The historic heritage areas be extended to encompass the area west of the Graham Street HHA to the boundary of the Hayes Paddock HHA, north to the boundary of the Hamilton East HHA and south to Cobham Drive.
Kylie O'Dwyer	419.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter opposes the exclusion of Brookfield Street west of Gray Street from the surround Historic Heritage Area, and seeks that this section of Brookfield Street is included within a historic heritage area because the notified extents of proposed HHAs to be insufficient and will not comprehensively protect the heritage of the area.	The inclusion of Brookfield Street west of Grey Street within a Historic Heritage Area.
Kylie O'Dwyer	419.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Support in part	The submitter considers the the HHA assessments to be incomplete and do not reflect the true nature of heritage areas.	That all historic heritage areas be based on street boundaries rather than lot boundaries.
SUO shanshan	420.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the scheduling of the dwelling at 3 Frances Street, as a built heritage item on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Retain H199, 3 Frances Street as a built heritage item in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
SUO shanshan	420.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter requests that the front dwelling at 5 Frances Street is scheduled as a built heritage item on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by adding 5 Frances Street as a built heritage item.
SUO shanshan	420.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the scheduling of 11 Frances Street as a built heritage item (H200) in Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.	Retain H200, 11 Frances Street in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.
SUO shanshan	420.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the continued scheduling of 18 Frances Street as a built heritage item (H110) on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Retain H110, 18 Frances Street in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage.
SUO shanshan	420.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of historic heritage and the establishment of Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29) in Plan Change 9, but are of the opinion that the methodology used was not as robust as it should be and that it was not applied consistently or logically and that the HHA should be extended to include at least the odd numbered side of Frances Street, if not both sides, as these properties are currently part of the Hamilton East dwelling control area and contain a number of items that would fit with the heritage theme.	Review the methodology used to determine the extents of the Te Aroha Street (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29),and that this HHA be expanded to include properties at numbers 3 - 17 and numbers 2 - 18 Frances Street.
SUO shanshan	420.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of historic heritage and the establishment of Te Aroha (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29) in Plan Change 9, but are of the opinion that the methodology used was not as robust as it should be and that it was not applied consistently or logically and that the HHA should be extended to include at least the odd numbered side of Frances Street, if not both sides, as these properties are currently part of the Hamilton East dwelling control area and contain a number of items that would fit with the heritage theme.	The expansion of the Te Aroha Street (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29) to include properties at numbers 3 - 17 and numbers 2 - 18 Frances Street.
SUO shanshan	420.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of historic heritage and the establishment of Te Aroha (East) HHA in PC9, but are of the opinion that the methodology used was not as robust as it should be and that it was not applied consistently or logically and that the HHA should be extended to include at least the odd numbered side of Frances Street, if not both sides, as these properties are currently part of the Hamilton East dwelling control area and contain a number of items that would fit with the heritage theme.	That the independent hearing panel make a visit to Frances Street, James Street, Bains Avenue and Bond Street to view the overall area and the value to the Historic Heritage of the overall area by adding Frances Street to the Te Aroha Street (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
SUO shanshan	420.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports the protection of historic heritage and the establishment of Te Aroha (East) HHA in PC9, but are of the opinion that the methodology used was not as robust as it should be and that it was not applied consistently or logically and that the HHA should be extended to include at least the odd numbered side of Frances Street, if not both sides, as these properties are currently part of the Hamilton East dwelling control area and contain a number of items that would fit with the heritage theme.	Review the methodology used to determine the extents of the Te Aroha Street (East) Historic Heritage Area (HHA29), and that this HHA be expanded to include properties at numbers 3 - 17 and numbers 2 - 18 Frances Street.
Catherine Mary Babe Smart	421.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter provides extensive research and video footage on the history of 56 Memorial Drive and considers that the information found, including the site's soil-type and occupation history support further investigation of the site and inclusion as a registered archaeological site. In addition, the submitter asks for recognition of certain soil types that supported Pre-European gardening as archaeological areas for further investigation and protection.	Investigate and include 56 Memorial Drive as a registered archaeological site. In addition, recognise certain soil types that supported Pre-European gardening as archaeological areas for further investigation and protection.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laursen Z Energy	422.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter is neutral to the General PC9 plan provisions subject to appropriate provisions that do not unduly restrict the ongoing operation, maintenance, and minor upgrading of Z Eastside, noting it is an existing use and directly related to the significance of the building as a purpose-designed petrol station.	Ensure that Plan Change 9 does not unduly restrict the ongoing operation, maintenance, and minor upgrade of Z Eastside (H113).
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laursen Z Energy	422.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is neutral to the proposed Hamilton East Historic Heritage Area (HHA 12), subject to appropriate provisions that do not unduly restrict the ongoing operation, maintenance, and minor upgrade of Z Eastside.	Ensure that the HHA provisions do not unduly restrict the ongoing operation, maintenance, and minor upgrade of Z Eastside.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laursen Z Energy	422.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.3, that requires the heritage values of significant buildings, structures and their setting and surroundings to be protected.	Retain the Objective 19.2.3 as notified; noting make any additions, deletions or consequential amendments necessary as a result of the matters raised in this submission and adopt any other such relief as to give effect to this submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurensen Z Energy	422.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The Purpose and intent of 19.1l as drafted is unclear. Significant modifications are required to better articulate the apparent intent.</p> <p>Z Energy seeks to directly refer to the HHA schedule, recognise the importance of the lawfully established existing environment, ensure the text aligns with the underlying provisions, and ensure that Heritage Impact Assessments are not required in all instances, irrespective of the nature and extent of an infringement of a permitted activity rule.</p> <p>The submitter seeks the amendment of the text to recognise the existing environment, the nature of proposed rules (which do not, for instance, control uses), and that HIA are not appropriately required in all instances.</p>	<p>Amend the text in 19.1 to recognise the existing environment, the nature of proposed rules (which do not, for instance, control uses), and that HIA are not appropriately required in all instances, to read:</p> <p>Historical Heritage Areas (<i>identified in Schedule 8D</i>).</p> <p>...</p> <p>19.1.l The dDesign and layout of the sites, including and the placement of buildings are critically important, are important to HHA and changes to the same they must address potential adverse environmental effects and ensure a good quality urban environment is achieved through design and heritage impact assessment to consider their compatibility and be sympathetic with identified heritage values are maintained or enhanced of the area. Standards have been placed on the use, development and demolition of buildings to manage change in these areas.</p> <p>19.1.m Each historic heritage area is supported by a Historic Heritage Statement identifying the locations and representativeness of the area. Assessment of proposals for development and modifications to buildings within these areas will be considered against the relevant policies and the historic heritage area statements. Commensurate to potential effects, this may require and a site-specific Heritage Impact Assessment to be provided as part of the development an application for resource consent.</p> <p>.....</p>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurensen Z Energy	422.5	25.10 Signs	25.10.2 Objectives and Policies: Signs	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes in part Policy 25.10.2.1e; the intent is supported but the provisions should focus on identified values not undefined heritage resources.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 25.10.2.1e, by deleting the words 'heritage resources', to read:</p> <p>Signs on buildings and structures and within sites identified in Schedules 8A and 8B must not compromise the identified heritage values and the heritage resources.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.6	25.10 Signs	25.10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports the RD pathway for low-intensity signs (the definition of which includes illuminated signs) on schedule 8A sites and subject to conditions is supported.	Retain Rule 25.10.3f as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.7	25.10 Signs	25.10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter proposes a new sign rule with a PA pathway for replacement of lawfully established signs within any scheduled site ranked B would provide certainty for continued operation of existing commercial activities and promote sustainable management.	Amend 25.10.3 Rules - Activity Table by providing a permitted activity pathway for replacement of lawfully established signs within any scheduled site ranked B.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.8	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.1aa; stating: "The proposed rule provides a permitted activity pathway for 'minor work' on a site of any structure or building identified in Schedule 8A that complies with 19.4.2 (accidental discovery protocol). The definition of minor work means the maintenance of existing site landscape features such as gardens, lawns, and planting beds but excludes development or redevelopment which involves excavation, modification of disturbance of the ground. This does not clearly provide for land disturbance activities which may be necessary to enable ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrades and are remote from buildings. Subject to an appropriate accidental discovery protocol, the rationale for this approach is unclear and it's considered to be more appropriate to Schedule 8B sites."	Amend Rule 19.3.1 to provide a permitted activity pathway on Schedule 8A sites for excavation, modification or disturbance that is temporary and does not permanently alter the profile, contour or height of the land.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Rule 19.3.2a because the definition of building in the Operative District Plan is particularly broad and as drafted this rule will require RDA consent for any alterations and additions to a range of buildings with limited potential effects. While this may be appropriate for sites listed in Schedule A, the effect of the application of the same to HHA is not justified and does not promote sustainable management.	Amend Rule 19.3.2a, so that the provision only applies to additions or alterations to principal buildings, to read: Alterations and additions to an existing <u>principal</u> building on a front, corner or through site within an HHA (excluding heritage buildings in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage)
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.10	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.1 Maintenance and Repairs to a Schedule 8A Built Heritage (Building or Structure)	Support	The submitter is in support of 19.4.1. - The standard provides for maintenance and repairs as defined to Schedule 8A buildings and is supported.	Retain Rule 19.4.1a as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Support in part	The submitter is neutral on Rule 19.4.3, stating: "the provisions, particularly b, are accepted as they only apply to dwellings, but are otherwise unclear and the rationale for the correlation between dwelling material, colour and form to a fence is unclear"	Retain Rule 19.4.3 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Rule 19.3.2c because: "from an effects perspective, the rationale for a distinction between residential and other structures is unclear. The rule should also provide for ancillary buildings".	Amend Rule 19.3.2c to read: Ancillary buildings and residential structures, excluding fences and/or walls provided in (h) and (i) below.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.13	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes 19.3.2f, because requiring consent for the demolition of existing detached accessory buildings suggests that they are important to the HHA. The nature of accessory buildings are such that this is not anticipated to be the case and isn't in the case of the accessory buildings at Z Eastside. The demolition and replacement of accessory buildings should be a permitted activity.	Amend Rule 19.3.2f to provide a permitted activity pathway for demolition, replacement, including minor upgrading, of accessory buildings.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the permitted and RDA pathways for fences, provided replacement fences are provided as a PA .	Retain Rule 19.3.2h as notified, subject to the introduction of a new rule providing for the replacement of existing fences as a permitted activity.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is neutral regarding Rule 19.3.2j, stating "an RDA pathway for new buildings is accepted subject to a permitted pathway for accessory buildings".	Retain Rule 19.3.2j, subject to the application of permitted activity status for accessory buildings as requested elsewhere in this submission.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter the text in 19.1.g to 19.1.i should directly refer to Schedule 8A as it is these buildings and structures to which the provisions relate. Seeking the amendment the heading for Purpose 19.1.g - 19.1.i to make clear that the underlying paragraphs relate to the structures identified in Schedule 8A but otherwise maintain paragraphs g through i as notified.	Amend the heading for Purpose 19.1.g - 19.1.i, to read: Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures <u>identified in Schedule 8A</u>)
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.17	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports the identification and protection of significant heritage resources as stated in Objective 19.2.1.	Retain Objective 19.2.1 as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.18	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.1a - The protection of historic heritage from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development.	Retain the Policy 19.2.1a as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.1b - the identification, recording and recognition of heritage resources and values to maintain and enhance identity, wellbeing and historical legibility.	Retain the Policy 19.2.1b as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.20	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part, Policy 19.2.1e because, while the intent of the policy is supported with the exception of the direction that signage must be consistent with historic heritage values. This will not provide appropriately for maintenance and upgrading of existing lawfully established signage which can be managed to maintain or enhance historic heritage values and in doing so give effect to Objective 19.2.1 but which in isolation may not be considered consistent with historic heritage values.	Amend Policy 19.2.1e, to read: Signs on buildings, structures and/or sites listed in Schedule 8A or 8B must: i. Be associated with lawful activities on the site; ii. Be consistent with and m Maintain or enhance the historic heritage values; iii. Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the heritage resource.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.21	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Policy 19.2.2b. The policy requires the loss of heritage values associated with scheduled items to be avoided. While no changes are proposed to the operative version of policy 19.2.2, it is listed in the 'All Historic Heritage' table and may now be interpreted as applying to historic heritage areas as proposed at Schedule D and it is considered to be within scope. It is not clear that this has been considered.	Amend Policy 19.2.2b so that the policy only applies to scheduled sites, not scheduled areas, or amend to demonstrate that avoidance of the loss of heritage values, irrespective of the extent and significance of that loss, is appropriate.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.3 because, it requires the heritage values of significant buildings, structures and their setting and surroundings to be protected.	Retain the Objective 19.2.3 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.23	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The policy requires development of sites in Schedule 8A to retain, protect and enhance the heritage values of any Schedule 8A listed building. To avoid a potential interpretation that development shall retain, protect, and enhance, which is not the apparent intent, tie the policy to identified heritage values, and more clearly articulate the importance of the existing environment, a number of amendments are proposed, including to more simply and clearly articulate the apparent intent and give effect to the overarching objective.</p> <p>A no tolerance approach to any adverse effects (however small) on visibility of a heritage building is opposed.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3c to read:</p> <p>19.2.3c Subdivision and/or development of the <u>a</u> site identified in Schedule 8A shall retain, protect and enhance the heritage values of any building or structure listed within Schedule 8A, including by ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposal is compatible with the sensitivity of the heritage building or structure protective of the heritage values having regard to the and its setting and surroundings to change and its capacity to accommodate change without compromising the heritage values of the building or structure; ii. The proposal is compatible with the heritage values, including the form, character, scale, proportions, materials and finishes; and iii. Subdivision and/or development of the site identified in Schedule 8A will not adversely affect the visibility of the heritage building or structure from public places; iv. The resulting setting of the building or structure is sufficient to maintain or enhance the heritage values.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.24	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	Policy 19.2.3e appears to intentionally focus on avoiding damage or destruction of the use, ie the activity, as opposed to development per se. This policy intent is supported.	Retain Policy 19.2.3e as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.25	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Policy 19.2.3f, stating "the requirement for development on Schedule 8A sites to be consistent with the identified heritage is a high threshold and may preclude ongoing adaptive use of existing buildings. For instance, replacement fuel dispensing infrastructure may not necessarily be consistent with the identified heritage but may be acceptable having regard to its effect on heritage values".	<p>Amend the Policy 19.2.3f as follows:</p> <p>The form, scale, character, location, design, materials and finish of any development within the setting of a historic heritage building or structure in Schedule 8A, shall <u>not</u> be <u>inconsistent</u> with identified heritage <u>values</u>.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.26	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part Policy 19.2.3g, stating "support for continued use is appropriate in a range of circumstances and should not be limited to circumstances where that use is integral to the heritage values. Further, what is practicable is a more appropriate threshold than what is possible, noting that what is possible may not be feasible for a range of reasons".	Amend Policy 19.2.3g to read: 19.2.3g The continued use or adaptive reuse of any building or structure of identified heritage value shall be encouraged where: i. The continued use, <u>supports the maintenance or enhancement of</u> is integral to the heritage values of the building or structure, that use should be retained ii. Any works undertaken to adapt the building or structure for the new use are undertaken in a manner that is consistent with and protects the heritage values of the building or structure and its surroundings; and; iii. Any works undertaken are kept to the minimum necessary for the use or adaptive reuse and keep the heritage fabric of the building or structure as intact as <u>practicable possible</u> .
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.27	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.3i because the "policy provides for a range of activities necessary for health and safety, servicing, and accessibility and is supported".	Retain Policy 19.2.3i as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.28	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Policy 19.2.3j because while the "intent of the policy is supported but sub clause i needs to recognise that there may be limitations on the potential to focus change on particular areas of the building".	Amend Policy 19.2.3j(i) to read: i. <u>Seeks to focus</u> Focuses any changes to those parts of the heritage building or structure that have more potential to accommodate change (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage);
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.29	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Policy 19.2.3k because it "enables interior modifications".	Retain Policy 19.2.3k as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.30	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports Objective 19.2.4 because the identification and protection of heritage values in HHA is appropriate.	Retain Objective 19.2.4 as notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.31	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the directive policies [Policies 19.2.4a - 19.2.4d] and requirement for HIA apply to extensive areas with little provided in PC9 by way of identified values for the areas. The directive policies are also inconsistent with the underlying rules.	Delete Policy 19.2.4a as notified and rely on the policies at 19.2.5.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.32	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the directive policies [Policies 19.2.4a - 19.2.4d] and requirement for HIA apply to extensive areas with little provided in PC9 by way of identified values for the areas. The directive policies are also inconsistent with the underlying rules.	Delete Policy 19.2.4b as notified and rely on the policies at 19.2.5.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.33	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the directive policies [Policies 19.2.4a - 19.2.4d] and requirement for HIA apply to extensive areas with little provided in PC9 by way of identified values for the areas. The directive policies are also inconsistent with the underlying rules.	Delete Policy 19.2.4c as notified and rely on the policies at 19.2.5
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.34	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the directive policies [Policies 19.2.4a - 19.2.4d] and requirement for HIA apply to extensive areas with little provided in PC9 by way of identified values for the areas. The directive policies are also inconsistent with the underlying rules.	Delete Policy 19.2.4d as notified and rely on the policies at 19.2.5.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.35	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part Objective 19.2.5 because "HHA appear to apply to all activities, not just residential zones. If this is the intent, the objective should be broadened accordingly. If the HHA provisions are only intended to apply to residential activities, then this is not clear. For the reasons set out at 19.2.3g, the objective should also focus on what is practicable rather than possible".	Amend Objective 19.2.5 to read: Recognise, protect and, where possible <u>practicable</u> , enhance the physical and visual qualities of the heritage values of a residential zoned site within a historic heritage area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.36	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Policy 19.2.4a because "the policy is not appropriately tied to the identified values of the HHA or the scale of potential effects".	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.4a to read:</p> <p>Development is sympathetic with to <u>to</u> the existing <u>existing identified</u> historic values found within of <u>found within</u> of the historic heritage area through:</p> <p>i. Being compatible with the design, material used and placement of buildings and structures within the area.</p> <p>ii. Mitigating the effects of the demolition or removal of existing buildings and structures from the site.</p> <p>iii. Ensuring that any car parking, servicing, lighting and sign requirements do not adversely affect <u>maintains</u> the <u>identified</u> heritage values of the area or the relationship of a building with the streetscape.</p> <p>iv. Providing a site-specific Heritage Impact Assessments <u>are provided where that is commensurate to potential effects</u>.</p>
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.37	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	Rule 19.3.1a The submitter supports a PA pathway for maintenance and repair as defined and otherwise an RDA pathway or maintenance and repair to buildings and structures is supported.	Retain Rule 19.3.1a as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.38	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	Rule 19.3.1b The submitter supports a PA pathway for maintenance and repair as defined and otherwise an RDA pathway or maintenance and repair to buildings and structures is supported.	Retain Rule 19.3.1b as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.39	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	Rule 19.3.1e A RD pathway for new accessory buildings or buildings within any scheduled site ranked B is supported but a PA pathway is sought for the replacement and minor upgrading of existing (include fences per 19.3.1o).	<p>Amend as follows and provide a new rule for replacement and minor upgrading of existing lawfully established accessory buildings, buildings, and fences (see new rule proposed in row 25 of the full submission):</p> <p><u>New Accessory buildings or new buildings within the Major Facilities Zone – Waikato Hospital Campus and Wintec City Campus any scheduled site ranked B</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.40	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.3.1c because a PA pathway for internal alterations is appropriate.	Retain Rule 19.3.1c as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.41	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter requests a new rule to provide a "PA pathway for replacement, including minor upgrading, of lawfully established existing accessory buildings, buildings and fences within any scheduled site ranked B would provide certainty for existing activities and promote sustainable management".	Amend Rule 19.3.1 to provide a permitted activity pathway for replacement, including minor upgrading, of lawfully established existing accessory buildings, buildings and fences within any scheduled site ranked B.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.42	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports the RD pathway for alterations or additions (excluding maintenance and repair) to the exterior of any structure or building ranked B. [Rule 19.3.1h]	Retain Rule 19.3.1h as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.43	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.3.1j because "a controlled activity pathway for alterations necessary to any structure or building ranked B for the purpose of providing or improving fire safety etc is appropriate".	Retain Rule 19.3.1j as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.44	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.3.1l because "a discretionary activity pathway for the demolition of any structure or building ranked b is appropriate" .	Retain Rule 19.3.1l as notified.
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.45	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part Rule 19.3.1o, stating "a RD pathway for erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on site is supported subject to clarity that it does not apply to replacement of existing structures or fences" [see proposed PA provision requested in Point 25 of the full submission]	Retain Rule 19.3.1o as notified, subject to a new rule providing for the replacement of existing fences and structures [requested in submission point 25 of the full submission].
4Sight Consulting Limited - Mark Laurenson Z Energy	422.46	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support	The submitter supports Rule 19.3.1q, stating "Signs – RD, also refer to Chapter 25.10"	Retain Rule 19.3.1q as notified.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter considers that Policy 19.2.6a should refer to <i>significant</i> archaeological and cultural sites in alignment with the corresponding objective. Amending the policy would better reflect the distinction between Group 1 and Group 2 archaeological sites and their respective activity status and consenting pathways.	Amend Policy 19.2.6a as follows: "Inappropriate subdivision, use and development shall be managed to avoid adverse effects on <u>significant</u> archaeological and cultural sites where they are known to exist, or are likely to exist."

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	<p>The submitter opposes in part 19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference to earthworks on a site in Schedule 8C: Group 2 under the matters of discretion in clause 19.6(a)(xvi) appears to be an error. Earthworks on a site in Schedule 8C: Group 2 requires resource consent as a Controlled Activity under Rule 19.3.3(d). 2. The matters of control for earthworks on a site in Schedule 8C: Group 2 are appropriately addressed in 19.5 Controlled Activities: Matters of Control under 19.5(a)(iii). 3. Controlled Activity status is appropriate for earthworks on sites in Schedule 8C: Group 2. 	Amend clause 19.6(a)(xvi) as follows: "Any earthworks on a site in Schedule 8B: Group 1 or Schedule 8C: Group 2 ".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter wishes to see additional objectives and polices within the Natural Environments chapter which recognises long-tailed bats as a city-wide issue and that a Bat Management Committee be established for all of Hamilton. Adopt a landscape-wide approach to managing the effects on the long-tailed bat and recognise bat habitat areas within the Peacocke Structure Plan area contributes to the wider city.	<p>Amend PC9 to insert the following new objective in Chapter 20: Natural Environments:</p> <p>"Maintain and enhance a network of open space that contributes to the mitigation of the adverse effects of existing urbanisation and future development on the habitat of the longtailed bat across all of Hamilton City".</p> <p>Amend PC9 to insert the following new policy: "Establish a Bat Management Committee to maintain and enhance the long-tailed bat population across all of Hamilton and to mitigate the adverse effects of existing urbanisation and future development on that population".</p> <p>Amend PC9 to insert the following new policy: "Adopt a landscape-wide approach to the management of effects on the long-tailed bat, including identification, protection and restoration of habitat".</p> <p>Amend PC9 to insert the following new policy: "Recognise that the establishment of Significant Bat Habitat Areas on public land within the Peacocke Structure Plan area contributes to the mitigation of the adverse effects of existing urbanisation on the longtailed bat across all of Hamilton City".</p>
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter requests consistency between Plan Change 5 and Plan Change 9 standards concerning the proviso of walkways and cycleways within SNAs.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain Rule 20.3(l). 2. Amend any equivalent provisions introduced to the district plan through PC5 to ensure that a consistent approach is taken to walkways and cycleways within SNAs across the City.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter notes the multi-purpose of SNAs and the complimentary potential of park furniture. Construction of new park furniture with a SNA should be an assessment criteria.	Add a new activity specific assessment criterion 20.6(a)(iii) as follows: iii. Construction of new Park Furniture within a Significant Natural Area, including associated pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees and associated earthworks. D - Natural Character and Open Space F – Hazards and Safety
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.6	General	General	Support in part	The submitter seeks consistency with between Plan Change 5 and Plan Change 9 concerning outcomes sought for ecological issues.	1. Amend Chapter 20 as necessary to ensure consistency with relief sought by Adare on PC5. 2. Any consequential amendments necessary to align the provisions of PC5 and PC9.
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.7	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter seeks consistency concerning the inclusion of park furniture as proposed by the submitter throughout the plan.	Amend assessment criterion D3D in Appendix 1.3.3 as follows: "The extent to which proposed public walkways and cycleways <u>and park furniture</u> will enhance the public's ability to connect with, and appreciate, the indigenous biodiversity of the Significant Natural Area".
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter seeks consistency between Plan Change 5 and Plan Change 9 concerning activity statuses for network utility infrastructure within SNAs and that new infrastructure should be Discretionary, rather than Non-Complying in fSNAs.	1. Retain the Discretionary Activity status in Rule 20.3(n) for new infrastructure within cSNAs. 2. Amend Rule 20.3(n) to make new infrastructure a Discretionary Activity within fSNAs. 3. Amend any equivalent provisions introduced to the district plan through PC5 to ensure that a consistent approach is taken to new infrastructure within SNAs across the City.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
The Adare Company Limited - Mike Doesburg The Adare Company Limited	423.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter requests consistent standards for SNAs between Plan Change 5 and Plan Change 9. That a new park furniture standard be introduced to provide for new park furniture within SNAs as a restricted discretionary activity.	1. Add a new Rule 20.3(ia) as follows: Construction of new Park Furniture within a Significant Natural Area, including associated pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees and associated earthworks cSNA - RD fSNA - RD 2. Amend any equivalent provisions introduced to the district plan through PC5 to ensure that a consistent approach is taken to Park Furniture within SNAs across the City.
David and Wendy Grant	424.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification and assessment of the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottage HHA in PC9 and considers that collectively, the properties (23 - 35a Oxford Street, and 28 - 36 Marshall Street) do not form a consistent heritage area as significant structural renovations, changes and improvements have been made to these properties since their initial construction within the PC9 HHA specified development periods.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
David and Wendy Grant	424.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter generally supports the Plan intent of protecting "those parts of Hamilton City which are of such heritage value locally, regionally or nationally that they should be identified as Historical Heritage Area (HHA) in the Hamilton District Plan." However, the submitter does not support the methodology used and considers that it was not as robust as it should be and that it has not been applied consistently. A lack of due diligence is shown by the fact that HCC did not bother to check the LINZ titles of the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA. This simple check would have shown the properties were never owned by Railways or the Crown and that most of them were built after 1930 and thus could not meet the two historical heritage themes designated for this proposed HHA. This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
David and Wendy Grant	424.3	General	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the general direction of the proposed changes to the district plan but opposes the introduction of the Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street Railway Cottage HHA including the inclusion of their property at 32 Marshall Street within the HHA. This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter partially supports the increase of mapped SNAs and understands that SNAs should be retained as notified. However, it is unclear how the two proposed classifications for SNAs will be in line with section 6(c) of the RMA, particularly given that cSNAs have a less restrictive activity status for three activities under Chapter 20.	<p>The more restrictive activity statuses that are proposed to apply to fSNAs, should also apply to cSNAs.</p> <p>An alternative method of applying different activity statuses to a particular activity within an SNA could be to utilise the 'Nationally', 'Regionally', and 'Locally' significant classifications that were assigned to fSNAs and cSNAs under the 4Sight Consulting report.</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	General	Support in part	The submitter supports Council initiatives to identify, map and protect the new SNAs, which include significant habitats of indigenous fauna. However, there are some conflicts between the SNAs identified in Plan Change 9 and Plan Change 5 (Peacocke Structure Plan) and areas that are already subject to designations and/or resource consents.	Resolve all conflicts to ensure that the functionality of SNAs are retained. Otherwise, retain all other mapped SNAs as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports SNA mapping and criteria but requests additional provisions to recognise that unmapped areas that meet SNA criteria are still to be managed appropriately as required by section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Amend the plan to recognise areas that are not mapped but meet the criteria for SNAs stated in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement are to be managed in accordance with section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.4	1.2 Information Requirements	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the focus throughout Plan Change 9 on management of adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity but considers there needs to be a shift towards restoration and enhancement to have better regard to section 6(c) of the RMA. Plan Change 9 also lacks clear guidance on biodiversity offsetting with regard to bat habitat and other significant biodiversity such as wetlands and wetland fauna.	<p>Provide clear guidance under "Section 1.2 Information Requirements" on biodiversity offsetting and biodiversity compensation.</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.5	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter states that 9D lists several Kauri as Notable Trees but have concerns about management of Kauri Dieback (which is caused by a pathogen that is easily spread through soil movements, including when it is carried on footwear, equipment and vehicles). The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree ("the kauri hygiene zone") can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread the disease.	<p>Include provisions to address the management of Kauri Dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease.</p> <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter states that there is no directive to monitor and report on the effectiveness of measures to avoid, remedy and mitigate (or offset and compensate) which can compromise the efficacy of the plan in carrying out its functions under Part 2 of the RMA.	Add objectives, policies, assessment criteria and/or other guidance to ensure monitoring and reporting is required to assess the efficacy of measures to avoid, remedy, and mitigate the effects of development on significant indigenous biodiversity. Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1a.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.8	25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.2 Objectives and Policies: Lighting and Glare	Support	The submitter supports Policy 25.6.2.1a.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.9	25.6 Lighting and Glare	General	Support in part	The submitter requests the addition of a policy that details the best practice lighting design principles to consider when mitigating adverse effects on indigenous fauna such as the long-tailed bat. The policy should apply for activities adjacent to or within a SNA.	Include a policy with lighting recommendations in line with the following document, which New Zealand is a party to as part of the United Nations Convention on Migratory Species: National Light Pollution Guidelines for Wildlife Including Marine Turtles, Seabirds and Migratory Shorebirds - DAWE In summary, best practice lighting design incorporates the following design principles: 1. Start with natural darkness and only add light for specific purposes. 2. Use adaptive light controls to manage light timing, intensity and colour. 3. Light only the object or area intended – keep lights close to the ground, directed and shielded to avoid light spill. 4. Use the lowest intensity lighting appropriate for the task. 5. Use non-reflective, dark-coloured surfaces. 6. Use lights with reduced or filtered blue, violet and ultra-violet wavelengths with a correlated colour temperature of 2700K or warmer.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.10	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.1 Acronyms Used in the District Plan	Support in part	The submitter considers that Figure 1.1.9a should be amended to allow for a scenario where the Department of Conservation is required to be notified on a limited basis.	Update Figure 1.1.9a to allow for a potential scenario where the Department of Conservation should be considered an affected party and notified on a limited basis.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.11	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Appendix 1.2 (1.2.1(h) because part iii does not raise the need to address effects on indigenous fauna, which is a requirement in other parts of the plan.	Change the wording to: Effects of the proposal on the natural environment (including existing vegetation and natural land form, and indigenous fauna such as (but not limited to) long-tailed bats and lizards), neighbourhood amenity, and infrastructure.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1b.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter has concerns with this aspect of Policy 20.2.1c: "to the extent it may result in a reduction in the occupancy and presence of those species" because, as an example, the Department of Conservation's technical expert considers that long-tailed bats may still be present or occupy an area the same proportion of nights when surveyed, but their use of the area may be less.	Change the wording of Policy 20.2.1c to: Avoid the following adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas: i. Loss of ecosystem function, representation and extent; and ii. Fragmentation; and iii. Loss of connectivity or buffer function; and iv. A reduction in the habitat of any Threatened or At-Risk species to the extent it may result in a reduction in the occupancy and presence of those species.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The use of policy that implements an effects management hierarchy is supported provided that Policy 20.2.1d aligns with the wording in the exposure draft to the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.	Align Policy 20.2.1d with the wording set out in the exposure draft for the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1e.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1f.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.17	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Policy 20.2.1g because the wording of this policy is very permissive and will effectively allow infrastructure, public walkways, and cycleways to be located near or within a SNA at resource consent stage.	Delete Policy 20.2.1g in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.18	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Policy 20.2.1h because there are concerns with the statement "where these have minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity".	Either change the wording of Policy 20.2.1h to: Recognise the need for essential pruning, maintenance and tree removal in Significant Natural Areas where these have minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity ; including customary activities and actions necessary to address a high risk to public health and safety, and property. Alternatively, include clear parameters around what constituents acceptable "minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity".
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.19	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1i.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.20	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Policy 20.2.1j.	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.21	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter submits that the extent to which SNAs and indigenous biodiversity are protected and enhanced should be a matter of discretion.	Change the wording of Policy 20.2.1k to: Enable activities that improve public connection to, and appreciation of, Significant Natural Areas and indigenous biodiversity provided that: i. Significant Natural Areas are protected and enhanced ; and ii. Indigenous biodiversity is maintained or protected and enhanced.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.22	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter suggests adding a policy that specifically protects and enhances the actual and potential habitat of long-tailed bats, acknowledging that they are critically endangered fauna with little tolerance for the actual, potential and/or residual effects of land development.	Add the following policy: Development is designed and located to protect and enhance long-tailed bats and their habitat.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.23	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter is supportive of the modification or removal of trees in case of disease, however, has requested additional wording to ensure the removal is necessary to prevent the spread of disease.</p> <p>Additional wording is requested for this rule to ensure any trees modified for track maintenance, fencing, or customary activities are only a Permitted Activity if it does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</p> <p>Alternative wording is also requested for when a tree or vegetation can be removed if there is a risk to human life or property. The Director-General holds concerns that the proposed wording may be too permissive and result in a typical arborist seeing any tree with a defect as “unacceptable risk”.</p>	<p>Trees in Volume 2, Appendix 9, Schedule 9D: Notable Trees) where:</p> <p>i. Necessitated by <u>Necessary to prevent the spread of disease</u> or age; or</p> <p>ii. There is an <u>imminent danger to human life</u> unacceptable risk to public health, safety or property ; or</p> <p>iii. The pruning or maintenance work is necessary to maintain or upgrade existing private tracks and fencing where Standard 20.5.1 is complied with <u>and does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species;</u> or</p> <p>iv. The pruning, maintenance or removal is for customary activities <u>and does not adversely affect at risk or threatened indigenous species.</u></p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.24	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter partially supports Rule 20.3(c) because the ability to relocate trees with no ability to consider the potential effects of the activity is inappropriate. This activity could result in potential adverse effects on ecological corridors, habitat fragmentation, and the death of trees that were unsuitable for relocation.</p>	<p>Change the wording of Rule 20.3(c) to: Planting and management of indigenous vegetation or trees for the purposes of restoration, including relocation of indigenous vegetation or trees within the same Significant Natural Area.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.25	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter partially supports Rule 20.3(d) because the Rule would be more appropriate as a Controlled Activity for all SNAs to allow for the implementation of conditions (for the matters which Council has reserved control) and subsequent monitoring.</p>	<p>Change the activity status of Rule 20.3(d) to a Controlled Activity for all SNAs.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.26	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	<p>The submitter has concerns with the permissive nature of the activity status, objectives and policies, and assessment criteria that relate to the construction of new public walkways and cycleways through a SNA. Although it is recognised that public walkways and cycleways result in a benefit to the public, an appropriate consideration of potential adverse effects should still be undertaken particularly with regard to indigenous biodiversity.</p>	<p>Change the activity status of Rule 20.3(l) to Non-Complying for a ‘Nationally’ or ‘Regionally’ significant SNA and Restricted Discretionary for a ‘Locally’ significant SNA.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.27	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 20.5.6 however would request an amendment to note that this should occur regardless of whether the tree is alive or dead.	<p>Change the wording to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A suitably qualified person has confirmed that there is a low potential for the tree (alive or dead) to be used as habitat for either bats or any other Threatened or At-Risk indigenous fauna (refer to NZTCS.org.nz); and 2. The report from the suitably qualified person is provided to Hamilton City Council prior to the removal of the tree(s).
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.28	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 20.5.7 because there are concerns that allowing 100m ² of vegetation or trees being removed per site per calendar year as a Permitted Activity will result in SNAs being incrementally lost, given that some SNAs/existing assets are located over multiple sites.	<p>Change the wording to:</p> <p>A. Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees a. The works are required to maintain an existing walking access track to access existing infrastructure; and</p> <p>b. Either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The works do not result in the removal of more than 100m² of indigenous vegetation per site existing asset, per calendar year and do not result in the loss of extent or integrity of the SNA; or ii. The works are limited to areas within two metres of the existing asset and do not result in the loss of extent or integrity of the SNA; and c. Either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any tree removed must have a diameter of no more than 150mm measured at 1.4m in height above ground level; or ii. The tree has a diameter greater than 150mm, measured at 1.4m in height above ground level; and iii. Does not result in the loss of extent or integrity of the SNA; and <p>1. A suitably qualified person has confirmed that there is a low potential for the tree to be used as habitat for either bats or any other Threatened or At-Risk indigenous fauna; and</p> <p>2. The report from the suitably qualified person is provided to Hamilton City Council prior to the removal of the tree(s).</p> <p>B. Earthworks</p> <p>a. The disturbance is limited to areas within 2m of the asset being operated, maintained, renewed or upgraded; or</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
						<p>b. No more than 100m² of land is disturbed per site existing asset, per calendar year; and</p> <p>c. The area disturbed is reinstated as soon as practicable following the completion of the works; and</p> <p>d. <u>Does not result in the loss of extent or integrity of the SNA.</u></p> <p>C. Renewal or upgrading of infrastructure The asset being renewed or upgraded is increasing in footprint by a maximum of 5% or 30m², whichever is the leastgreater.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.29	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter request an additional note to ensure District Plan users are aware of their obligations under the Wildlife Act 1953, specifically how the Act relates to the habitat of protected wildlife, such as the removal of vegetation and trees.	<p>Include the following text as a note:</p> <p><u>5. In accordance with the Wildlife Act 1953, a Wildlife Act permit is a legal requirement for any activity involving killing or disturbing protected wildlife, including the felling of bat roost trees and the destruction of habitat of copper and ornate skinks.</u></p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.30	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter states that there is no setback requirement from a SNA which means development could be located directly against the boundary of a SNA. Adverse effects resulting from development within proximity to an SNA include bright lights impacting indigenous biodiversity such as long-tailed bats and people trimming/removing vegetation/trees from an SNA for being too close to their property.	<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 the boundary of a “Locally” significant SNA. <p>Any other amendments that may be necessary or appropriate to address my concerns e.g., the addition of objectives, policies, and/or assessment criteria that relate the potential effects associated with any proposed development in proximity to a SNA.</p>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.31	25.6 Lighting and Glare	General	Support in part	The submitter requests a specific standard in relation to the potential effects from light spill into all SNAs.	<p>Include the following as a specific standard:</p> <p><u>Lighting shall not exceed 0.3 lux (horizontal and vertical) when measured at the external boundary of a Significant Natural Area.</u></p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.32	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support	The submitter supports the proposed definition of biodiversity offset which is in line with the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act".	Retain as notified.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.33	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the proposed definition of biodiversity compensation which is in line with the guidance document "Biodiversity Offsetting under the Resource Management Act", however would note that the word 'aquatic' should be replaced to allow for a wider range of scenarios.	Change the definition to: Means a conservation outcome resulting from actions that are intended to compensate for any more than minor residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity after all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, remediation, and aquatic biodiversity offset measures have been sequentially applied.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.34	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support in part	The submitter is unclear in relation to the definition of ecological district.	Change the definition to: Means plants and naturally occurring vegetation in the Hamilton eEcological dDistrict . Alternatively, clarify the meaning of ecological district.
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.35	1.1 Definitions and Terms	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the proposed definition of restoration (in relation to a Significant Natural Area), however it is requested that text is added to the definition to specify that restoration must be carried out in accordance with the NES for Freshwater and Hamilton City Council's Gully Restoration Guide.	Add the following text to the definition: Means active intervention and management to maintain, reinstate or enhance the ecological values and functions of the Significant Natural Area. It includes the planting and management of indigenous vegetation or trees and reestablishment planting of indigenous vegetation or trees at the conclusion of infrastructure or public walkway and cycleway projects. <u>Restoration can only be carried out in accordance with a restoration plan complying with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020 and Gully Restoration Guide (Hamilton City Council) and approved by Hamilton City Council's Planning Department.</u>
Department of Conservation - Ashiley Sycamore	425.36	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The submitter considers the Department of Conservation should be referenced when directing applicants to consider which parties require consultation in relation to a resource consent, particularly given Hamilton City's context as the one of the only cities in New Zealand to still support a population of long-tailed bats.	Change the wording to: Details and outcomes of any consultation undertaken (e.g. Kiwi Rail, Transpower, Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Waikato Regional Council, Te Papa Atawhai Department of Conservation) and of engagement with representatives of Mana Whenua.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Te Haa o te Whenua O Kirikiriroa - Sonny Karena and Rawiri Bidois	426.1	General	General	Oppose	The submitter - Te Haa O Te Whenua O Kirikiriroa (THAWK) considers the plan change to provide additional protection for European heritage and history but not pre-European, Maaori history of the area. The submitter details the differences between European-based and Maaori archaeological concepts which has resulted in fewer parts of the City having cultural sites recognised. The submitter considers there to be deficiencies in the mapping of cultural sites, omissions of other sites, and a dominant use of European archaeological criteria rather than Maaori cultural and historic values to identify and prioritise the areas and importance of cultural sites.	The submitter seeks Council staff work with THAWK to develop new maps showing the location and extent of sites of significance to Mana Whenua based upon Maaori values and not European archaeological values and for this map to be included in the next District Plan revision.
Te Haa o te Whenua O Kirikiriroa - Sonny Karena and Rawiri Bidois	426.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter - Te Haa O Te Whenua o Kirikiriroa (THAWK), detail the extensive spatial nature of many cultural sites across the City. A single dot or area indicated on the Planning Maps may not portray the true extent of that registered site. The submitter proposes a 100m boundary around identified sites that would require consultation with Mana Whenua before development or earthworks occurs within that area.	To include a new rule requiring consultation with Mana Whenua where development or earthworks is proposed within 100m of an identified cultural site.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	That a broader range of themes and historic heritage items spread throughout the city, including former rural communities still needs to be undertaken. The submitter states that" while there has been improvement in identification and proposals significant regional and local heritage does not address fully the areas that are being brought into the city and as shown on the e-map there is a distinctive absence of existing and proposed heritage items".	Seeks a citywide review throughout the city, including former rural communities, and engaging with the community.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	While the submitter acknowledges that there has been improvement in the identification and proposals significant regional and local heritage does not address fully the areas that have been brought into the city, and there is a distinctive absence of existing and proposed heritage items. The submitter has provided a schedule of 192 heritage buildings/structures (WHG Historic Heritage Preliminary Survey - WHG Proposed Schedule items) that they wish to have included into Schedule 8A - Built Heritage.	Seeks the addition of the 192 buildings/structures as listed in the WHG Historic Heritage Preliminary Survey - WHG Proposed Schedule items
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter seeks the inclusion into Schedule 8A - Built Heritage of places of regional and national significance (such as Deanwell School and Te Rapa Dairy Factory) that are in the WHG Historic Heritage Preliminary Survey - WHG Proposed Schedule items attached to their submission.	Seeks the inclusion of places of regional and national significance as listed in the WHG Historic Heritage Preliminary Survey - WHG Proposed Schedule items that they wish to have included into Schedule 8A - Built Heritage, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deanwell School, Deanwell • Te Rapa (Fonterra) Dairy Factory, Te Rapa.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter has noted that several of the heritage assessments have mixed local background histories and need reviewing. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nawton Hall should be Frankton and Waipa County; • Manning Street Should be Hamilton West and not Frankton. 	Seek improved inventory background information on some draft reports.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter advises that there is known awarded enduring architecture in Hamilton that is both regionally and nationally recognised by the New Zealand Institute of Architecture that should be included in Schedule 8A. Further stating that "while one or two has been proposed this is insufficient and does not represent the work of Waikato architect from the 1950s-1970s mid century Modernism period. Items should not be limited to a set date as buildings from the 1980s are not scheduled and types such ad Post Modernist architecture are in a distinctive time period and at risk. There is no acknowledged date such as 50years or 100years".</p>	That Schedule 8A be amended to include the known post 1950s architecture (but not limited to a date of 1970) which has received regional and national Enduring architecture awards.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter requests that the heritage assessment for 95 Lake Road is reviewed and amended to address that the "building is a former Frankton NZR Settlement House from Rifle Range Road removed in the 1990s to Lake Road. However the railway house is one of he original model pre factory houses and has high value".</p>	Seeks the amendment of the inventory for H233 - 95 Lake Road to correctly reference the origins on the building.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	<p>The submitter has identified that "while the existing inventory was not reviewed there are ongoing inaccuracies" and minor amendments to the inventories of the existing scheduled items is required.</p>	That the inventories for the existing schedule 8A items is updated and amended as necessary to ensure accuracy of information.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter states that while some professional reports have been reviewed it is unclear if all have been, including the Opus 2001 Report. The report identifies a number of items and areas, previously recommended for scheduling, but not scheduled that may have increased in value over time and should be included in Schedule 8A, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton West Cemetery • Little Bull, Hamilton Gardens • Roestenberg mural as part of Angus Flood Griffiths Building, Victoria Street. 	<p>That the 2001 Opus Report is reviewed and those items and areas, previously recommended for scheduling, but not scheduled be included in Schedule 8A, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton West Cemetery • Little Bull, Hamilton Gardens • Roestenberg mural as part of Angus Flood Griffiths Building, Victoria Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter identifies that there are errors in the proposed heritage items inventory drafts that need correcting. Such as the proposed names of proposed heritage items, e.g. 'Westside Church' to 'First Church Presbyterian'.</p>	That the draft inventories are reviewed to ensure correct naming of scheduled items.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.10	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment		The submitter states that 'to support each proposed Historic Heritage Area there should be individual historic heritage items included such as community buildings, shops.	Seeks the inclusion of at least one proposed historic heritage item within each significant proposed Historic Heritage Area.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.11	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		<p>The submitter raises concern that a citywide Heritage Landscape Assessment Review has not been provided; that there are no proposed heritage landscape items; and therefore it is unclear if there are significant historic heritage items and groups of items such as gardens, early nursery and the work of significant Landscape Architects. This review would provide a better understanding of historic heritage and identification and scheduling, including historic areas.</p> <p>Noting also that Notable Trees do not protect historic heritage values sufficiently.</p>	That a specific city wide Heritage Landscape Assessment Review is undertaken; and historic areas are identified and scheduled.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.12	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter requests within the Schedule 8A there should be more structures, monuments, and groups, along with groups of items. Including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Bull • Hamilton City WW2 Gates Anzac Parade • Hitching posts Hamilton east 920 • Cenatph • Parana Park Bridge • Girl Guide Memorial Ring, Parana Park • Skating Rink, Lake Domain 	<p>Amend Schedule 8A there to include more structures, monuments, and groups, along with groups of items, such as, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Bull • Hamilton City WW2 Gates Anzac Parade • Hitching posts Hamilton east 920 • Cenatph • Parana Park Bridge • Girl Guide Memorial Ring, Parana Park • Skating Rink, Lake Domain
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.13	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter raises concern that a citywide Heritage Landscape Assessment Review has not been provided; that there are no proposed heritage landscape items; and therefore it is unclear if there are significant historic heritage items and groups of items such as gardens, early nursery and the work of significant Landscape Architects. This review would provide a better understanding of historic heritage and identification and scheduling, including historic areas; and would provide a better degree of protection for heritage not given by the STEM System. The submitter seeks the inclusion of the Memorial Drive and plantings in the H158 Historic Item Ruakura Homestead, and for it to be reference as the "Ruakura Homestead/College (former) and Memorial Drive.	Amend H158, Schedule 8A to include the Ruakura Homestead Memorial Drive and plantings in the H158 Historic Item Ruakura Homestead, and for the item to be renamed the "Ruakura Homestead/College (former) and Memorial Drive".

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.14	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter raises concern that a citywide Heritage Landscape Assessment Review has not been provided; that there are no proposed heritage landscape items; and therefore it is unclear if there are significant historic heritage items and groups of items such as gardens, early nursery and the work of significant Landscape Architects. This review would provide a better understanding of historic heritage and identification and scheduling, including historic areas; and would provide a better degree of protection for heritage not given by the STEM System. The submitter seeks the inclusion, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former NZR Frankton Railway Settlement Memorial Trees on former railway reserve now part of Swarbrick Park, Frankton • Beale Cottage's garden and trees • Beale Cottage Well • Ruakura Homestead Memorial Drive • the Hamilton Borough Nursery 	<p>Amend Schedule 8A to include historic plantings, gardens and landscape heritage, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former NZR Frankton Railway Settlement Memorial Trees on former railway reserve now part of Swarbrick Park, Frankton • Beale Cottage's garden and trees • Beale Cottage Well • Ruakura Homestead Memorial Drive • the Hamilton Borough Nursery
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.15	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter wishes that the interiors of items within Schedule 8A are protected because, while this occurs in other major cities there are no interiors protected in Hamilton and many have been lost. To walk into a historic heritage building without its historic interior is an incomplete acknowledgement of the historic place and its ability to demonstrate past interiors and interior planning i.e. a house without its fireplace and mantel, or a church without its original interior. Hamilton should have significant interiors within Schedule 8A and include council owned buildings identified interiors and owner requested interiors.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 8A to include significant interiors that have been identified by conservation plans, owner requests, or owned by Council, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H44 Frankton Railway Institute (main hall and caretakers flat) • H72 Former Paul's Book Arcade (front space) • H49 Waipahihi, 129 Cambridge Road
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.16	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		<p>The submitter states that the interiors of items within Schedule 8A should also be scheduled and the appropriate policy framework provided.</p>	<p>Introduce objectives, policies and rules for significant interiors.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.17	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter states "historic places is a better definition than item", because "it is important to include the immediate context and setting which has heritage values. Within proposed sites there may be other historic items, but the survey may not have been on site to survey. For example railway sites may have original outhouses or railway huts".</p>	<p>Seeks the protection of the elements on the site (of a scheduled built heritage item) that are historic heritage including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outhouses • outbuildings • early garages • early built landscape • plaques
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.18	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		<p>The submitter identifies additional buildings and considers the extent of the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA31) should be extended to include Hood Street; reference is made to the Proposed South End study undertaken in the 1990s.</p>	<p>Seeks the amendments to HHA31 - Victoria Street to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • buildings from mid-century, and • Hood Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.19	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter identifies additional buildings that should be scheduled: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 236 Victoria Street • 222, 226, 228 Victoria Street • Deco buildings in Hood Street 	Schedule 8A be amended to include the following buildings at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 236 Victoria Street • 222, 226, 228 Victoria Street • Deco buildings in Hood Street
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.20	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitters states that some of the "areas may need more of a finer review", specifically Brookfield Street West and 1-23, 2-26 Wye Street.	Review HHA 12 - Hamilton East an include Brookfield Street West.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.21	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitters states that some of the "areas may need more of a finer review", specifically Brookfield Street West and 1-23, 2-26 Wye Street.	Review HHA 19 - Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street to include the properties: 1-23 and 2-26 Wye Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter identifies that "the old town boundaries from 1860s-1870s indicate where there may have been possible activities and or buildings. This may help with owners knowing that there may be archaeology at an early stage. Identifying pre 1900 buildings scheduled historic items with possible pre1900 markers is supported however more modern buildings may also have pre 1900 use". The submitter identifies that this could be done by the addition of "predictive overlay to assist with early alert to council and owners of potential pre 1900 use based on 1864 and 1877 borough maps for Hamilton West, Hamilton East and Frankton".	The addition of predictive overlay to assist with early alert to council and owners of potential pre 1900 use based on 1864 and 1877 borough maps for Hamilton West, Hamilton East and Frankton.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.23	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1 Purpose	Support in part	The submitters supports the recognition of the heritage values of that part of Victoria Street between Garden Place and Hood Street to enhance a sense of place in the Central City.	Amend 7.1g to include two small shops on eastern side of Victoria Street and Hood Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.24	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1.1 Precinct 1 – Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitters supports the recognition of the heritage values of that part of Victoria Street between Garden Place and Hood Street to enhance a sense of place in the Central City.	Amend 7.1.1.f. to include two small shops on eastern side of Victoria Street and Hood Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.25	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	Submitter supports Policy 7.2.2d because it is in line with s6 of the RMA.	Retain Policy 7.2.2d.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.26	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	The submitter supports Policy 7.2.6i, but states it needs to be tied to a rule that "carries into each zone include sympathetic and retain integrity and authenticity along with associated definitions.	Retain Policy 7.2.6i and ensure a rule framework that "carries into each zone include sympathetic and retain integrity and authenticity along with associated definitions.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.27	Chapter 16 Community Facilities Zone	16.2 Objectives and Policies: Community Facilities Zone	Support	he submitter supports Policy 16.2.2d because it is in line with s.6 of the RMA.	Retain Policy 16.2.2d; and identify all other policy (d) in each chapter.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.28	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports Purpose 19.1m because it is in line with s.6 of the RMA.	Seeks references to site specific heritage assessment needs to be tied to a rule - and carried into each zone.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.29	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		The submitter states that the "protection of significant interior is important" and there should be "discretionary controls for schedule interiors". The submitter seeks rules for the protection of interiors, similar to the rules for exteriors of items; and that it is a discretionary activity to undertake internal alterations to a scheduled items.	Seeks the protection of interiors of scheduled items.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.30	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter identifies that the placement of the heading 'Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites' in Chapter 19, rule 19.3.1 activity table appears to be misplaced.	That the heading 'Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites' in 19.3.1 be moved or altered.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.31	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter wishes there to be buffer zones on the edges and boundaries of HHAs and scheduled items to protect them from development on adjacent sites.	The introduction of buffer zones around historic heritage areas and scheduled items; with associated rules.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.32	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria		The submitter states that the assessment criteria for HHAs should be the same as for Historic Heritage items (BH) to ensure consistency in the plan and with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and RMA.	The submitter states that the assessment criteria for HHAs should be the same as for Historic Heritage items (BH) to ensure consistency in the plan and with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and RMA.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.33	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2b - Alterations and additions to an existing building on a rear site within a HHA because historic heritage can be located on rear sections, and the lack of controls and differentiation can lead to affecting the integrity of the overall area.	Amend Rule 19.3.2a by combining it with Rule 19.3.2b, remove the exception of rear sites, and change the activity status be a Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.34	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2b - Alterations and additions to an existing building on a rear site within a HHA because historic heritage can be located on rear sections, and the lack of controls and differentiation can lead to affecting the integrity of the overall area.	Amend Rule 19.3.2b by combining it with Rule 19.3.2a, remove the exception of rear sites, and change the activity status be a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.35	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2c because relocating buildings onto an HHA sites has the potential to detract from heritage values.	Amend Rule 19.3.2c by changing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.36	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2d. because it should be signalled that the expectation is for the preservation of curtilage walls in the relevant HHAs.	Amend the activity status for Rule 19.3.2d. <i>Demolition of existing curtilage wall</i> to be a Discretionary Activity; and Amend 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan by adding a definition for the term 'curtilage wall'.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.37	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2e because demolition is of concern. Demolition of existing buildings within HHA is not appropriate and will affect integrity over time.	Amend Rule 19.3.2e by combining it with Rule 19.3.2g, remove the exception of rear sites, and change the activity status be a Non Complying Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.38	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2g because demolition is of concern. Demolition of existing buildings within HHA is not appropriate and will affect integrity over time.	Amend Rule 19.3.2g by combining it with Rule 19.3.2e, remove the exception of rear sites, and change the activity status be a Non Complying Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.39	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2f because demolition of existing detached accessory buildings on sites with HHAs can affect integrity over time.	Amend Rule 19.3.2f to remove the exception of rear sites, and change the activity status be a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.40	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2h, and seeks that it is deleted, or have rule to apply to historic fencing and built landscape, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fences and fence heights do not add nor detract from heritage values, where they are less than 1.8m height. Fences are typically forward of the front building line, adjacent to the road berm. Historic fences need to be identified such as in Frankton Railway village and have rules tied to this. 	Delete Rule 19.3.2h. Or Revise Rule 19.3.2h which applies to historic fencing and built landscape.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.41	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 19.3.2j New buildings as notified because it is too broad and unclear how context and integrity is held; of concern is new building in front yards.	Amend Rule 19.3.2j by changing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.42	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter states that because relocation should be a "last resort" the rules should reflect this; accordingly seeks that all forms of Relocation should a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule 19.3.k by changing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.43	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter states that because relocation should be a "last resort" the rules should reflect this; accordingly seeks that all forms of Relocation should a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule 19.3.2l by changing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.44	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter states that because relocation should be a "last resort" the rules should reflect this; accordingly seeks that all forms of Relocation should a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule 19.3.2m by changing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.45	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The submitter considers the notified definition for Historic Heritage Areas is more commensurate with character than historic heritage values; therefore it should be revised to be consistent with assessment criteria for historic heritage resource and sufficiently distinct form meaning of character (note: the latter term is not defined in the definitions section).	Revise the notified definition for Historic Heritage Areas in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.46	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		The definition of Adaptive re-use by Heritage New Zealand should be used, as use of term can imply considerable change and loss of heritage values. The submitter seeks rule that gives weight to the same use or sympathetic new use.	Delete the existing definition for Adaptive Re-use and replace it with the definition used by Heritage New Zealand.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.47	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		Under the Definition section of the submission the submitter states that the areas and sites of scheduled built heritage should be mapped because the extent and context is also important.	That the areas and sites of scheduled items are mapped.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.48	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		Under the heading 'Definitions' in the submission, the submitter states: Appendix 8 Historic items, areas and site should be mapped – not only buildings and seek review of definition and more appropriate rule for settings in historic items and historic areas, because extents and context are important. Need clarity on what is protected as more than buildings in Schedules	Amend 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan by reviewing the definition for <i>Setting</i> , and more appropriate rule for settings in historic items and historic areas

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.49	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		<p>Under the heading Definitions in the submission, the submitter states:</p> <p>"Appendix 8 Historic items, areas and site should be mapped Seek review of definition and more appropriate rule for surroundings in historic items and historic areas.</p> <p>Extents and context are important.</p> <p>Need clarity on what is protected as more than buildings in Schedules"</p>	<p>Under the heading Definitions in the submission, the submitter seeks the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 8 Historic items, areas and site should be mapped • Seek review of definition and more appropriate rule for surroundings in historic items and historic areas.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.50	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan		<p>The submitter considered there is a need for a definition of Partial Demolition to control the loss of integrity and authenticity. Because, partial demolition can be substantial and remove significant amounts of fabric and heritage values</p>	<p>Amend 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan to insert a definition for Partial Demolition.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.51	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>H244 - Single Dwelling, 57 Memorial Drive</p> <p>The submitter states that the single dwelling scheduled as H244 and notated in the inventory as 'Parr House" is incorrectly identified and is in fact the Hamilton Borough Caretaker's House at Parana Park.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H244 and the associated inventory to correctly reference the building as the Hamilton Borough Caretakers House and separately schedule the Former Parr House.</p>
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.52	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>H62 - NZ Dairy Co Building (1), Norton Road.</p> <p>This is an existing scheduled building - the submitter seeks amendments to the inventory and ranking for this building:</p> <p>The DP Schedule Built Heritage Inventory Form needs a review. Buildings incorrectly named. Each building on the site needs to be identified and scheduled. All ought to have higher ranking i.e. A. Correct name is NZ Cooperative Dairy Company factories. Only half the butter factory building has been scheduled. See Ambury & English building proposed. The 2007 Report for HCC [Kellaway] has identified the timber drying kiln, power house, box factory, tin factory, services and rail tracks and a small store building as- being of value as part of an industrial complex on the site with considerable collective values. Seek Historic Heritage Area as identified as in 2007.</p>	<p>Amend the 2012 inventory and ranking for H85 - NZ Dairy Co Building (1), Norton Road.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.53	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>H85 - NZ Dairy Co Building (2), Norton Road.</p> <p>This is an existing scheduled building - the submitter seeks amendments to the inventory and ranking for this building:</p> <p>The DP Schedule Built Heritage Inventory Form needs a review. Buildings incorrectly named. Each building on the site needs to be identified and scheduled. All ought to have higher ranking i.e. A. Correct name is NZ Cooperative Dairy Company factories. Only half the butter factory building has been scheduled. See Ambury & English building proposed. The 2007 Report for HCC [Kellaway] has identified the timber drying kiln, power house, box factory, tin factory, services and rail tracks and a small store building as being of value as part of an industrial complex on the site with considerable collective values. Seek Historic Heritage Area as identified as in 2007.</p>	Amend the 2012 inventory and ranking for H85 - NZ Dairy Co Building (2), Norton Road.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.54	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter requests that the 2012 inventory for H28 - Hockin House is amended to recognise the trees planted by the Waikato Historical Society as memorial trees; and that these trees are listed as part of the Graham Park Reserve.	Amend the 2012 inventory for H28 - Hockin House to recognise the trees planted by the Waikato Historical Society as memorial trees; and that these trees are listed as part of the Graham Park Reserve.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.55	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	Supports the A ranking of this heritage item (H316)	Retain, as notified the scheduling and A ranking of H316 - 1864 Jetty Piles.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.56	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	H221 - Gosling & Higgins Building - ranking should reflect the proposed ranking in the Opus Report 2001 Review and Assessment items and archaeological sites in Hamilton, when it was recommended to be A ranked.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H221 - Gosling & Higgins Building by deleting, and replacing the B with an A ranking.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.57	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter seeks amendments to the description H158 Ruakura Homestead: to ensure the description of H158 is extended to include the memorial avenue of the homestead; and the date of establishment of the model farm needs to be corrected.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H158 Ruakura Homestead: to ensure the description of H158 is extended to include the memorial avenue of the homestead; and the date of establishment of the model farm needs to be corrected.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.58	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	The submitter supports the A ranking of H315 - Union Bridge Piles, however requests the item is corrected referenced as the Union Bridge.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H315 - to identify the item as the Union Bridge.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.59	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	H244 - Single Dwelling, 57 Memorial Drive - The submitter supports the proposed scheduling of the caretakers house, but request that the historical information in the inventory form is reviewed and corrected; and the house at 103 Memorial Drive, actually being Parr House is also assessed and scheduled separately.	Review Schedule 8A: Built Heritage and associated inventory report to ensure the historical information in the inventory form for the caretaker's house at 57 Memorial Drive is corrected; and the house at 103 Memorial Drive (Parr House) is assessed and scheduled separately.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.60	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	H289 - Former St George's Church, 32 Somerset Street - The reference as a church needs to be corrected; this was St George's Hall not a church; it was used for a church very briefly in the 1990s after the church next door was removed. Nevertheless, the submitter states it is significant as St George's Church Hall for the Frankton community.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H289 to correctly reference the building.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.61	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter requests that research is undertaken on the building behind the church, referenced as H226 in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, to determine scheduling in the district plan.	Research the building behind the church, referenced as H226 in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, for scheduling in the district plan.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.62	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states there should be research undertaken, to schedule the manse at 9 King Street. Because the Manse is associated H226 - 11 King Street.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to include the building (manse) on 9 King Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.63	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter seeks corrections to the inventory for H226 - 11 King Street - Corrections are required for the identification of this building - the correct original and current name is First Church; the manse at 9 King Street is associated and needs to be scheduled; the separate building behind the First Church also needs research and to be considered for scheduling.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H226 - 11 King Street, and its inventory report - Corrections are required for the identification of this building - the correct original and current name is First Church; the manse at 9 King Street is associated and needs to be scheduled; the separate building behind the First Church also needs research and to be considered for scheduling.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.64	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter seeks corrections to the history of H233 - this was a Frankton Railway House that was removed from the Settlement and relocated to 95 Lake Road in the 1990s. It retains some heritage value, but no longer has its original context.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H233 to reference that this was a Frankton Railway House that was removed from the Settlement and relocated to 95 Lake Road in the 1990s. It retains some heritage value, but no longer has its original context.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.65	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states the interior of H49 - Waipahihi at 129 Cambridge Road be added to Schedule 8A, and ranked B.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by adding the interior of H49 - Waipahihi at 129 Cambridge Road, and ranked B.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.66	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states the interior of H44 - Frankton Railway Institute, Pukeko Street be added to Schedule 8A, and ranked B.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by scheduling the interior of H44 (Interior 194) - Frankton Railway Institute, Pukeko Street, and ranked B.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.67	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter seeks the scheduling of the Hamilton Underground Railway and its interior, and ranked B.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by scheduling the Hamilton Underground Railway and its interior, and ranked B.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.68	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states the interior of H7 - Hamilton Courthouse, Anglesea Street, be added to Schedule 8A, and ranked A.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by scheduling the interior of H7 - Hamilton Courthouse, Anglesea Street, and ranked A.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.69	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states the (former) Angus Flood Griffiths Office (Victoria Street) and its interior, be added to Schedule 8A, and ranked B.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by scheduling the (former) Angus Flood Griffiths Office (Victoria Street) and its interior, and ranked B.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.70	General	General		The submitter states that Council should have undertaken a citywide Heritage Landscape Study to assist with informing significant HHA and the protection of historic heritage, including Waikato University Landscape design. the inclusion of heritage landscape within historic items and historic areas to afford more robust protection. There should be rules included into Chapter 19 to incorporate heritage landscape heritage landscapes should be added to Appendix 8A and HHA, including historic streets.	That a citywide study and review of the city's Heritage Landscape is undertaken and incorporated into the District Plan.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.71	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter identifies that the Beale Cottage garden, it's well and plantings, as recommended in Conservation Plan and Heritage Landscape Plan should be protected as part of the scheduling of Beale Cottage in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H1 - Beale Cottage as plantings have been damaged and destroyed.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H1 - Beale Cottage - to also reference the Beale Cottage garden, it's well and plantings (as recommended in Conservation Plan and Heritage Landscape Plan).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.72	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter states that the road and extent (Ruakura Homestead Memorial Avenue) is part of the historic place and integral to the understanding. Noted that proposed also as Notable Trees however for historic heritage should be part of scheduling.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage, H158 - Ruakura Homestead to also reference the Notable Trees on site, the road and extent that is part of the historic place and integral to its understanding.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.73	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		HHA 10 - Frankton Railway Village - the submitter states that the group of trees located on Swarbrick Park need to be included within the HHA and as a group of notable trees. Because these were WW1 memorial planting part of historic Frankton Junction Railway Settlements, and planted c.1922, within the historic railway reserve which is now part of the HHC park.	Amend Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas, HHA10 - Frankton Railway Village to reference the group of trees located on Swarbrick Park within the HHA and as a group of notable trees.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.74	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General		The submitter states that the group of trees located on Swarbrick Park need to be included as a group of notable trees. Because these were WW1 memorial planting part of historic Frankton Junction Railway Settlements, and planted c.1922, within the historic railway reserve which is now part of the HHC park.	Amend Schedule 9D: Notable Trees to include the group of trees located on Swarbrick Park as a group of notable trees.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.75	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		The submitter wishes to have the Hamilton Borough Nursery at Cobham Drive scheduled in Appendix 8, Schedule 8A and suitable rules added to Chapter 19.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage to add the Hamilton Borough Nursery at Cobham Drive scheduled in Appendix 8, Schedule 8A; and provide suitable rules in to Chapter 19 Historic Heritage.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.76	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	General		The submitter states that the street trees located on Weka Street need to be included in Schedule 9D as a group of notable trees. Because these are historic planting related to the New Zealand Railway Department.	Amend Schedule 9D: Notable Trees to identify the street trees located on Weka Street as a group of notable trees.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.77	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		HHA 10 - Frankton Railway Village - the submitter states that the street trees located on Weka Street need to be included within the HHA. Because these are historic planting related to the New Zealand Railway Department.	Amend Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas, HHA10 - Frankton Railway Village to reference the street trees located on Weka Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.78	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General		The submitter seeks the addition to Schedule 9D to include the 'Old Mill Street Oaks' located on Old Mill Road and Commerce Street. These were part of the Edgecumbe estate of 19th century and markers of Frankton main street.	Amend Schedule 9D: Notable Trees to include the 'Old Mill Street Oaks' located on Old Mill Road and Commerce Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.79	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General		The submitter seeks the inclusion of the oak tree at the corner of Seddon and Mill Street on to Schedule 9D; because it is the surviving street tree marking Seddon Road and main road to Frankton.	Amend Schedule 9D: Notable Trees to include the oak tree at the corner of Seddon and Mill Street.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.80	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		HHA 13 - Hayes Paddock - the submitter states that the street trees located in Hayes Paddock need to be included within the HHA and as a group of notable trees. Because these are historic planting related to the state housing design.	Amend Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas, HHA13 - Hayes Paddock to identify the street trees as historic planting related to the state housing design.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.81	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General		The submitter states that the street trees located in Hayes Paddock need to be included within Schedule 9D as a group of notable trees. Because these are historic planting related to the state housing design.	Amend Schedule 9D to include the street trees located in Hayes Paddock as a group of notable trees.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.82	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter highlights the Burstall 1970 Waikato report on significant trees, and requests Council reviews this report and schedule those not already scheduled in Appendix 9, Schedule 9D in Appendix 8.	That Burstall 1970 Report is reviewed and the trees identified are scheduled in Appendix 8: Historic Heritage.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.83	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter requests the amendment of the archaeological schedules to include the Frankton Railway Station (1877-1909).	Amend Appendix 8, Schedules 8B and 8C Archaeological and Cultural Sites to include the Frankton Railway Station (1877-1909).
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.84	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter requests the amendment of the archaeological schedules to include the Frankton Drain, located Killarney east side to Killarney to crossing along MTL to Hamilton Railway Station.	Amend Appendix 8, Schedules 8B and 8C Archaeological and Cultural Sites to include the Frankton Drain, located Killarney east side to Killarney to crossing along MTL to Hamilton Railway Station.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.85	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter requests the amendment of the archaeological schedules to include the Gibbons Mill and tramway line located off Grey Street in Hamilton East.	Amendment Appendix 8, Schedules 8B and 8C Archaeological and Cultural Sites to include the Gibbons Mill and tramway line located off Grey Street in Hamilton East.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.86	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter requests the amendment of the archaeological schedules to include the Former NZR House Factory and Mill site works at Rifle Range Road and Railside.	Amendment Appendix 8, Schedules 8B and 8C Archaeological and Cultural Sites to include the Former NZR House Factory and Mill site works at Rifle Range Road and Railside.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.87	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter requests the inclusion of an 'Alert Overlay' within the known boundaries of the three old boroughs, based on 1864 maps that identifies: Hamilton West - 1864-1900 Hamilton East - 1864 -1900 Frankton - 1877 - 1900	Amend Appendix 8 to provide an overlay alert within the known boundaries of the three old boroughs, based on 1864 maps.
Waikato Heritage Group - Laura Kellaway Waikato Heritage Group	427.88	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General		The submitter seeks the addition of a provision of policy and scheduling of items for 20th century sites such as industrial sites.	The addition of policy and scheduling of items for 20th century sites such as industrial sites.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.1	General	General		The submitter opposes the costs historic heritage places on private property rights, placing undue and disproportionate cost on land owners in addition to the costs that would now be incurred as a result of resource consents being required for a range of activities. These will also place "significant constraint on (if not, preclude) Kainga Ora's ability to comprehensively plan for and enable, sustainable land-use efficiency in the ongoing delivery of its housing and urban regeneration program".	Removal of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic Heritage Areas provisions and notations on planning maps in their entirety; and • All new buildings identified as 'built heritage' in Appendix 8A and notated on the planning maps
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas		The submitter, while generally supporting the protection of areas of historic heritage where the requirements of Section 6, RMA are met, oppose the new proposed Historic Heritage Areas that are sought to be introduced under Plan Change 9 in their entirety. The submitter does not consider that the proposed HHAs meet the requirements of Section 6 of RMA to the extent that they should be accorded 'historic heritage' status of 'national' significance.	The removal of Historic Heritage Areas throughout the Plan Change 9 provisions and within the planning maps in their entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)		<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of all 182 built heritage items, as notified, because:</p> <p>(a) is contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is otherwise inconsistent with Part 2 of the Act;</p> <p>(b) is in-part contrary to the intended function of Section 6 of the Act;</p> <p>(c) is inconsistent with the established Historic and Cultural Heritage assessment criteria under Section 10A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement ('WRSP') and existing Heritage Assessment criteria under Appendix 1.3 of the ODP;</p> <p>(d) will place a significant constraint on (if not preclude) Kāinga Ora's ability to comprehensively plan for and enable, sustainable land-use efficiency in the ongoing delivery of its housing and urban regeneration program;</p> <p>(e) will place a disproportionate value on identified HHAs which, given their qualities, does not outweigh the need on a national level to provide for the efficient use of existing land for the delivery of public and affordable housing. This is considered to have a wider socio-economic benefit to the community which has not been appropriately assessed or balanced within the section 32 evaluation of the RMA supporting the PC9;</p> <p>(f) will place a significant constraint on landowners to develop market and affordable housing in the Hamilton and Waikato region; and</p> <p>(g) will in those circumstances impact significantly and adversely on the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing.</p>	Delete all 182 proposed scheduled built heritage items from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A:Built Heritage and their notations on the planning maps.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support in part	<p>Refer to the full submission - paragraphs 24 - 26</p> <p>The submitter supports in part the need to protect notable trees and their contribution to the amenity values of the wider environment, and therefore supports the spatial identification of notable trees with the street scape.</p> <p>(Note - the submitter opposes the definition of 'Protected Root Zone' - this is addressed through a separate submission point - 428.106)</p>	That the mapped Notable trees, and the relevant provisions, excluding the definition for 'Protected Root Zone', be included as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports the principle of giving effect to Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato ("Te Ture Whaimana") in part through the identification of additional areas of SNA and their categorisation into floristic and corridor/indigenous fauna habitat, which will ensure the ongoing ecological preservation and biodiversity of both the Waikato River and wider environment.	not stated.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submitter supports the mapped Significant Natural Areas, Notable trees and Archaeological sites, and the relevant provisions, as-notified.	The proposed amendments to the operative District Plan under PC9 as-notified, the mapped Archaeological sites, and the relevant provisions, be included as-notified.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.7	General	General		<p>The submitter opposes the plan change in part, for the reasons set out in this submission letter, and in relation to particular provisions (without limitation) as set out in-detail in Attachments 1-3. There are aspects of Plan Change 9 which is supported, subject to the relief sought being granted and matters raised in its overall submission is addressed:</p> <p>"Kāinga Ora seeks a number of amendments to PC9 which are set out in further detail in this submission below and set out in:</p> <p>(a) Attachment 1 – Identifies the proposed spatial changes of PC9 to the Operative District Plan that Kāinga Ora either supports or opposes;</p> <p>(b) Attachment 2 – Table 1: Identifies the specific amendments to the operative District Plan under the proposed provisions of PC9 that Kāinga Ora either supports, opposes or seeks amendment to;</p> <p>(c) Attachment 3 – Table 2: Identifies specific proposed 'built heritage' buildings that Kāinga Ora opposes."</p>	<p>(a) The removal of Historic Heritage Areas throughout the PC9 provisions and within the planning maps in their entirety, for the reasons outlined in this submission and its attachments.</p> <p>(b) The removal new buildings specifically identified as 'built heritage' in PC9 within Appendix 8A and the planning maps in their entirety, for the reasons outlined in this submission and its attachments.</p> <p>(c) The proposed amendments to the operative District Plan under PC9 as notified, be deleted or amended, to address the matters raised in this submission and its attachments so as to provide for the sustainable management of the Region's natural and physical resources and thereby achieve the purpose of the Act.</p> <p>(d) That the mapped Significant Natural Areas, Notable trees and Archaeological sites, and the relevant provisions, be included as-notified.</p> <p>(e) Such further or other relief, or other consequential or other amendments, as are considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out herein.</p> <p>(f) Any other alternative or consequential relief to give effect to this submission.</p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.8	4.3 Rules – General Residential, Residential Intensification and Large Lot Residential Zones	4.3.1 Activity Status Table – General Residential Zone, Residential Intensification Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone	Oppose	The submitter opposes all reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 4.3.1 Activity Status Table - General Residential Zone, Residential Intensification Zone and Large Lot Residential Zone.	Delete Rules 4.3.1ss to 4.3.1vv.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.9	4.4 Rules – General Standards – General Residential, Residential Intensification Zones and Large Lot Residential Zone	4.4.8 Fences and Walls		The submitter opposes, in part Rule 4.4.8 Fences and Walls relating to statements pertaining to Historic Heritage Areas because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and there oppose any reference to these.	Amend Rule 4.4.8 Fences and Wall to read: Rule 4.4.8a Fences and/or walls shall have a maximum height of 1.8m, except where sites are located within a Historic Heritage Area then the fences and/or walls standard in Chapter 19 Historic Heritage will take preference.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.10	4.5 Rules – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.5.1 Comprehensive Development Plan Process	Support in part	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 4.5.1.b.v. in Rule 4.5.1 Comprehensive Development Plan Process.	Retain, as notified Rule 4.5.1.b.v. in Rule 4.5.1 Comprehensive Development Plan Process.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.11	4.5 Rules – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.5.3 Activity Status Table – Medium-Density Residential Zone (excluding Rotokauri North, Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes)	Support in part	The submitter support in part, as notified Rules 4.5.3g, 4.5.3cc., and Note 3 in Rule 4.5.3 Activity Status Table - Medium Density Residential Zone (excluding Rotokauri North, Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes) because these changes as considered by the submitter to be administrative amendments to clarify the intent of the activity/standard.	Retain, as notified Rules 4.5.3g., 4.5.3cc., and Note 3. in Rule 4.5.3 Activity Status Table - Medium Density Residential Zone (excluding Rotokauri North, Ruakura and Te Awa Lakes).

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.12	4.5 Rules – Medium-Density Residential Zone	4.5.4 Activity Status Table – Rotokauri North Medium-Density Residential Zone, Ruakura Medium-Density Residential Zone and Te Awa Lakes Medium-Density Residential Zone	Support in part	The submitter support in part, as notified Rules 4.5.4.c, 4.5.4.aa., and Note 1. in Rule 4.5.4 Activity Status Table - Rotokauri North Medium-Density Residential Zone, Ruakura Medium-Density Residential Zone and Te Awa Lakes Medium-Density Residential Zone because these changes as considered by the submitter to be administrative amendments to clarify the intent of the activity/standard.	Retain, as notified Rules 4.5.4.c, 4.5.4.aa., and Note 1. in Rule 4.5.4 Activity Status Table - Rotokauri North Medium-Density Residential Zone, Ruakura Medium-Density Residential Zone and Te Awa Lakes Medium-Density Residential Zone.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.13	4.9 Rules – Specific Standards – Large Lot Residential Zone	4.9.1 Effluent Disposal	Support in part	The submitter supports in part, as notified Rule 4.9.1 Effluent Disposal as the change is an administrative amendment for consistency with the 'protected root zone' definition.	Retain, as notified Rule 4.9.1 Effluent Disposal.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.14	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.3.1 Activity Status – Special Residential, Special Heritage, Special Natural Zones and Rototuna North East Character Zone		The submitter opposes, in part the notified version of Rule 5.3.1 because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas, so therefore oppose reference to these.	Amend Rule 5.3.1 by deleting all reference to Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.15	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.3.2 Activity Status – Peacocke Character Zone		The submitter opposes the references to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 5.3.2.3 Activity Status Table - Peacocke Character Zone because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Amend Rule 5.3.2.3 by deleting all references to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.16	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.3.3 Activity Status Table – Temple View Zone		The submitter opposes, as notified any reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 5.3.3.2 Activity Status Table - Temple View Zone, including reference to Schedule 8D, because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Amend Rule 5.3.3.2 Activity Status Table - Temple View Zone by deleting all references to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.17	Chapter 5 Special Character Zones	5.4.8 Fences and Walls		The submitter opposes the references to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 5.4.8 Fences and Wall, because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Amend Rule 5.4.8 Fences and Walls to read: a. Fences and walls shall have a maximum height of 1.8m, except as provided below. For sites located within a Historic Heritage Area then the fences and/or walls standard in Chapter 19 Historic Heritage will take preference. b. Fences and walls within the Special Residential Zone and Special Heritage Zone shall have a maximum height of 1.2m for front and side boundary fences or walls located forward of the front building line of the dwelling
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.18	Chapter 6 Business 1 to 7 Zones	6.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter opposes all reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 6.3 Rules - Activity Status Table, because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Amend Rule 6.3 by deleting all references to Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.19	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1 Purpose	Oppose	The submitter opposes, as notified Purpose 7.1.g that references the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Areas, because they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Purpose 7.1.g.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.20	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.1.1 Precinct 1 – Downtown Precinct	Oppose	The submitter opposes, as notified 7.1.1 Precinct 1 - Downtown Precinct, 7.1.1f, because it references Historic Heritage Area, and they do not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete all reference to Historic Heritage Areas in 7.1.1f.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.21	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Oppose	The Submitter opposes, as notified Policy 7.2.2d because of the use of terminology which requires heritage values to be 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time, however existing heritage values cannot be 'maintained' while also being 'enhanced'.	Amend Policy 7.2.2d to read: Heritage resources and heritage values are recognised and managed to maintain and enhance <u>the ensure a sense of identity, the and</u> wellbeing of the City's residents and the historical legibility of the Central City
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.22	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct		The submitter opposes the inclusion of the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and requests Policy 7.2.6.i. be deleted.	Delete Policy 7.2.6.i.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.23	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	7.3 Rules – Activity Status		The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore opposes all activities/references relating to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 7.3 Rules - Activity Status.	Delete all references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 7.3 Rules - Activity Status.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.24	Chapter 8 Knowledge Zone	8.3.1 Rules – Activity Status for Precincts A, B and D	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 8.3.1 Rules - Activity Status for Precincts A, B and D.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.25	Chapter 8 Knowledge Zone	8.3.3 Rules – Activity Status for Precinct C - Ruakura Retail Centre only	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 8.3.3 Rules - Activity Status for Precinct C - Ruakura Retail Centre only.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.26	Chapter 9 Industrial Zone	9.3 Rules Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 9.3 Rules Activity Status Table in the Industrial zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.27	Chapter 11 Ruakura Industrial Park Zone	11.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 11.3 Rules - Activity Status Table for the Ruakura Industrial Park Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.28	Chapter 12 Te Rapa North Industrial Zone	12.3.1 Concept Development Consent – Process within Te Rapa North Industrial Zone – Stage 1A	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 12.3 Rules for the Te Rapa North Industrial Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.29	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.4 Rules – Activities Subject to a Comprehensive Development Plan	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 13.4 Rules - Activities Subject to a Comprehensive Development Plan for the Rototuna Town Centre Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.30	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.5 Rules Activities Proposed after the Implementation of a Comprehensive Development Plan	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 13.5 - Rules - Activities Proposed after the Implementation of a Comprehensive Development Plan, Chapter 13 - Rototuna Town Centre Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.31	Chapter 13 Rototuna Town Centre Zone	13.7 Rules Activity Status Table for Activities Proposed Within an Area with an Implemented Comprehensive Development Plan		The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 13.7.b and Notes, 13.7 Rules - Activity Status Table for Activities Proposed Within an Area with an Implemented Comprehensive Development Plan.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.32	Chapter 14 Future Urban Zone	14.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 14.3.f. and Note 3, 14.3 - Rules - Activity Status Table, Chapter 14 - Future Urban Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.33	Chapter 14 Future Urban Zone	14.4.6 Effluent Disposal	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 14.4.6 Effluent Disposal.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.34	Chapter 15 Open Space Zones	15.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to, and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 15.3 - Rules - Activity Status Table, Chapter 15 - Open Space Zone.	Amend Rule 15.3 - Rules - Activity Status Table, Chapter 15 - Opens Space Zone by deleting all references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.35	Chapter 16 Community Facilities Zone	16.2 Objectives and Policies: Community Facilities Zone		The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to, and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas in Policy 16.2.2d., 16.2 Objectives and Policies - Community Facilities Zone, Chapter 16 - Community Facilities Zone	Delete Policy 16.2.2d.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.36	Chapter 16 Community Facilities Zone	16.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to, and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas in Rule 16.3 - Rules - Activity Status Table, Chapter 16 - Community Facilities Zone.	Amend Rule 16.3 Rules - Activity Status Table by deleting all references and provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.37	Chapter 17 Major Facilities Zone	17.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter supports, in part, the administrative changes in Rule 17.3 Rules - Activity Status Table, Chapter 17 - Major Facilities Zone.	Include the proposed provisions, to the extent they are consistent with the Kāinga Ora submission(s) on those Chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.38	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter does not support the identification, by way of the methodology and assessment criteria used, of the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose all reference to, and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.	Withdraw the Plan Change with respect to HHAs and revert to existing provisions.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.39	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the methodology and assessment criteria used to identify the additional built heritage items on Schedule 8A:Built Heritage	Withdraw the Plan Change with respect to built heritage (buildings and structures) and revert to the existing schedule 8A of the ODP, as shown in appendix 3 of this submission.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.40	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose		The submitter generally supports the proposed wording as-notified for 19.1 Purpose, concerning archaeological and cultural sites and built heritage, which clarifies the purpose of the various provisions proposed and already present within Chapter 19, and ensures that the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga are recognised. However, the submitter does not support the identification, by way of the methodology and assessment criteria used, of the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose all reference to, and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, while amending the provisions concerning historical heritage areas to give effect to the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought. Delete reference to and provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.41	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage		The submitter opposes the use of terminology which requires heritage values to be 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time, however existing heritage values cannot be 'maintained' while also being 'enhanced'. While it is accepted that this is terminology used within the RMA, the submitter considers it appropriate to amend the proposed wording of Policy 19.2.1b to simplify.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified with the suggested amendments, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought. Ensuring that where features have been destroyed or damaged, the historical <u>Historic heritage resources</u> and heritage values of these sites are shall be identified , recorded and recognised to ensure maintain and enhance <u>ensure the ongoing sense of identity and wellbeing of the City's residents and the historical legibility of Hamilton the City.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.42	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage		<p>The submitter opposes the use of terminology which requires heritage values to be 'maintained and enhanced'. This implies that both outcomes must be achieved at the same time, however existing heritage values cannot be 'maintained' while also being 'enhanced'.</p> <p>While it is accepted that this is terminology used within the RMA, the submitter consider it appropriate to amend the proposed wording to simplify.</p>	<p><u>Amend Policy 19.2.1e to read:</u></p> <p>19.2.1e Signs on buildings, structures and/or sites listed in Schedule 8A or 8B must:</p> <p>i. Be associated with lawful activities on the site; ii. Be consistent with, and maintain, and where appropriate, or enhance the historic heritage values; iii. Avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the heritage resource.</p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.43	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	<p>Kainga Ora opposes policy 19.2.2c as the introduction of reference to 'historic heritage' requires that it be consistent with s6 of the RMA, and that such areas are of 'national' significance.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.2c to read: Outstanding examples of a particular type of site, or sites <u>historic heritage</u> that are highly significant <u>nationally and</u> to the community shall be scheduled.</p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.44	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		<p>The submitter opposes the use of the term 'avoid' in Policy 19.2.3b as it 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.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3b to read:</p> <p>The relocation of buildings and structures in Schedule 8A within the site identified in Schedule 8A is avoided, except shall only occur where: ...</p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.45	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		<p>The submitter does not support the use of terminology which requires heritage values to be 'maintained and enhanced', or in the case of Policy 19.2.3c, "retain, protect and enhance". This implies that all outcomes must be achieved at the same time, however existing heritage values cannot be 'retained and protected' while also being 'enhanced', therefore enhancements should be undertaken 'where practicable'.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 19.2.3c to read:</p> <p>Subdivision and/or development of the site identified in Schedule 8A shall retain, protect and <u>where practicable</u>, enhance the heritage values of any building or structure listed within Schedule 8A, including by ensuring that:</p> <p>.....</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.46	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to Policy 19.2.3.e.	Amend Policy 19.2.3e to read: <u>Identified</u> heritage buildings and structures shall be used in a manner that ensures that <u>identified</u> heritage values are not damaged or destroyed.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.47	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)		The submitter opposes the need to ensure works are reversible with the exception of 'damage' (Policy 19.3.2.j.v) as these conflicts with ongoing maintenance and repair, which should be enabled to ensure the ongoing preservation of identified buildings in schedule 8A.	Amend Policy 19.2.3j to read: (v) Is reversible wherever practicable (other than where works are undertaken as a result of damage <u>or for maintenance and repair</u>);
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.48	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter does not support the Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete all provisions within 19.2.4 relating to HHAs, including Appendix 8, Schedule 8D. Or, Alternatively amend Policies 19.2.4a and 19.2.4c to read: 19.2.4a <u>Development is discouraged where it would result in</u> Cumulative adverse effects that compromise and/or degrade the identified and existing on the heritage values of the <u>an</u> area.s are avoided wherever practicable . 19.2.4c The design, material use and placement of buildings and structures, including relocated buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings, demonstrate consistency with the physical and visual qualities of the historic heritage area through a Heritage Impact Assessment <u>where the nature and extent of the proposed development requires it.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.49	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas due to the way in which these have been identified.	In relation to Policy 19.2.5a.iv and 19.2.4c. the following alternative wording is proposed: Those changes are also highlighted for reference. <u>Providing a site-specific Heritage Impact Assessment where the nature and extent of the proposed development requires it.</u>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.50	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports the proposed amendments to Objective 19.2.6 and Policies 19.2.6a to 19.2.6e.	Retain Policy 19.2.6 and policies 19.2.6a - 19.2.6e as notified.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.51	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed amendments to the Rule 19.3 activity table, for the reasons outlined in its overall submission; however does not support Rule 19.3.1.o, the construction of a fence being a restricted discretionary activity. This can more-appropriately be managed through permitted activity standards concerning fencing height and fencing typology. A corresponding RD activity could be added where compliance with Rule 19.4.3 is not achieved. Requiring a resource consent to construct a fence, places a disproportionate cost on the landowner to secure their property. Effects associated with fencing can also be included in assessment criteria for activities associated with 'additions and alterations' to ensure that any fencing proposed as part of a development is consistent.	Amend Rule 19.3.1.o to read: Constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site. Amend Rule 19.3.1.p to read: Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site within the Major Facilities Zone - Waikato Hospital Campus and Wintec City Campus
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.52	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the all identified Historic Heritage Area.	Delete Rule 19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas (activity status table) in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.53	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed activity table for Archaeological and Cultural Sites (Rule 19.3.3), for the reasons outlined in its overall submission.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought. Delete reference to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.54	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.1 Maintenance and Repairs to a Schedule 8A Built Heritage (Building or Structure)	Support in part	The submitter supports Rule 19.4.1 as notified.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall Kāinga Ora submission and relief sought.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.55	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the addition of Rule 19.4.2.b as notified because it is in fact an information requirement that is already under the 'information requirements' section of the Plan under Volume 2, Appendix 1.2(h). The proposed wording is also not clear whether mana whenua engagement is in fact a requirement for the purpose of the standard.	Delete Rule 19.4.2.b. in its entirety.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.56	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter opposes the identification of all Historic Heritage Areas, accordingly Rule 19.4.3 should be deleted.	Delete Rule 19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls in its entirety.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.57	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.5 Controlled Activities: Matters of Control	Support in part	The submitter opposes in part the use of special character as a matter of discretion in relation to historic heritage (Rule 19.5 - Controlled Activities: Matters of Control).	Include the proposed provisions as notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.58	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria		<p>The submitter generally supports the proposed provisions and cross referencing for plan administration purposes, however they are opposed to 19.3.1 which would require RD consent for the construction of a fence; and does not support the identified Historic Heritage Areas, so opposes the reference to these in Rule 19.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities : Matters of Discretion and Assessment.</p> <p>The submitter also does not support the inclusion of special character as a matter of discretion in relation to historic heritage.</p>	<p>Delete reference to Special Character and sections relating to HHAs, as well as the inclusion of proposed amendments to the extent they are consistent with the relief sought.</p> <p>A consequential amendment is required, and identified in highlight.</p> <p>vi. <u>Signs Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site*</u></p> <p>E – Heritage Values</p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.59	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 20.1 Purpose, 20.1a This chapter of the District Plan Relates to Significant Natural Areas, Notable Trees and peat lake catchments.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.60	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Significant Natural Areas, 20.1b - 20.1f.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.61	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Notable Trees 20.1g. - 20.1j.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.62	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Objective 20.2.1 and policies 20.2.1a - 20.2.1l.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.63	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Objective 20.2.2 and policies 20.2.2a and 20.2.2b.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.64	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Objective 20.2.3 and policies 20.2.3a - 20.2.3e.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.65	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	While the submitter supports Policy 20.2.3c, they consider that this policy is more suited to be in Chapter 23 Subdivision.	Move Policy 20.2.3c <i>Within areas of greenfield development the values of significant trees shall be maintained and taken into account in the layout and design of new development</i> to Chapter 23 Subdivision.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.66	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the 20.2.3 Explanation.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.67	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	<p>The submitter supports in part 20.3 Activity Status Table, considering that there will be many circumstances where protected vegetation in SNAs is located in close proximity to existing buildings, which may impede access for maintenance and/or general upkeep of buildings. In such cases there is (as notified) no exclusion for such ‘pruning’ to take place in SNAs unlike notable trees that are interfering with buildings under 20.3(t). The submitter considers that to not provide for such an activity would place a substantial cost-burden on land owners through the requirement for resource consent and potential specialist advice in the general upkeep and maintenance of buildings.</p> <p>Plus, to be consistent with their submissions on the definition and measurement of a ‘protected root zone’, the submitter seeks the deletion of the following text in Note 4 of Rule 20.3:</p> <p>4. The extent of the individual Protected Root Zone for each Notable Tree, as shown on the planning maps is indicative. The radius measurement in Appendix 9D is to be measured form the centre of the trunk of the Notable Tree to confirm the physical location of the protected root zone.</p>	<p>Include the proposed amendments to the as-notified provisions.</p> <p>A proposed permitted activity is highlighted to enable pruning to ensure clearance around existing buildings. It is noted that consequential amendments to other provisions concerning limits on the quantum of pruning able to be undertaken in a calendar year would be required to avoid conflict.</p> <p><u>v. The pruning is required to ensure a 1m wide area for access and maintenance to an existing lawfully-established building, provided that pruning is only undertaken where the vegetation / tree is within 1m of the existing building.</u></p> <p><u>The extent of the individual Protected Root Zone for each Notable Tree, as shown on the planning maps is indicative. The radius measurement in Appendix 9D is to be measured form the centre of the trunk of the Notable Tree to confirm the physical location of the protected root zone.</u></p>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.68	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.69	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.2 Pruning and Maintenance of Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5 2 Pruning and Maintenance of Notable Trees.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.70	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.71	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.4 Emergency Works to, or Removal of, an Indigenous Tree in a Significant Natural Area or a Notable Tree	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.4 Emergency Works to, or Removal of, an Indigenous Tree in a Significant Natural Area or a Notable Tree.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.72	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.73	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.74	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.75	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 20.6 restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.76	Chapter 22 Natural Hazards	22.3 Rules Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 22.3 Rules - Activity Status Table, Rule 22.3a., 22.3b., 22.3c.,22.3.d, 22.3.g., and 22.3.n.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.77	Chapter 22 Natural Hazards	22.5.4 Removal of Trees and Other Vegetation	Support in part	The submitter supports, as notified Note 1 for Rule 22.5.4 as the change is an administrative amendment to clarify which standard applies.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.78	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter opposes the identification of Historic Heritage Areas and therefore reference to those in Policy 23.2.5a.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas. Delete policy 23.2.5a iii.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.79	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 23.3 Activity Table Status, Table 23.3a.xi. <i>Any subdivision of an allotment within a archaeological and cultural site, or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C.</i>	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.80	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 23.3 Activity Status Table, Table 23.3b. xi. <i>Any subdivision of an allotment within an archaeological and cultural site, or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C.</i>	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.81	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Rule 23.3 Activity Status Tables, Table 23.3c.xi <i>Any subdivision of an allotment within an archaeological and cultural site, or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C.</i>	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.82	25.1 Development Suitability	25.1.2 Objectives and Policies: Development Suitability	Support in part	The submitter opposes the identification of Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas. Delete policy 25.1.2.2bii.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.83	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter supports in part the notified version of Rule 25.2.3 with the exception of Rule 25.2.3.k <i>Pruning and maintenance of the canopy of a tree overhanging the boundary of a Significant Natural Area, provided that Standards 25.2.4.3(b) is complied with</i> because they consider that the intent of standards relating to the trimming of trees overhanging the boundary of an SNA are unclear. As it would be overly-restrictive to manage the effects of vegetation growing outside of an SNA boundary.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora. Amended wording is proposed in highlight. k. <u>Pruning and maintenance of the canopy of a tree located within and overhanging the boundary of a Significant Natural Area, provided that Standard 25.2.4.3(b) is complied with</u>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.84	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.4 Rules – General Standards		The submitter supports in part Rule 25.2.4.3 <i>Earthworks in the dripline of, and pruning and maintenance of, trees overhanging the boundary of a Significant Natural Area.</i> However, they consider that the intent of standards relating to the trimming of trees overhanging the boundary of an SNA are unclear. As it would be overly-restrictive to manage the effects of vegetation growing outside of an SNA boundary.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora. Amended wording is proposed in highlight. b. <u>When pruning or maintaining the canopy of a tree where the trunk is located within a Significant Natural Area and the canopy is overhanging the boundary of a Significant Natural Area:</u>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.85	25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 25.6.1 Purpose for Rule 25.6 Lighting and Glare.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.86	25.6 Lighting and Glare	25.6.2 Objectives and Policies: Lighting and Glare	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 25.6.2 Objectives and Policies: Lighting and Glare.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.87	25.10 Signs	25.10.2 Objectives and Policies: Signs	Support	The submitter supports the notified version of Policy 25.10.2.1e Signs on buildings and structures and within sites identified in Schedule 8A and 8B must not compromise the identified heritage values and the heritage resources.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.88	25.10 Signs	25.10.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 25.10.3 - Rules - Activity Status Table as notified.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.89	25.10 Signs	25.10.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports Rule 25.10.6 Restricted Discretionary Activities: Matters of Discretion and Assessment Criteria as notified.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.90	Chapter 26 Designations	26.2 Use of Designated Land		The submitter opposes, in part Rule 26.2 Use of Designated Land because they do not support the identification of Historic Heritage Areas.	Amend Rule 26.2 to delete the reference to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.91	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.1 Acronyms Used in the District Plan		The submitter opposes the identification of Historic Heritage Areas, accordingly opposes all references and provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas. Delete the HHA Historic Heritage Area acronym.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.92	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the proposed definition in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan for Adaptative re-use (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.93	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition of 'Awa' as referenced in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.94	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Biodiversity offset' as notified in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.95	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Biodiversity compensation' as notified in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.96	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Building Services (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)' as notified in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.97	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the amendments to the definition for 'Eco-sourced' as notified in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.98	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes Historic Heritage Areas, according they oppose the definition for 'Historic Heritage Area' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas. Delete the 'Historic Heritage Area' definition.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.99	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Kaitiakitanga' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.100	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for Kainga' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.101	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Maara kai' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.102	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Maatauranga Maaori' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.103	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures (in relation to Chapter 19:Historic Heritage)' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.104	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Mana Whenua' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.105	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Paa' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.106	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Pest control' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.107	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	<p>The submitter oppose the notified definition for Protected Root Zone because it is considered too complex. Given that root zones have also been identified for notable trees through the PC 9 process, it is more appropriate that a 'dripline' approach to the definition of 'protected rootzone' is administratively simple, understandable to the lay-person, and can account for the mapped rootzones for notable trees.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the 'Protected Root zone' definition in the Auckland Unitary Plan is an administratively-simpler and efficient definition to administer being based on a 'dripline' approach.</p>	<p>Amend the definition for Protected Root Zone, by deleting the notified version and replacing it with the following:</p> <p>Protected Root Zone: Means the minimum radius, from the centre of the tree trunk to ensure a tree's health and stability is safeguarded, as calculated using the following protocols: For single trunk trees – the trunk diameter multiplied by 12 at 1.4m above the ground For multiple stem trees – either:</p> <p>a. The trunk diameter multiplied by 12 at the narrowest point below any fork/multiple stem development; or</p> <p>b. When the multiple stems are at ground level multiply the square root of the combined stems by a factor of 12</p> <p><u>circular area of ground around the trunk of a protected tree, the radius of which is the greatest distance between the trunk and the outer edge of the canopy. For columnar crown species the protected root zone is half the height of the tree.</u></p> <p>This definition is to be accompanied by two diagrams - Protected root zone A - for a spreading canopy and Protected root zone B - Columnar Canopy.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.108	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for Protected Tree as notified.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.109	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the notified definition for Pruning, trimming and maintenance of a notable tree.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.110	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the definition for 'Puna' as notified.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.111	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for 'Reconstruction (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage) in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.112	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for 'Restoration (in relation to a Significant Natural Area)' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.113	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports the deletion of the existing definition: 'Root Protection Zone' from 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Delete the definition 'Root Protection Zone' from 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.114	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for 'Roto' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.115	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the definition 'Setting (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)' in its entirety, as it is inconsistent with s6 of the RMA. The protection afforded by s6(f) of the RMA should only be extended to the surrounding land (or 'areas') of historic sites or places if there is sufficient intensity of heritage fabric woven into the landscape to warrant the application of s6 of the RMA. The definition is broad and lacks specificity, which should be outlined in any Heritage Area Statement as to what the protected 'setting' might be, in relation to any specific historic heritage values that are being protected. Furthermore, including arbitrary 'views' from the building or structure would need to be specifically identified in any Heritage Area Statement at the very least.	Delete the definition 'Setting (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan in its entirety and undertake changes as required within correlating chapters.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.116	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter opposes the definition ' Surroundings (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19:Historic Heritage)' in its entirety, as it is inconsistent with s6 of the RMA. The protection afforded by s6(f) of the RMA should only be extended to the surrounding land (or 'areas') of historic sites or places if there is sufficient intensity of heritage fabric woven into the landscape to warrant the application of s6 of the RMA. The definition is broad and lacks specificity, which should be outlined in any Heritage Area Statement as to what the protected 'surrounding' might be, in relation to any specific historic heritage values that are being protected.	Delete the definition 'Surroundings (in relation to Volume 1, Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan in its entirety and undertake changes as required within correlating chapters.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.117	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Takiwaa' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.118	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Te Awa Tupuna' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.119	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Tikanga (in relation to Chapter 19: Historic Heritage)' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.120	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Urupaa' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.121	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Vegetation trimming and maintenance' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.122	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Vegetation removal' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.123	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the definition for ' Waahi Tapu' in 1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.124	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Oppose	The submitter opposes, in part the notified version of 1.2.1.d.iv. where it references Historic Heritage Areas because they not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to these.	Amend 1.2.1.d.iv. to delete all reference to Historic Heritage Areas: 1.2.1.d.iv. Any historic or natural feature identified in Appendix 8 or Appendix 9 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (buildings and structures) • Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites • Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites • Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas • Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas • Schedule 9D: Notable Trees
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.125	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Support	The submitter supports, as notified the 1.2.1d.xii Location, layout, dimensions and description of existing (noting any that are to be retained or removed) and any proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping and vegetation • Walls or fences • Signs (including sign design) • Utility services (e.g. water lines, street lights), which may also require details about connections to Three Waters infrastructure (including size, depth at boundary, grade and distance to boundary pegs <u>peg</u>) 	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.126	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.1 All Applications	Support in part	The submitter supports in part 1.2.1 h Assessment of environment effects, while proposes an amendment to 1.2.1h.iii. because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to ensure that any details of engagement with mana whenua is acknowledged within resource consent applications. • for consistency of plan administration, this should be noted as a 'requirement' where a site and/or development involves land containing 'identified' features of cultural importance and significance. 	Amend 1.2.1.h.iii third bullet point to read: Identification of any measures included in the application to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects that were proposed in any engagement with Mana Whenua <u>in the case of the site having identified tangata whenua values.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.127	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support in part	The submitter supports in part 1.2.2.1.a.i to ensure that any details of engagement with mana whenua is acknowledged within resource consent applications. For consistency of plan administration this should be noted as a 'requirement' where a site and/or development involves land containing identified features of cultural importance and significance.	Amend 1.2.2.1.a.i as notified to read: a. Plans, reports or information may also be required to be provided in relation to: i. Details of outcomes and any consultation undertaken (e.g. <u>Kiwi</u> Rail, Transpower, Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Waikato Regional Council) and of engagement with representatives of Mana Whenua <u>where tangata whenua values are identified.</u>
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.128	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 1.2.2.7 Historic Heritage - Built Heritage and Archaeological and Cultural Sites.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.129	1.2 Information Requirements	1.2.2 Additional Information Requirements	Oppose	The submitter opposes the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to these in 1.2.2.8 Historic Heritage Areas.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.130	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control	Support in part	The submitter supports in part 1.3.2.E.b. Management of effects on, and risks to, the values of the archaeological and cultural sites identified in Schedule 8C, Volume 2, Appendix 8, including., and considers that the matter of control associated with mana whenua representation can be clarified so as to not read as a requirement regardless of the outcome of any engagement (in the potential instance where attendance may not be required onsite). This is consistent with the approach utilised in the restricted discretionary assessment criteria.	Amend 1.3.2.E.b.i to read: 1.3.2.E.b. Management of effects on, and risks to, the values of the archaeological and cultural sites identified in Schedule 8C, Volume 2, Appendix 8, including.. i. Provision for Mana Whenua representation on site for monitoring of earthworks and land disturbance <u>where attendance has been requested as part of any engagement with Mana Whenua.</u>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.131	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 1.3.3 D Natural Character and Open Space in its entirety (D1 - D13).	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.132	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria		The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to Historic Heritage Areas in 1.3.3..E Heritage Values and Special Character	Delete all references to Historic Heritage Areas in 1.3.3.E Heritage Values and Special Character (E1 - E36)
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.133	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	The submitter supports, as notified 1.3.3.G7d and 1.3.3.G7h.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.134	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.135	1.4 Design Guides	General	Support	The submitter supports, as notified, reference to 'notable' to replace 'significant' when referencing scheduled trees in 1.4.9 Temple View Zone Urban Design Guide.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.136	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-2 Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP): Archaeological Sites, Archaeological Areas, Historic Areas or Waahi Tapu	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the intent of Appendix 8, 8-2 Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP): Archaeological Sites, Archaeological Areas, Historic Areas or Waahi Tapu but requests that the wording clarifies whether the engagement is a 'requirement' for all sites, regardless of whether an archaeological site is not identified as having specific cultural values to mana whenua.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.137	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes Appendix 8, 8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas and the provisions and assessment methodology and consider them to not be consistent with established guidance and practice concerning the identification and assessment of historic heritage, or the existing established Historic and Cultural Heritage assessment criteria under Section 10A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and existing Heritage Assessment criteria under Appendix 1.3 of the Operative District Plan.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.138	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.2 Historic Heritage Area Assessment Criteria	Oppose	The submitter opposes Appendix 8, 8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas and the provisions and assessment methodology and consider them to not be consistent with established guidance and practice concerning the identification and assessment of historic heritage, or the existing established Historic and Cultural Heritage assessment criteria under Section 10A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and existing Heritage Assessment criteria under Appendix 1.3 of the Operative District Plan.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.139	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore oppose reference to these in Appendix 8, 8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment. Specifically, opposes the provisions and assessment methodology, and considers them to not be consistent with established guidance and practice concerning the identification and assessment of historic heritage, or the existing established Historic and Cultural Heritage assessment criteria under Section 10A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and existing Heritage Assessment criteria under Appendix 1.3 of the Operative District Plan.	Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.140	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of all new new buildings and sites, that have been identified for protection as 'built heritage' as part of Plan Change 9, being H138 - H319 in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Amend Schedule 8A: Built Heritage by removing the new identified Built Heritage buildings and sites, H138 to H319.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.141	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports, as notified Appendix 8B: Group 1 Archaeological and Cultural Sites.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.142	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter supports, as notified Appendix 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites.	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.143	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter does not support the proposed Historic Heritage Areas and therefore opposes the spatial identification of new historic heritage areas in Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas (HHA1 - HHA32).	Delete Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas (HHA1 - HHA32) in its entirety.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.144	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1 Significant Tree Assessment Valuation Method and Criteria	Support in part	The submitter supports Appendix 9: Natural Environments, 9-1 Significant Tree Assessment Valuation Method and Criteria, the STEM methodology and criteria as-notified.	Include the methodology and criteria as-notified.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.145	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	General	Support	The submitter supports, as notified Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas.	Include the proposed provisions as-notified, to the extent they are consistent with the overall submission and relief sought by Kāinga Ora
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.146	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	General	Support in part	The submitter supports, as notified Schedule 9D: Notable Trees (T3 - T335).	Include the proposed provisions 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	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.147	Appendix 13 Network Utilities and the Electricity National Grid Corridor	General		Delete references and any provisions relating to Historic Heritage Areas.	The submitter opposes the spatial identification of new historic heritage areas and therefore all reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Appendix 13: Network Utilities and the Electricity National Grid Corridor.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.149	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage		The submitter considers that the use of the term 'avoid' in Policy 19.2.2b 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. The use of 'avoid' in Policy 19.2.2b needs to appropriate with the wider policy framework of the ODP and not-contrary to other enabling provisions for alterations/relocation of buildings.	Review the wording of Policy 19.2.2b to ensure the use of 'avoid' is appropriate with the wider policy framework of the ODP and not-contrary to other enabling provisions for alterations/relocation of buildings.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.150	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Support in part	The submitter supports in part the proposed amendments to the Rule 19.3 activity table, for the reasons outlined in its overall submission; however does not support Rule 19.3.1.p. relating to the construction of a fence in the Major Facility zone. Requiring a resource consent to construct a fence, places a disproportionate cost on the landowner to secure their property. Effects associated with fencing can also be included in assessment criteria for activities associated with 'additions and alterations' to ensure that any fencing proposed as part of a development is consistent.	Amend Rule 19.3.1.p. to read: p. Erecting, constructing or extending any structure or fence on a site within the Major Facilities Zone – Waikato Hospital Campus and Wintec City Campus.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.151	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City		The submitter opposes the references in Policy 7.2.6.g to Historic Heritage Area, and because they do not support the proposition of Historic Heritage Areas all references to these should be deleted.	Amend Policy 7.2.6.g. to read: Diversity in building form and height is encouraged, subject to enhancing and protecting public amenity values and, minimising adverse effects on adjoining sites and the public realm, and protecting the authenticity and integrity of the identified historic heritage area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.152	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter does not support the identified Historic Heritage Areas, accordingly, seek the reference to 'historic heritage area' in Note 1 under Rule 19.3.3 to be deleted.	Delete reference to Historic Heritage Areas in Note 1 under Rule 19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites Activity Table.
Campbell Brown Planning Ltd - Michael Campbell Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Gurv Singh - PO Box 74598 Greenlane, Auckland	428.153	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	Note 1 under Rule 19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites Activity Table. The submitter seek clarification around the requirement to engage with Mana Whenua; this should clearly state where an accidental discovery is made or when undertaking works within an identified site of significance.	Amend Note 1 under Rule 19.3.3 Archaeological and Cultural Sites Activity Table to clearly state the requirement to engage with Mana Whenua is when an accidental discovery is made or when undertaking works within an identified site of significance.
Rupert Lewis Clive Hodgson	429.1	General	General	Support	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 as notified.	Maintain Plan Change 9 as notified.
Candace and Sam Hood	430.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to 8 Marama Street, Frankton being included within Schedule 8A and considers that this would penalise them financially and that the location is ideal for modern inner city living.	Remove the property (H240) from Schedule 8A.
Candace and Sam Hood	430.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the Marama Street Historic Heritage Area over 8 Marama Street.	Delete Marama Street Historic Heritage Area.
Simon Travaglia	431.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees		The submitter advises that the notable tree T75.3, Melody Lane, no longer exist due to adverse weather.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T75.3 from Schedule 9D.
Simon Travaglia	431.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees		The submitter advises that the notable tree T75.6, Melody Lane, no longer exist due to adverse weather.	Remove all reference to the notable tree T75.6 from Schedule 9D.
Simon Travaglia	431.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	General		The submitter advises to include the London Plane trees along Ruakura Road in the Schedule 9D due to age and condition of the trees.	Include the London Plane trees along Ruakura Road in the Schedule 9D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Ben and Mary van den Engel	432.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	<p>The submission opposes the inclusion of Archaeological Site A177 on the planning maps and in Schedule 8C.</p> <p>The WSP report is referred to, specifically that no iwi consultation and only selected ground truthing was undertaken, and that further assessment is required of the sites studied.</p> <p>An archaeological assessment and monitoring of earthworks associated with a consent has been undertaken of which a memo is provided for. Iwi groups found no evidence of the paa site and in archaeological monitoring, Dr Gumbley found no evidence of archaeological deposits.</p>	Remove Archaeological Site A117 from the District Plan and Planning Maps.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Ben and Mary van den Engel	432.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites		The submission considers it appropriate for the inclusion of A117 as an Archaeological Site to be revisited noting the lack of 'further assessment' undertaken and evidence to prove the area's archaeological significance.	Review the status of Archaeological Site A117 within Schedule 8C.
GIS Consulting Services Ltd - Aaron Barnsdall	433.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the proposed Historic Heritage Area zoning and considers that if there are houses of heritage value, that they are assessed on an individual basis.	Remove HHA's and change these areas to 'residential intensification zone', or stick with the status quo.
GIS Consulting Services Ltd - Aaron Barnsdall	433.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of the notable tree T320 (T320.1- 320.21) (Street Trees) along Wellington Street (East) due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees have no real heritage value, cause shading during the summer months • The fallen leaves clog drains and cause widespread street flooding during the months of autumn and winter. "This is not good in an area that is subject to flooding because Clyde park is not draining." • The trees also grow into the overhead powerlines, which causes problems during windy periods • Maintenance of trees are difficult to keep up • "Some of the tree root systems in Hamilton East are causing footpath destruction, this will only be more costly to repair. As a result of the destruction, they create hazards to wheeled, disabled, and pedestrian users." 	Remove all reference to the group of notable tree T320 (T320.1- 320.21) (Street Trees) from Schedule 9D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
GIS Consulting Services Ltd - Aaron Barnsdall	433.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of the notable tree T322 (Street Trees) along Wellington Street (East) due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees have no real heritage value, cause shading during the summer months • The fallen leaves clog drains and cause widespread street flooding during the months of autumn and winter. "This is not good in an area that is subject to flooding because Clyde park is not draining." • The trees also grow into the overhead powerlines, which causes problems during windy periods • Maintenance of trees are difficult to keep up • "Some of the tree root systems in Hamilton East are causing footpath destruction, this will only be more costly to repair. As a result of the destruction, they create hazards to wheeled, disabled, and pedestrian users." <p>(T322 is being identified at 53A Wellington Street in Schedule 9D).</p>	Remove all reference to the group of notable tree T322 (Street Trees) from Schedule 9D.
GIS Consulting Services Ltd - Aaron Barnsdall	433.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of the notable tree T323 (T323.1-323.14) (Street Trees) along Wellington Street (East) due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees have no real heritage value, cause shading during the summer months • The fallen leaves clog drains and cause widespread street flooding during the months of autumn and winter. "This is not good in an area that is subject to flooding because Clyde park is not draining." • The trees also grow into the overhead powerlines, which causes problems during windy periods • Maintenance of trees are difficult to keep up • "Some of the tree root systems in Hamilton East are causing footpath destruction, this will only be more costly to repair. As a result of the destruction, they create hazards to wheeled, disabled, and pedestrian users." 	Remove all reference to the group of notable tree T323 (T323.1-323.14) (Street Trees) from Schedule 9D.
GIS Consulting Services Ltd - Aaron Barnsdall	433.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T301-T335	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T301-T335		<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of the notable tree T321 (T321.1-321.10) (Street Trees) along Wellington Street (East) due to the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees have no real heritage value, cause shading during the summer months • The fallen leaves clog drains and cause widespread street flooding during the months of autumn and winter. "This is not good in an area that is subject to flooding because Clyde park is not draining." • The trees also grow into the overhead powerlines, which causes problems during windy periods • Maintenance of trees are difficult to keep up • "Some of the tree root systems in Hamilton East are causing footpath destruction, this will only be more costly to repair. As a result of the destruction, they create hazards to wheeled, disabled, and pedestrian users." 	Remove all reference to the group of notable tree T321 (T321.1-321.10) (Street Trees) from Schedule 9D.
John Caradus	434.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to a proposed SNA (C71) at 6 Geoffrey Place because the proposed area was a weedy slope when the property was purchased in 2004 and was landscaped and planted with native plants purchased or given to the owners.	Remove the SNA (C71) from the property at 6 Geoffrey Place.
Chris Eames	435.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports all proposed changes to the consenting as notified because it is important to restore and protect the biodiversity of gullies and that restrict development activities.	Retain provisions in relation to protection of biodiversity of gullies and restriction of development.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Chris Eames	435.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Notable Trees	Support	The submitter supports changes for Notable Trees as notified because are vital for the ecosystems they sustain as well as the aesthetics and other amenities they provide.	Maintain Notable Trees provisions as notified.
First Credit Union - Simon Scott	436.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter does not agree with scheduling H182 because "the building in question has no historical architectural merit and has been so changed as to make any suggestion it is laughable".	Nothing stated.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the extent of the archaeological site A121 related to 401 Grey Street/3 Cook Street (Pt Lot 1 DPS 40665) - stating the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "planning maps appear inaccurate. The proposed plan change 9 maps show the property at 401 Grey Street /3 Cook Street (Pt Lot 1 DPS 40665) as being affected. However, the entry of A121 in Schedule 8C does not list Pt Lot 1 DPS 40665 as being affected by the overlay. There is a disconnect between the maps and the listing". 2. "Operative District Plan shows A121 as not affecting the site at 401 Grey/3 Cook Street (Pt Lot 1 DPS 40665). There is no evidence provided in the WSP report to suggest that A121 should now affect this site. In fact, the WSP report (page 10 and Table 4 on Page 13) say that site A121 is recommended for further investigation to determine whether it should be on the Schedule as an archaeological site. The WSP report does not say that it is an archaeological site and does not recommend that the A121 listing be identified as such. Regardless, Council have decided to include it. The submitter disagrees with this approach taken". 	Amend the planning maps to remove A121 from affecting 401 Grey/3 Cook Street (Pt Lot 1 DPS 40665); and any subsequent amendments as necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3w, in particular Rule 20.3w.ii, because, the current wording "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface" does not permit maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as footpaths. Given current wording, resource consent is required for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces or upgrades to existing street frontages. This is onerous and adds another layer to the resource consenting requirements, where management of adverse effects could be achieved through a more specific rule. For example, "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)" .	Amend Rule 20.3.w (ii), to exclude maintenance and replacement of impervious surface, to read: The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface <u>that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)</u> . And any subsequential changes as necessary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (b) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (b). Any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (iii) because the rule states that 'The alteration of the ground level by either permeable or impervious materials' requires resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This rule does not allow for improvements to the ground plane under the tree (eg removal of impervious surface, or mulching to improve grass cover under the tree's canopy, or further protect a tree's roots.) This rule will also be extremely difficult to show compliance with and monitor by Council.	Remove Rule 20.3.w (iii) in its entirety; or alternatively, remove 'permeable' from this rule so the rules states that "the alteration of ground level by impervious surfaces" requires RD consent.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (v) because it states that resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity is required for the placement and/or construction of a building or structure. This rule is superfluous as it is already covered by 20.3w ii) and iv).	Remove Rule 20.3.w (v) in its entirety. And any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (viii) it states that resource consent is required for the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment within the RPZ. This rule is vague and provides no guidance to the reader as to what would be permitted or not. It is also unclear as to whether the temporary parking of vehicles is classed as 'storage' and also, unclear as to what 'equipment' refers to. It also does not provide for existing storage. The effects that this rule appears to be capture are already addressed through ii), iv).	Rule 20.3w viii) Remove in its entirety, and make any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (c) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (c). Any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Made of Hamilton Limited	437.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (d) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (d). Any subsequential amendments necessary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Tin Structures Limited	438.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T201-T300	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T201-T300	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of notable tree (Street Trees) T219 (T219.1 to T219.4) on Kahikatea Drive, and stating "the reason for this is that these trees are located at an intersection that will be upgraded in the near future, as Greenwood Street is extended, and as 279 Kahikatea Drive is re developed. The intersection will undergo significant works to ensure traffic safety is paramount and it is likely that these trees will need to be removed in order to construct a safe intersection. The protection of them is non-sensical given the safety works that will be necessary."	Remove all reference to the group of notable tree (Street Trees) T219 (T219.1 to T219.4) from Schedule 9D - Notable Trees, and any consequential amendments.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Tin Structures Limited	438.2	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the group of notable tree (Street Trees) T219 (T219.1 to T219.4) on Kahikatea Drive, and stating "the reason for this is that these trees are located at an intersection that will be upgraded in the near future, as Greenwood Street is extended, and as 279 Kahikatea Drive is re developed. The intersection will undergo significant works to ensure traffic safety is paramount and it is likely that these trees will need to be removed in order to construct a safe intersection. The protection of them is non-sensical given the safety works that will be necessary."	Remove the notations for the group of notable tree (Street Trees) T219 (T219.1 to T219.4) from the Planning Maps, and any consequential amendments.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3w, in particular Rule 20.3w.ii, because, the current wording "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface" does not permit maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces, such as footpaths. Given current wording, resource consent is required for maintenance or replacement of existing impervious surfaces or upgrades to existing street frontages. This is onerous and adds another layer to the resource consenting requirements, where management of adverse effects could be achieved through a more specific rule. For example, "The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)" .	Amend Rule 20.3.w (ii), to exclude maintenance and replacement of impervious surface, to read: The laying, sealing, paving or forming of any impervious surface <u>that increases the area of impervious surface within the PRZ from that which existed as at (date of plan change)</u> . And any subsequential changes as necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (b) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (b). Any subsequential amendments necessary.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (iii) because the rule states that 'The alteration of the ground level by either permeable or impervious materials' requires resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This rule does not allow for improvements to the ground plane under the tree (eg removal of impervious surface, or mulching to improve grass cover under the tree's canopy, or further protect a tree's roots.) This rule will also be extremely difficult to show compliance with and monitor by Council. Remove Rule 20.3.w (iii) in its entirety; or alternatively, remove 'permeable' from this rule so the rules states that "the alteration of ground level by impervious surfaces" requires RD consent.	Remove Rule 20.3.w (iii) in its entirety; or alternatively, remove 'permeable' from this rule so the rules states that "the alteration of ground level by impervious surfaces" requires RD consent.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (v) because it states that resource consent for a Restricted Discretionary Activity is required for the placement and/or construction of a building or structure. This rule is superfluous as it is already covered by 20.3w ii) and iv).	Remove Rule 20.3.w (v) in its entirety. And any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.3.w (viii) it states that resource consent is required for the storage of materials, vehicles, plant or equipment within the RPZ. This rule is vague and provides no guidance to the reader as to what would be permitted or not. It is also unclear as to whether the temporary parking of vehicles is classed as 'storage' and also, unclear as to what 'equipment' refers to. It also does not provide for existing storage. The effects that this rule appears to be capture are already addressed through ii), iv).	Remove Rule 20.3w viii) in its entirety, and make any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (c) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (c). Any subsequential amendments necessary.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Octagon Property Limited	439.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule 20.5.3 (d) because it is too restrictive and affect the ability to establish, or maintain landscaped areas in the streetscape, or on sites.	Remove Rule 20.5.3 (d). Any subsequential amendments necessary.
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support	The submitters supports Plan Change 9 as notified however, amendments are requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing character areas being placed in historic heritage areas Chapter 19 Proposed historic heritage areas to be under Chapter 19 	Amend Plan Change 9 to ensure the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing character areas being placed in historic heritage areas Chapter 19 Proposed historic heritage areas to be under Chapter 19
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the inclusion of Significant Natural Areas and the protection of Notable Trees on council land, however, the proposal should be reviewed to include any private owners who have historic trees and may wish to be included.	Inclusion of any historic trees on private land [please ask the community]

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support	<p>The submitter supports to protection of the interiors of scheduled buildings, specifically their own - dwelling 'Waipahihi' in Schedule 8A, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we applied for scheduling of 'Waipahihi', many years ago, we specifically requested that the special interiors of this home, designed by Fred Ernest Smith, be scheduled along with the exterior. We have not had our request reviewed, and are very concerned that there are no rules for owners who wish to protect the interiors of their historic homes. • It would be a great loss to Hamilton's heritage if our decades of work preserving and restoring the interior were to be destroyed by a negligent future owner (such as the one we bought it from). 	<p>That the interior of H29 - 'Waipahihi' (129 Cambridge Road) is protected by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the inclusion of the interior [design, materials, etc, of major rooms identified in the attachment] in Chapter 19 Historic Heritage Item Appendix 8 A • inclusion of Interiors in Chapter 19 Appendix 8A with associated rules applied to historic heritage as a category in Chapter 19 • the identification of both the house and outbuilding designed by Fred E Smith as historic heritage under Chapter 19, excluding the carport • Very strong rules that make it difficult to relocate the historic buildings from the original site, or demolish as per the Heritage New Zealand Relocation guidelines • the protection of the setting around the house with appropriate rules
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the proposed relocation rules off-site of the proposed historic areas, and request a significant amendment in line with the Heritage New Zealand best practice guide, which has set criteria for when relocation is supportable. Our historic home is on a rear section and should have the same protection for individual houses and areas controlling relocation as a last resort.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the loss of many historic buildings, particularly in Hamilton East, over the last three decades. A significant home similar to ours was lost in Beerescourt because protection was not provided, despite being requested by the owner, who was a friend of ours.</p>	<p>Much stronger rules and criteria that control relocation of historic heritage off-site for both individual and area buildings (as a last resort).</p>
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitters oppose the proposed relocation rules off-site of the proposed historic areas, and request a significant amendment in line with the Heritage New Zealand best practice guide, which has set criteria for when relocation is supportable. Our historic home is on a rear section and should have the same protection for individual houses and areas controlling relocation as a last resort.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the loss of many historic buildings, particularly in Hamilton East, over the last three decades. A significant home similar to ours was lost in Beerescourt because protection was not provided, despite being requested by the owner, who was a friend of ours.</p>	<p>Much stronger rules and criteria that control relocation of historic heritage off-site for both individual and area buildings (as a last resort)</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks protecting the setting and relationship of historic homes to neighbours under development.</p> <p>We seek rules that give historic places and their settings protection, and a rule that ensures a better relationship on the boundary with neighbours as high density development happens without regard for the old suburb and historic homes. For instance, our historic place includes the historic house and its historic out-building, but only the house exterior is included, not the outbuilding. There are no rules for the setting or the out-building despite these being important to understanding the history of the place. If we had a historic garden there are no rules, but a tree associated with the older wider site is protected in our neighbour's property [117 Cambridge Road]. Historic places are not just front facades.</p> <p>We seek the inclusion within the extent of the historic site of all historic buildings and areas and those that are not, with rules to protect the setting within the site.</p> <p>Our house is located behind a set of shops. We are concerned that there are no rules that address historic homes in this situation in the areas, and ask that historic places behind street-frontage properties be identified and protected with the same rules as a house on a front section.</p>	<p>Request rules that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify and protect not just the house but it's setting within the site, and identify what is not historic [like our carport] • An appropriate rule which protects historic heritage on the boundary with neighbouring developments so new neighbouring buildings does not reduce the heritage settings • the same rules for front houses and rear houses to protect from poor alterations, relocation and demolition [both individual and areas]
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks protecting the setting and relationship of historic homes to neighbours under development.</p> <p>We seek rules that give historic places and their settings protection, and a rule that ensures a better relationship on the boundary with neighbours as high density development happens without regard for the old suburb and historic homes. For instance, our historic place includes the historic house and its historic out-building, but only the house exterior is included, not the outbuilding. There are no rules for the setting or the out-building despite these being important to understanding the history of the place. If we had a historic garden there are no rules, but a tree associated with the older wider site is protected in our neighbour's property [117 Cambridge Road]. Historic places are not just front facades.</p> <p>We seek the inclusion within the extent of the historic site of all historic buildings and areas and those that are not, with rules to protect the setting within the site.</p> <p>Our house is located behind a set of shops. We are concerned that there are no rules that address historic homes in this situation in the areas, and ask that historic places behind street-frontage properties be identified and protected with the same rules as a house on a front section.</p>	<p>Request rules to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same rules for front houses and rear houses to protect from poor alterations, relocation and demolition [both individual and areas] • An appropriate rule which protects historic heritage on the boundary with neighbouring developments so new neighbouring buildings does not reduce the heritage settings • the same rules for front houses and rear houses to protect from poor alterations, relocation and demolition [both individual and areas]

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.8	General	General	Oppose	Funding to support owners- Historic Heritage [all categories] The ongoing maintenance of a recognised historic home requires regular work, and is unavoidably expensive. We have been fortunate to have received small sums for the HCC Heritage Fund to preserve leaded-pane windows and to replace some of the original spouting. To assist owners of historic heritage [whether individual items, historic heritage areas, or notable trees], we seek inclusion of all categories of historic heritage in the Hamilton City Council Heritage Fund. We believe a substantially-increased amount should be allocated to this fund to help with both built heritage maintenance and natural heritage maintenance. If inclusion of natural landscape and historic trees is not possible, then we seek the continuation of a separate heritage fund to support owners with repairs and maintenance, and a separate annual fund for significant natural areas and notable trees.	Improve funding support for owners of historic heritage, and provide funding support for both owners of homes and of significant natural areas and notable trees.
Philip Rupert and Sylvia Phyllis Hart	441.9	General	General	Oppose	The submitters ask that relief is given to support historic home owners by assisting with resource consent fees and providing heritage advisor support from heritage specialists, as is available, we understand, in Auckland and Wellington.	Reduced or free resource consent fees for historic place owners, along with specialist heritage advisor support.
Douglas Julian Rattray	442.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Support in part	The submitter considers their to be a mapping error concerning Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165), and 16 Hensley Crescent. The submitter details inaccurate spatial data and mapping errors that have resulted in the subject property having an archaeological overlay.	Amend the mapping of Archaeological Site A1 and A105 (S14/165) to remove its extent over 16 Hensley Crescent.
Ross Meehan	443.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T52.2 (Black walnut) at 953 River Road due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tree is located in the middle of the driveway, 3m from garage door and 2m from fence so that left hand side of the garage is unable to access. (See attached photos) • The top of the tree is dead and large branches drops intermittently, the roots also cause damage to the pavers and cause blockage of water drains, driveway and garage floods. (employing drainage companies to clear them). • The rating for STEM – 156 is too high and it should be 120, 15 for Form and 15 for Climate influence is also too high. • “The tree is unappealing and doesn't have any amenity value. It reduces the value of my property. The tree makes no contribution to the urban forest, does not moderate adverse climatic effects, ameliorate wind, maintain ecological habitats or improve community health outcomes. (There are many defects in the tree including dead wood, factures etc”. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T52.2 from Schedule 9D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Western Property Trust - Mark Brunton	444.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T38 (<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>) at 93 Peachgrove Road due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HCC's assessment of the overall health of the tree was not completed at a time to appropriately determine its health. • The assessment completed in spring and the tree is in poor overall health, therefore not a notable tree. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T38 from Schedule 9D.
Cameron Gray	445.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees		<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T12 at 1 Blue Cedar Lane due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant branches failure occurred during high winds in 2021. • Dropping of large branches likely to pose risks of serious injury or death. (Evidence of risks are highlighted in Appendix-1). • The ongoing maintaining cost for large tree is not reasonable. • The tree is 25m tall and has potential to fall, which can lead to safety risks. "As noted in the attached report there was a recent failure of this magnitude that could have killed someone walking on the footpath adjacent to the tree. It is a time bomb and this is both our and the councils chance to eliminate this risk". <p>(Appendix are provided for tree reports and evidences such as significant branch failure).</p>	Seeks the removal of the designation of the tree as protected [Notable Tree T12 at 1 Blue Cedar Lane from Schedule 9D]
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes to the purpose of Chapter 20 to the extent that all gully systems are considered SNAs because many Gully systems are simply grassed and contain no significant vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna. It is inappropriate to identify them as SNA and thus to restrict potential development within the vicinity of such systems.</p>	<p>Amend Chapter 20.1 as follows:</p> <p>20.1 Purpose ... Significant Natural Areas ...</p> <p>e. Significant Natural Areas include: i. The <u>vegetated</u> Waikato River corridor and gully systems.</p> <p>.</p>

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The Submitter is not in favour of Policy 20.2.1c applying the highly restrictive word "Avoid" when considering adverse effects on SNA and seek the inclusion of the words "remedy or mitigate". Alternatively, it is considered that Policy 20.2.1c should adopt pragmatic wording to the same extent as proposed Policy 20.2.1d whereby a management approach to a SNA overlay.	Amend Policy 20.2.1c to remove the word 'avoid' and insert the words "remedy or mitigate" OR Policy 20.2.1c should adopt pragmatic wording to the same extent as proposed Policy 20.2.1d whereby a management approach to a SNA overlay.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.3	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The submitter supports Objective 23.2.5 and Policy 23.2.5a to the extent that the use of the words avoid remedy or mitigates adverse effects. The use of the words collectively reflects that remedy and mitigation are viable aspects to urban development as opposed solely to the overly restrictive application of the word "avoid".	Specific relief not stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The Submitter opposes the introduction of SNAs where the mapped area does not align with the physical feature/s on or characteristics of each site. The Submitter also opposes new SNAs where the SNA area contains no significant vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna – just grass for example. In consideration of the required setbacks, a blanket SNA overlay will take away significant buildable areas (i.e., making most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all) - Which defeats the purpose of zoning the land to residential or residential medium density. This is particularly concerning in situations where such Gully areas are vacant of significant vegetation or any vegetation at all.	No specific relief stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.5	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the SNA (C87) over 66-67 Peacockes Road as it is currently defined because the slopes of the gully hold no ecological significance given they are grassed and damaged from stock, and their inclusion in the SNA unreasonably restricts the developable area on the elevated land due to the associated setbacks.	No changes specified, but the submitter opposes SNA (C87) over 66-67 Peacockes Road.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.6	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	General	Support	The submitter supports that no SNA has been identified on 76A Peacockes Lane because the site contains no vegetation or land of ecological significance.	No relief is sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.4.1 Activities within or affecting the Peat Lakes, Wetlands and Peat Lake Catchments	Oppose	The submitter opposes the required setbacks for SNA because it will take away significant buildable areas (i.e., making most peninsula areas with gully on both sides unable to be used at all). This is particularly concerning in situations where such Gully areas are vacant of significant vegetation or any vegetation at all.	Specific relief not stated.
Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd - Jacob Robb Shortbread Limited - 66 & 76A Peacockes Lane, Peacocke	446.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter is not in favour of Policy 20.2.1b as currently drafted, and seeks that the word <u>Accurately</u> is placed in front of the words "Map areas of significant ..." given that the current mapping has been presented as a low resolution and in many instances will not reflect on-site SNA. Inaccurate SNA mapping will unreasonably restrict landowners to undertake land development entitlements to their properties. It is fair and reasonable to expect policy direction to acknowledge the need for accuracy.	Amend Policy 20.2.1b to insert the word <u>Accurately</u> before the words "Map areas of significant ...".
Susan Walsh	447.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to 33 Oxford Street being included in a HHA. The concerns relate to the restrictions that this would bring on future use and development of the property and the submitter has summarised these concerns under the following points - Architecture and Alterations; Patchwork Zoning; Physical Barrier; Energy Efficiency; Garage/Self Contained Unit; Lost Investment Potential; and Personal Wellbeing.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Susan Walsh	447.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the proposed rules regarding the height of fences / walls and considers that these are a barrier to ensuring personal/property safety and the ability to provide privacy.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Susan Walsh	447.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to fencing rules within HHA's.	Remove HHA 22 Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street from the district plan.
Susan Walsh	447.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 33 Oxford Street within proposed HHA 22 and considers that this will restrict their ability to upgrade the house, to fully utilise the property and to ensure the energy efficiency of the dwelling.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Susan Walsh	447.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the inclusion of 33 Oxford Street within proposed HHA 22 and considers that this will restrict their ability to potentially construct a garage to the side of the house at a later date.	The proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street "Railway Cottages" HHA not be created and be removed in its entirety from Schedule 8D.
Susan Walsh	447.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	That the hearing commissioners undertake a site visit to the proposed Oxford Street (East) and Marshall Street HHA's.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Susan Walsh	447.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Oppose	This submission relies on submission 411, Whyte/Dorrell .	When reviewing other submissions, the commissioners consider that the other proposed HHAs' may also be based on an inconsistent methodology but the submitters may not have the resources or skills to prove this.
Richard and Marion Francis	448.1	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	<p>The submitter disagrees with the the assessment of the tree due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STEM score of totara tree is recorded as 144, which is well below the average of 160 from the 310 entries in the analysis of existing notable trees. • The totara tree's structure and canopy shape are recorded as "good", but in reality it is not a regular shape, it has been radically pruned and has sustained structural damage over the years. "Some of this is a consequence of having to cut the canopy away from the power lines". • The tree is too big for a typical city section. <p>The submitter advise to correct the potential notable tree (totara tree) identified at 33A Naylor Street because the tree is inside and fence line of 31 Naylor Street. The ownership of tree is recorded as "road reserve", which is wrong.</p>	Remove T161.1 under schedule 9D Notable Tree and all relevant reference; or if it is to be retained as scheduled as notable tree, change the reference address to 31 Naylor Street and change the location of tree.
Richard and Marion Francis	448.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports on part the preservation of HHA, however, the requirement for resource consent for demolition of all buildings imposes an additional compliance and cost burden for property owners.	Amend rule 19.3.2.f activities status as permitted for demolition of small buildings and structures.
Richard and Marion Francis	448.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports the inclusion of controls around the development of rear sites and advise to include the regulations to notify adjoining affected HHA landowners by developments.	Seeks the inclusion of rule which require resource consent to notify adjoining Historic Heritage Area landowners for developments at rear sites.
Richard and Marion Francis	448.4	General	General	Support	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a requirement that all resource consent or buildings consent applications for sites adjoining Historic Heritage Areas are notified. And the owners of the Historic Heritage Areas are provided opportunities to submit on the applications.	Seeks the inclusion of a requirement that all resource consent or buildings consent applications for sites adjoining Historic Heritage Areas are notified. And the owners of the Historic Heritage Areas are provided opportunities to submit on the applications.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Professional Business Consultancy Ltd - Sandhya Devi Singh	449.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T8.10 by 242 Grey Street due to the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tree is dangerous to the surrounding properties, pedestrians and branches can cause serious damage while the visibility is greatly impacted. The tree is obstructing driveway and It is a hazard for persons driving vehicles from driveways to the road. 	Remove all reference to the notable tree T8.10 from Schedule 9D.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Due to the varying colour palettes, materials, designs, layouts, density and overall building typologies along the Victoria Street frontage, which creates inconsistencies across the HHA, the submitter seeks to understand the intention of including the site at 320 Victoria Street as within a Historic Heritage Area (HHA). Submitter is seeking further protection of existing Built Heritage Areas rather than the the introduction of new restrictions over vacant sites within the CBD.	The removal of the Historic Heritage Area 9HHA31) overlay from our site [320 Victoria Street] and rely on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the relevant historic notations for buildings. the existing CBD provisions that enable new buildings downtown that promote and manage the aesthetics of new buildings.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Oppose	The submitter opposes the reference in Policy 19.2.1c to the external international document 'International Council on Monuments and Sites' (ICOMOS); stating that this document is subject to change outside of the Schedule 1 plan process, and that this document has not been notified as part of this Plan Change.	The removal of the reference to 'ICOMOS' in the objectives and policies. This is better reference as an advisory document in a design guide, or particular elements of the ICOMOS be used as Assessment Criteria.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the use of wording 'setting' under Objective 19.2.3 and relevant policies as it will restrict future development of the site as it is contained within the setting of Built Heritage H39. In particular Policy 19.2.3f requires new development to be consistent with identified heritage (in this instance H39) with specific note to the form, scale, character and location of the setting.	Seeks amendment of Objective 19.2.3 and the related policies to remove the wording of 'setting' and rely on the existing character of the 'surrounds' to retain heritage values of recognised heritage items.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.5	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The objective and related policies seek to protect the values attributed to a historic heritage area through sympathetic design and the inclusion of a Heritage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Policy 19.2.4c states that the design, material use and placement of buildings shall demonstrate consistency with the physical and visual qualities of the historic heritage area. As mentioned above, the Victoria Street frontage (within the HHA) has a variety of colours, materials, heights and styles used on the buildings, creating inconsistencies with the existing physical and visual qualities.</p> <p>There are varying materials, lot layout/designs, densities and styles already prevalent in the area, creating inconsistencies which is generally not present within a recognised heritage area.</p>	The removal of the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) overlay and for this area to be a recognised special character area, as opposed to heritage.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.6	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks amendments to the wording of provisions in 19.3 to identify the proposed Victoria Street HHA as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards. Because, "the Victoria Street HHA is recognised as having "of at least moderate heritage value". The standards should recognise the area as a special character area and provide specific criteria related to maintaining and enhancing the character of the area, opposed to the heritage. We agree with the current development restrictions and current design guides for the CBD, which we think is adequate to rely on when proposing new development within the CBD to ensure a positive contribution to the street front is generated".</p>	Amend the wording to identify the proposed Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a special character area and reflect this within the appropriate design guides and development standards.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.7	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non- Complying Assessment Criteria		<p>The submitter opposes the requirements for developments to be consistent with heritage values of an area which already has a variety of styles is putting further, unnecessary restrictions on future developments on key sites within the CBD which could be sufficiently addressed through existing design guides and assessment criteria. Their reasoning being that "the assessment criteria relating to Heritage Values ensures existing and new buildings are consistent with the heritage values attributed to an area. Specifically, E1 uses 'consistent and compatible' with heritage values attributed to an area when referring to alterations to existing and new buildings. As reiterated throughout this submission (refer to Appendix A), the Victoria Street frontage currently does not exhibit a consistent street front which would typically be seen in a heritage area (e.g. Napier City heritage)."</p>	Remove the Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a recognised heritage area and provide specific criteria for this area, not as a heritage area but as a special character area.
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.8	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the current definition of wording 'setting' as notified under Plan Change 9 because it is broad and non-specific. It restricts future development on the site and the submitter considers the 'setting' surrounding a heritage item is susceptible to change over time as permitted activities, thus it is unreasonable to require new buildings to be consistent with a setting which may be subject to change in future. The submitter also considers the existing provisions and standards under Central City Zone, along with design guideline are sufficient to ensure developments is consistent with the surrounding environment.</p>	Amend the definition for 'Setting' to only encompass the heritage building and site itself but not extending beyond the legal boundaries of a site.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Michelle Baillie & Arron Money - Sky City Hamilton Limited	450.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.4.3 Historic Heritage Areas - Fences and Walls	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments to the wording of provisions in 19.4 to identify the proposed Victoria Street HHA as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards. Because, "the Victoria Street HHA is recognised as having "of at least moderate heritage value". The standards should recognise the area as a special character area and provide specific criteria related to maintaining and enhancing the character of the area, opposed to the heritage. We agree with the current development restrictions and current design guides for the CBD, which we think is adequate to rely on when proposing new development within the CBD to ensure a positive contribution to the street front is generated".	Amend the wording to identify the proposed Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area (HHA 31) as a special character area and reflect this within design guides and development standards.
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer Tainui Group Holdings ("TGH")	451.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3.3 Historic Heritage Area Assessment	Oppose	The submitter opposes to the addition of the Hamilton Central Police Station located at 12 Anzac Parade, Hamilton as a Category B historic heritage site #H153 within schedule 8A: Built Heritage because the Hamilton Central Police Station is a working public service and emergency response facility. The proposed scheduling of the station, and the proposed amendments to activity rules mean the modification or demolition of the building will require a resource consent as a discretionary activity.	Remove Hamilton Central Police Station located at 12 Anzac Parade, Hamilton from Category B historic heritage site #H153 within schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer Tainui Group Holdings ("TGH")	451.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Rule 19.3.1(l) that make the demolition of any structure or building ranked B a discretionary activity.	Amend Rule 19.3.1(l) as follows: Rule 19.3.1(l) Erecting, constructing or extending Demolition of any structure or fence on a site building ranked B. – Discretionary Activity
Tonkin + Taylor - K O'Dwyer Tainui Group Holdings ("TGH")	451.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T101-T200	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees T101-T200	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T190 (Street Trees) along the frontage of the 12 Anzac Parade, which includes two (2) Pin Oaks and two (2) Red Oaks. (T109 is being identified as Street Trees along Anzac Parade in Schedule 9D and includes T109.1, T109.2, T109.3 and T109.4.) The existing access to the site is through a narrow vehicle service lane and the protection of the trees will create a significant constraint for future improvement of access.	Remove the trees identified as T109 (T109.1, T109.2, T109.3 and T109.4) from Schedule 9D.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value under Plan Change 9.	Undertake an independent city-wide review of Hamilton to identify places that may be qualified to be scheduled as built heritage, as to include a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment for "extent of place" for each scheduled item to be determined, mapped, and included within Appendix 8 for each scheduled site, as this would assist in understanding the setting and curtilage for each place and inclusion of any historic heritage within the site.	Identify, map and include the 'extent of place' for each scheduled built heritage item in Appendix 8A.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the criteria used for identifying Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 is primarily based on character elements, including Street Frontage Treatments. The submitter also disagrees on the six criteria have been assessed on an equal basis without any weighting of criteria, because this would appear to unbalance an assessment process that is very visual and focus on street views, rather than historic heritage based. It is also unclear how historic heritage has included historic values and the degree of historical research that supports the heritage valuing. Assessment ratings should allow for ranges of building and land use types and a pattern that aligns with historical values. There should be assessment valuing of heritage values	Review the criteria used in relation to Historic Heritage Areas and have a more comprehensive understanding as 'historic place' rather than street and façade for the historic areas. Also seeks to include criteria for scheduling buildings which include mixed uses and range of buildings that do not need to be consistency in style or type in order to better represent mixed uses historic areas.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the criteria used for identifying Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 is primarily based on character elements, including Street Frontage Treatments. The submitter also disagrees on the six criteria have been assessed on an equal basis without any weighting of criteria, because this would appear to unbalance an assessment process that is very visual and focus on street views, rather than historic heritage based. The submitter opposes that the Historic Heritage Areas Assessment is lacking specific identification of historic elements, such as historic fencing, historic garages and historic concrete walls, within each Historic Heritage Area.	Review the criteria used in relation to Historic Heritage Areas and seeks clearer identification of historic elements for Historic Heritage Areas.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter consider Frankton commercial area holds historic heritage values that its associated the Frankton commercial area, as defined in Frankton Community Plan, should be scheduled as a Historic Heritage Area under Appendix 8D, in particularly the survey and review of heritage of Frankton is very limited and remaining heritage of the famous railway town is not identified, and the buildings including rebuilt after the 1948 tornado is part of the distinctive character which is rapidly being demolished. Several heritage buildings have been removed in the last few years.	Add and include Frankton Commercial Area as defined in Frankton Community Plan as a new Historic Heritage Area under Appendix 8D.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.6	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle of the recognition of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area, however opposes that the extent of such area. Taniwha Street, Parr Street, Norton Road and Torrington Street and Wye Street all have early mass housing examples present a significant group of building company cottages by the builders of one of the significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton. The submitter opposes the assessment for Wye Street and considers it should be within the Historic Heritage Area. The submitter considers a wider review of the extent and boundaries for this area is required, along with a more comprehensive understanding of the suburb's history and associated people along with the houses built within a short period of time, whereas such history is used to directly inform the proposed extent and description of heritage value of this Historic Heritage Area.	Review the extent of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area, along with a more comprehensive understanding and research of the suburb's history, and to include Torrington Street, Wye Street and Norton Road, along with houses in Taniwha Street at 2, 10 and 12 as part of the area under Plan Change 9.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.7	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle of the recognition of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area, however opposes that the extent of such area. Taniwha Street, Parr Street, Norton Road and Torrington Street and Wye Street all have early mass housing examples present a significant group of building company cottages by the builders of one of the significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton. The submitter opposes the assessment for Wye Street and considers it should be within the Historic Heritage Area. The submitter considers a wider review of the extent and boundaries for this area is required, along with a more comprehensive understanding of the suburb's history and associated people along with the houses built within a short period of time, whereas such history is used to directly inform the proposed extent and description of heritage value of this Historic Heritage Area.	Review the extent of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area and include properties at 2, 10 and 12 Taniwha Street as part of the Historic Heritage Area.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter consider property at 10 Taniwha Street holds historic heritage values that should be scheduled as built heritage under Appendix 8A. Despite there have been some modifications and alterations to the building, the submitter notes the property was built in 1922 and it retains most of the original design features and original location, which represents an early bungalow built by and for one of the suburbs builders. Recognising and identifying this property as one of the built heritage help to understand Taniwha Street as a historic street which was designed to be a main road and continue to Rimu Street.	Include 10 Taniwha Street as a built heritage item in Appendix 8A.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.9	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter consider property at 12 Taniwha Street holds historic heritage values that should be scheduled as built heritage under Appendix 8A. Despite there have been some modifications and alterations to the building, the submitter notes the property was built in 1923 and it retains most of the original design features and original location, which represents an early bungalow built by and for one of the suburbs builders. Subject to further research, the property may be built as the builders house. Recognising and identifying this property as one of the built heritage help to understand Taniwha Street as a historic street which was designed to be a main road and continue to Rimu Street. The submitter also notes that the owner at 12 Taniwha has advised that she is happy for the house to be assessed as part of the proposed historic area.	Include property at 12 Taniwha Street as a built heritage item in Appendix 8A.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.10	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter considers the definition of Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 is more aligned with the meaning of character rather than historic heritage values. The submitter considers Historic Heritage Areas should represent groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous, places or features that collectively have heritage value. Historic Heritage Area should also include a range of buildings across zones.	Review and amend the definition of Historic Heritage Area to be consistent with the assessment criteria for historic heritage resources and sufficiently distinct from the definition of 'character'.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.11	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	Partial demolition can be substantial and involve replication and/or significant loss of heritage fabric and values.	Introduce new definition of 'partial demolition' under Plan Change 9.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	Partial demolition can be substantial and involve replication and/or significant loss of heritage fabric and values.	Introduce a new rule for 'partial demolition' to address submitter's concerns.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.13	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	Make the assessment criteria for Historic Heritage Areas the same as for Built Heritage for greater consistency in the plan and for alignment with the WRPS and the RMA in relation to historic heritage.	Make the assessment criteria for Historic Heritage Areas the same as the assessment criteria for historic heritage items (buildings and structures).
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the permitted activity status for demolition of existing buildings on a rear site within a Historic Heritage Area, because it does not protect heritage value of the area cohesively. The submitter considers the provisions and rules for rear sties should be the same and be of same level of controls as front, corner and through sites. This will provide a more robust level of integrity and authenticity of the overall Historic Heritage Areas as identified.	Remove permitted activity status for rear section within proposed historic areas.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.15	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the permitted activity status for additions and alterations on a rear site within a Historic Heritage Area, because it does not protect heritage value of the area cohesively. The submitter considers the provisions and rules for rear sties should be the same and be of same level of controls as front, corner and through sites. This will provide a more robust level of integrity and authenticity of the overall Historic Heritage Areas as identified.	Remove permitted activity status for rear section within proposed historic areas.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.16	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter consider Former NZR Office and good shed High and Empire Street holds historic heritage values that should be scheduled as built heritage under Appendix 8A, in particularly the survey and review of heritage of Frankton is very limited and remaining heritage of the famous railway town is not identified, and the buildings including rebuilt after the 1948 tornado is part of the distinctive character which is rapidly being demolished. Several heritage buildings have been removed in the last few years.	Include Former NZR Offices and good shed High and Empire Street Frankton as built heritage items in Schedule 8.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.17	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter consider historic trees on Old Mill Street and corner Seddon Road and Mill Street bypass holds historic heritage values that should be scheduled, as these trees are significant to Frankton and mark the edges of the 19th century Edgecumbe Estate and the original Frankton road before the bypass. These trees were identified by the Waikato Tree Trust and the submitter in resource consent hearing for the V8s.	Include historic trees on Old Mill Street and corner Seddon Road and Mill Street bypass in Schedule 8.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.18	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter considers Frankton commercial area holds historic heritage values that its associated Frankton community buildings should be scheduled as built heritage under Appendix 8A, in particularly the survey and review of heritage of Frankton is very limited and remaining heritage of the famous railway town is not identified, and the buildings including rebuilt after the 1948 tornado is part of the distinctive character which is rapidly being demolished. Several heritage buildings have been removed in the last few years.	Include Frankton commercial area (including early 20th Century buildings to post tornado) and associated Frankton community heritage buildings as items as per Frankton Community Plan and as a proposed historic area in Schedule 8 and Chapter 19.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.19	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of provisions and controls for sites and properties adjacent to Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9. The submitter concerns inappropriate development on adjoining sites will significantly detract from the heritage qualities of the area.	Add a rule that makes new neighbouring developments sympathetic in scale near boundaries.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.20	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of provisions and controls for sites and properties adjacent to Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9. The submitter is concerned that inappropriate development on adjoining sites will significantly detract from the heritage qualities of the area.	Include a buffer between the Historic Heritage Areas and adjacent properties, and associated rules, that reduce the impact of development and extreme contrast particularly of Frankton East proposed historic area.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.21	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Oppose	There is a lack of subdivision controls of sites within Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9. The submitter is concerned that inappropriate subdivision will have significant adverse effects on historic heritage values of those identified Historic Heritage Area, in particular for integrity, form and lot layouts of all section types.	Introduce subdivision rules for sites within Historic Heritage Areas which retain integrity and settings for all section types.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.22	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions and controls do not protect heritage values for Historic Heritage Areas cohesively, in particular for additions and alteration, and establishment of accessory buildings on sites within Historic Heritage Area could potentially be visually intrusive, or of an inappropriate scale thereby adversely affect the historic heritage values of the area.	Amend rules to ensure that new building work is visually at the same scale and height of existing historic heritage, and controlled by appropriate associated rules that retain integrity and authenticity of the HHA. Proposed rules on alterations and additions, and accessory buildings could extend to adding storeys to rear structures that are visually intrusive, of inappropriate scale and significantly effect the historic pattern of settlement which is part of the significance.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.23	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle of the recognition of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area, however opposes that the extent of such area. Taniwha Street, Parr Street, Norton Road and Torrington Street and Wye Street all have early mass housing examples present a significant group of building company cottages by the builders of one of the significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton. The submitter also concerns that there is a lack of clear identification of historic elements, such as streets, trees, built landscape, garages and outbuildings, which hold historic values to the area.	Opposes current extent of HHA and seeks a more specific identification of historic elements and extent for Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street HHA.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.24	General	General	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protection of historic heritage under Plan Change 9 but wants more supports from Council for property owners, including heritage assistance, potential rates relief, reduced consent fees, and significant improved funding of the Hamilton City Council Heritage Fund.	Seeks increased support and incentives from Council for property owners that are affected by historic heritage.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.25	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the housing themes identified in the Historic Heritage Area Assessment in relation to railway housing and considers the theme for inclusion in Plan Change 9 and Chapter 19 should be amended to reflect Waikato's earliest and largest house building company Ellis and Burnand, who were Waikato based and were one of the two significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton.	Amend the housing themes identified in the HHAs with 'railway suburbs' amended to 'railway suburb' and to include "and early builder housing [Ellis and Burnand and others]". This is workers housing.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.26	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value under Plan Change 9. The submitter considers the Former Frankton Post Office should be a historic heritage item because of its historical and social significance to Frankton area.	Add Former Frankton Post Office as a historic heritage item in Appendix 8A.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.27	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter seeks an assessment and the inclusion of an additional Historic Heritage Area which represents the Frankton extensions and history of Frankton, which is between Rimu Street south and Goldsmith Street from the 1910s and includes 1920s, There are also early group houses seen in Rimu Street by Maeroa Road.	Assess and include a new Historic Heritage Area between Rimu Street and Goldsmith Street, including an HHA for former Frankton Dudley Terrace and Goldsmith 1910s housing.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.28	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value under Plan Change 9.	Add the workshop and sculpture [Tin man] on former Hyder Electrical workshop on Norton Road as an historic heritage item in Appendix 8A.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.29	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Oppose	The submitter supports the additions of notable trees under Schedule 9D however considers the camellia located at 10 Taniwha Street should be identified and included as one of the notable trees under Schedule 9D because of its historic values as identified by the submitter. The tree is identified as be planted in 1922 by John Phillips who was a builder and first owner of 10 Taniwha Street. The submitter identifies the tree is one of oldest trees in Taniwha Street dating from first years of subdivision.	Add the camellia at property at 10 Taniwha Street to Schedule 9D - Notable Tree under Plan Change 9.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.30	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.1 Purpose	Support	The submitter supports the intention and purpose of the Plan Change as identifying and protecting Hamilton's historic heritages. The submitter also supports the improved scheduling of NZAA sites under Schedules 8B and 8C.	Not stated.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.31	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the additions of notable trees under Schedule 9D however raises concerns the lack of identification and protection of historic landscape and historic trees within historic heritage items and historic heritage areas, in particular Frankton East area. There is a lack of provisions and rules to protect these historic landscape and historic trees.	Include and identify historic landscape and historic trees within Historic Heritage Areas, in particular in Frankton East area and Maire Street, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, as one of the historic elements to be protected under Plan Change 9.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.32	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	All Central City	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of Policy 7.2.2.d regarding Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area within central city.	Not stated.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.33	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support	The submitter supports the introduction of policy 7.2.6. i regarding Victoria Street Historic Heritage Area within central city.	Not stated.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.34	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports Plan Change 9 in relation to Significant Natural Area and also seeks funding for owners for the maintenance of heritage for the benefit of the wider community.	Seeks funding for owners for the maintenance of heritage for the benefit of the wider community.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.35	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers removal or demolitions of historic heritage mostly will significantly affect the historic values of setting and context of the Historic Heritage Areas and therefore should be the last option to be considered. Historic heritage should also not be compromised because of enabling new development.	Seeks stronger rules for demolitions.
Laura Liane Kellaway	452.36	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	While there are provisions and controls proposed for managing relocation within Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9, the submitter notes relocation is not a heritage process and any removal resulting from relocations may adversely affect the historic heritage values of the setting and context of Historic Heritage Areas.	Seeks amendment to rules in relation to relocation and use the Heritage New Zealand guidelines on definition and criteria.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Waikato Community Hospice Foundation	453.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>"The submitter is opposed to the tree protection zones proposed for the two trees that sit on their land. Future maintenance, upgrades and works on their facility will be severely impacted. It is opposed to the tree protection zones proposed for a number of identified trees located to the north and north east of their land, mostly contained within 332 Cobham Drive, Hillcrest and HCC Recreation Reserve.</p> <p>The tree protection zones range from 11.7m to 16.9m from the centre of the identified tree trunks and cut significantly into their land at several points.</p> <p>The vast majority of the proposed tree protection zones already contain concrete hardstand, carparking or built form and it is considered onerous to apply a consent requirement for future works located within these zones and within the Hospices land.</p> <p>There is concern raised about the lack of exemptions, lack of empirical evidence and blanket application of such large tree protection zones. Especially, when the hard stand and built form may have already dictated root growth away from the subject site or any future work areas".</p>	Seeks the uplifting of the protection status in Appendix 9, Schedule D T3-T100: Natural Environment for trees T4.1 and T4.6 located on the Hospice land and also Tree 4.1 to Tree 4.8 and specific tree protection radius requirements from the centre of the tree trunks as they overhang their properties.
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Waikato Community Hospice Foundation	453.2	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Oppose	The consent requirements will create financial and timing issues for the Hospice should they wish to redevelop those portions of their site. Particularly, when the majority of the trees to be protected are not within their site and cover portions of their site where built infrastructure/hard surfacing is already in place.	Seeks changes to the rule framework that would apply to the property, including Rules 20.3u, 20.3w and 20.3x, and specifically the provisions that would require resource consent approval as a result of the proposed tree listing, that would reduce the constraints/consenting obligations in relation to the development of the sites under ownership of the Waikato Community Hospice Foundation.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Bloxam Burnett and Olliver - Kathryn Drew Waikato Community Hospice Foundation	453.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.3 Activities in the Protected Root Zone of a Notable Tree	Oppose	<p>The reasons for the Waikato Community Hospice Foundation submissions are as follows:</p> <p>(a) The Waikato Community Hospice Foundation is opposed to the tree protection zones proposed for the two trees that sit on their land. Future maintenance, upgrades and works on their facility will be severely impacted.</p> <p>(b) The Waikato Community Hospice Foundation is also opposed to the tree protection zones proposed for a number of identified trees located to the north and north east of their land, mostly contained within 332 Cobham Drive, Hillcrest (Lot 1 DPS 237501 – SA22C/341) and HCC Recreation Reserve (Lot 3 DPS 23750—SA22C/387).</p> <p>(c) The tree protection zones range from 11.7m to 16.9m from the centre of the identified tree trunks and cut significantly into their land at several points.</p> <p>(d) The vast majority of the proposed tree protection zones already contain concrete hardstand, carparking or built form and it is considered onerous to apply a consent requirement for future works located within these zones and within the Hospices land.</p> <p>(e) The consent requirements will create financial and timing issues for the Hospice should they wish to redevelop those portions of their site. Particularly, when the majority of the trees to be protected are not within their site and cover portions of their site where built infrastructure/hard surfacing is already in place.</p> <p>(f) There is concern raised about the lack of exemptions, lack of empirical evidence and blanket application of such large tree protection zones. Especially, when the hard stand and built form may have already dictated root growth away from the subject site or any future work areas.</p>	The removal of the Hospice land from any tree protection zone and subsequent consenting requirements.
Aurecon New Zealand Limited - Stephen Gascoigne Jono Tims - Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture	454.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA (C59) over the Te Awa Lakes development area in Horotiu East North because C59 covers stands of mature pine; some areas of which are located on Hutchinson Road, Lots 2, 3 and 6 DP 563693 and Lot 200 DP 563692 and have since been cleared or are the subject of authorisations for clearance in the upcoming Zone 1 earthworks period (commencing 1 October). These areas have been subject to comprehensive ABM bat surveys in accordance with HCC and WRC consents through which recordings have not indicated the presence of indigenous bat species either through foraging or roosting within these areas. All mature pines have been included within the scope of vegetation clearance that has been consented. Pine removal is scheduled for the 2023-2024 earthworks season within Zone 2 (shown in Figure 3 of the submission).</p>	Remove the proposed cSNA C59 Te Rapa North in its entirety from the land parcels identified in the Te Awa Lakes development area shown in Table 2 of the submission.
Aurecon New Zealand Limited - Stephen Gascoigne Jono Tims - Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture	454.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the SNA (C76) because C76 covers an area of native riparian margins sited between sections of Te Awa River Ride and the Waikato River, within the legal boundary of land parcels under development by TAL. This cSNA is subject to permitted clearance within the scope of works authorised by LDP Consent 010.2021.00011468.001 including the reformation and realignment of the Te Awa River Ride and Waikato River-bank for the purposes of ensuring the seamless integration and outlook of development areas to the Waikato River (enabling resident interaction with the Awa).</p>	Remove the proposed cSNA C76 Waikato River - Te Rapa in its entirety from the land parcels identified in the Te Awa Lakes development area shown in Table 2 of the submission.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Aurecon New Zealand Limited - Stephen Gascoigne Jono Tims - Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture	454.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes the cSNA C59 on Te Awa Lakes area because an ecological assessment (attached to the submission) was undertaken on the area of the proposed SNA and part of the area does not meet the criteria for inclusion as an SNA.	Adjust the boundary of cSNA C59 as identified in the submission to remove 5,438m ² from Lot 2 DP 551065.
Aurecon New Zealand Limited - Stephen Gascoigne Jono Tims - Te Awa Lakes Unincorporated Joint Venture	454.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA		The submitter opposes the SNA C76 on Te Awa Lakes development area because an ecological assessment (attached to the submission) was undertaken on the area of the proposed SNA and part of the area does not meet the criteria for inclusion as an SNA.	Adjust the boundary of the cSNA C76 as identified in the submission to remove 1,519m ² from Lot 2 DP 551065.
Tainui Group Holdings - Brian Croad	455.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T74.14, T74.16 and T74.17 along Ruakura lane and their protected root zone due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Not withstanding the STEM evaluation." • "Protection unnecessarily constrains the future development of the Knowledge zone, the protected plane trees along Ruakura Lane provide appropriate canopy cover in the vicinity and the overall benefits of protecting these 3 trees is not warranted against the loss of valuable development land for knowledge zone purposes." • "The reduction of the significant trees identified above from the Ruakura locality will not result in an unacceptable level of coverage of significant vegetation to meet policy requirements while recognising the reasonable and necessary development aspirations of TGH." 	Remove the trees identified as T74.14, T74.16 and T74.17 and their protected root zone from Schedule 9D.
Tainui Group Holdings - Brian Croad	455.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the scheduling of notable tree T79.1 and T79.2 along Ruakura lane and their protected root zone due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Not withstanding the STEM evaluation." • "This locality is a potential electricity sub station site for servicing Ruakura super hub and retention of T79.1 and 2 will have an unwarranted detrimental effect of the optimal development of necessary and essential services." • "The reduction of the significant trees identified above from the Ruakura locality will not result in an unacceptable level of coverage of significant vegetation to meet policy requirements while recognising the reasonable and necessary development aspirations of TGH." 	Remove the trees identified as T79.1 and T79.2 and their protected root zone from Schedule 9D.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Tainui Group Holdings - Brian Croad	455.3	Appendix 9 Schedule 9D T3-T100	Schedule 9D: Notable Trees		The submitter advises that the notable tree T80 identified in Schedule 9D no longer exists.	Remove the tree identified as T80 from Schedule 9D.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	All Historic Heritage	Support in part	The submitter considers that Objective 19.2.1 does not give full effect to the WRPS, in particular Objective 3.18 that states that "historic and cultural heritage are protected, maintained or enhanced"	Amend Objective 19.2.1 to align with Objective 3.18 of the WRPS, as follows: Historic <u>and cultural</u> heritage that contributes to an understanding and appreciation of the history and culture of the City is identified, and significant heritage resources are protected, <u>maintained or enhanced</u> .
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter considers that proposed Objective 19.2.5 does not give full effect to the WRPS, in particular Objective 3.18 of the WRPS states that "historic and cultural heritage are protected, maintained or enhanced".	That objective 19.2.5 is amended. The following wording (or similar) is suggested: "The heritage values of a historic heritage area shall be identified and protected, <u>maintained or enhanced</u> ".
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.3	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter is in support of: - Objective 20.2.1 - Policy 20.2.1c - Policy 20.2.1d	No Changes
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.4	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 20.2.1e: The policy should give better effect to implementation method 11.2.2 in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS)	The submitter suggests the policy should be amended with attention to implementation method 11.2.2(e) and (g). Alternatively, they recommend the inclusion of a new policy to address implementation method 11.2.2(e) and (g).
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.5	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	The word "naturally" should be deleted from (a) as indigenous means naturally occurring as per the ODP definition.	Policy 20.2.1(f)(ii)(a.): Floristic SNA (fSNA) as areas of significant naturally indigenous vegetation,
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.6	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter is in support	The submitter suggest no changes

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.7	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter questions 20.5.1 which is 'why notable trees (most of which are exotic as listed in Schedule 9D) have stricter rules associated with pruning and maintenance than indigenous species in the SNA. Standard 20.5.1 prescribes for 15% of foliage removal in SNA per calendar year, while Standard 20.5.2 prescribes for 5% of foliage removal for notable trees in a calendar year'	The submitter proposes changes to 20.5.1 to better provide for rule 20.3a (iii). It seeks clarification on why standard 20.5.1 is less restrictive. In addition, it considers it more appropriate to reduce the foliage removal within SNAs to 5% in alignment with standard 20.5.2.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The essence of the rule is to be permissive and that is supported. However, the rule is restrictive regarding pest control.	Amend Rule 20.3b. to allow for the wider community to be able to undertake activities to control harmful organisms. Alternatively, amend the definition of pest control.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rules 20.3c	The submitter seeks no changes
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter questions whether Rule 20.5.5 relates to exotic vegetation and trees (including non-exotics). If that is the case 20.5.5a(ii) should be amended to prevent indigenous tress being removed within 10 years. If the intent of the standard is to address only exotic vegetation and exotic trees, then 20.5.5b should be reviewed as indigenous plantings are better suited for restoration purposes.	The submitter seeks clarification regarding the content and purpose of standard 20.5.5.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports Rule 20.3e to j	The submitter seeks no changes
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table		The submitter suggests seeing comments for standard 20.5.7 which mentions 'The vegetation removal limit of 100m2 per site/per calendar year is significant and can cause cumulative losses of indigenous biodiversity, which is contrary to policy 11.1 of the WRPS. In addition, the standard will hinder HCC's efforts in achieving the 10% target of increasing the extent of significant natural areas and indigenous biodiversity under policy 20.2.1i.'	The submitter seeks an amendment to standard 20.5.7b.i. by reducing the indigenous vegetation removal limit to 50m2 per site per calendar year in alignment with standard 20.5.6a.ii.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter is in support of Rule 20.3l to r	The submitter suggest no changes
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.1 Pruning and Maintenance in a Significant Natural Area	Oppose	- The submitter requires clarity regarding why notable trees (most of which are exotic as listed in Schedule 9D) have stricter rules associated with pruning and maintenance than indigenous species in the SNA. - Standard 20.5.1 prescribes for 15% of foliage removal in SNA per calendar year, while Standard 20.5.2 prescribes for 5% of foliage removal for notable trees in a calendar year.	We seek clarification on why standard 20.5.1 is less restrictive. In addition, we consider more appropriate to reduce the foliage removal within SNAs to 5% in alignment with standard 20.5.2.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.15	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.5 Planting of Exotic Vegetation or Trees in a Significant Natural Area		The submitter questions if the standard relates to exotic vegetation and trees (including non-exotics). If that is the case 20.5.5a(ii) should be amended to prevent indigenous trees being removed within 10 years. If the intent of the standard is to address only exotic vegetation and exotic trees, then 20.5.5b should be reviewed as indigenous plantings are better suited for restoration purposes.	We seek clarification regarding the content and purpose of specific standard 20.5.5.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.16	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The vegetation removal limit of 100m2 conflicts with Policy 11.1 of the WRPS. The standard will hinder HCC's efforts in achieving the 10% target of increasing the extent of significant natural areas and indigenous biodiversity under policy 20.2.1i.	Reduce the indigenous vegetation removal limit under specific standard 20.5.7b(i) to 50m2 per site/per calendar year in alignment with specific standard 20.5.6 a(ii).
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.17	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Support in part	The objective fails in providing for the protection of the natural environments. The proposed objective only provides for the protection of historical heritage. Therefore, we consider the objective is not in alignment with objective 3.12(a) and implementation method 11.1.1(a) of the WRPS.	Amend Objective 23.2.5 to read: 'Subdivision occurs in a manner that recognises historic heritage and natural environments <u>and promotes positive biodiversity outcomes</u> , and recognises <u>and provides for the protection of historic heritage</u> .
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.18	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The definition of pest control has a direct link with rule 20.3(b), the rule prescribes for pest control as a permitted activity, however, the definition of pest control limits activities to only be undertaken by, or at the direction of a local authority. The definition also limits pest control activities to species listed in the WRPMP. WRC has just approved a new WRPMP, which has limited the number of listed pest species. As mentioned before, there is risk that restoration activities or management activities to protect human health that includes management of weedy or nuisance non-indigenous species will be severely limited if the definition connects only to the WRPMP. Therefore, we believe the definition for pest control should be more holistic and more far reaching.	Amend the definition of pest control to include any pest species able to cause an adverse effect at the site or wider environment. Proposed new definition (or similar): Means any activity undertaken by, or at the direction of a local authority or by a landowner, or occupier for the management of a nuisance plant or animal species that is impacting on the values of a site or area.
Waikato Regional Council - Joao Paulo Silva	456.19	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	General		Map 34B has limited distributions and the tree would be better represented as "Kahikatea fragments".	We recommend changing "Kahikatea tree" to "Kahikatea fragments" to achieve better protection under representation type PRS4. We suggest using WRC's standard map (publicly available) to define the Kahikatea distribution. The map can be accessed at: Biodiversity & Environment (waikatoregion.govt.nz)
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 29 Petersburg Dr	457.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitters support appropriate vegetation activities being able to be undertaken as Permitted Activities in SNAs, however, it is considered that consented and lawfully established land use activities should be enabled.	Include a permitted activity provision for consented or lawfully established land use activities.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 29 Petersburg Dr	457.2	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Oppose	The submitters oppose to the SNA (C26) at 29 Petersburg Drive because the existing planting has limited habitat value for terrestrial fauna and the removal of a small area (230m ²) at the top of the slope is unlikely to have a notable impact on terrestrial or aquatic values.	Remove part of the SNA (C26) from the property at 29 Petersburg Drive.
David and Barbara Yzendoorn For 29 Petersburg Dr	457.3	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes the introduction of the SNA (C26) shown over 29 Petersburg Drive site because the existing planting has limited habitat value for terrestrial fauna and the removal of a small area (230m ²) at the top of the slope is unlikely to have a notable impact on terrestrial or aquatic values.	Remove or realign with the development that is proposed within this site the SNA (C26) on the property at 29 Petersburg Drive.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.4	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support	The submitter supports the mapping of the Significant Natural Area as it applies to Lot 3 DPS 45202 and Lot 3 DP 408579 because it aligns with the mapping of the Proposed Significant Bat Habitat Area in Figure 2-3 of Proposed Plan Change 5 – Peacocke and is supported by a robust technical assessment and will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Retain the extent of the mapping of the Significant Natural Area C87 as it applies to Lot 3 DPS 45202 and Lot 3 DP 40857.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8C: Group 2 Archaeological and Cultural Sites	Oppose	The submitter opposes the mapping of Archaeological Area A127 which they consider to be too extensive and with no evidential basis for the extent given. The submitter considers the mapping to be an unnecessary duplication of Heritage NZ requirements.	Amend the maps to delete Archaeological Area A127 and all other Archaeological Areas shown on the planning maps.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.6	Chapter 15 Open Space Zones	15.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 15.3 because Note 6 as proposed states that the rules in Chapter 20 Natural Environments apply instead of those in Chapter 15 Open Space Zones. Notes do not have any status under the Resource Management Act (the Act).	Amend 15.3 Rules - Activity Status Table to add new clauses for the removal, planting, pruning and maintenance of vegetation or trees in the Schedule 9D: Notable Trees and Schedule 9C: Significant Natural Areas. In the activity status columns add the following text: Refer to Chapter 20: Natural Environment
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.7	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Oppose	The submitter opposes all amendments to Archaeological Areas in the plan change. The submitter considers their to have been limited field work on the condition and status of recorded sites. With an absence of technical assessments, provisions relating to archaeological sites should not be included in the District Plan. In addition, the submitter considers such rules to be a duplication of Heritage NZ requirements. The submission notes that many recorded sites appear to have been destroyed or highly modified. The submitter opposes the inclusion of archaeological areas that do not have attributes of sufficient significance.	Delete all provisions and amendments made to text in Chapter 19 relating to Archaeological Areas. Retain the approach of the Operative District Plan that sites are identified for information purposes and that an Authority must be obtained for Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to destroy or modify sites.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.8	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1b because it will provide certainty for plan users and will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Retain Policy 20.2.1b

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.9	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1d because it provides clarity that infrastructure and walkways and cycleways may locate in significant natural areas where adverse effects can be managed in accordance with a prescribed management hierarchy.	Retain Policy 20.2.1d
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.10	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Support	The submitter supports Policy 20.2.1g because it provides for infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways to be located near or within significant natural areas.	Retain Policy 20.2.1g
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.11	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Policy 20.2.1i because it is imposing an arbitrary target that is not linked to the significance criteria as the policy seeks to promote increasing the extent of significant natural areas to meet the target of 10% indigenous vegetation cover in the city.	Delete Policy 20.2.1i
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.12	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.3 Rules – Activity Status Table	Support	The submitter supports 20.3 Rules - Activity Status Table, rules (i) – (n) because buildings, structures, infrastructure, public walkways and cycleways in significant natural areas are considered compatible with the protecting the values and attributes of significant natural areas.	Retain Rules 20.3 (i) – (n).
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.13	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.6 Pruning, maintenance or removal of indigenous or exotic vegetation or trees associated with restoration in a cSNA	Oppose	The submitter opposes to 20.5.6 because the standard imposes maximum girth and height for the removal of single trees. Significant natural areas are protected due to ecological and biodiversity values and the area as a whole, rather than single trees per se.	Delete Rule 20.5.6.c.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.14	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	20.5.7 The operation, maintenance, renewal or upgrading of, or access to, existing infrastructure and public walkways and cycleways	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Rule 20.5.7 because clause c imposes maximum girth and height for the removal of single trees. Significant natural areas are protected due to ecological and biodiversity values and the area as a whole, rather than single trees per se.	Delete Rule 20.5.7.c.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.15	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Objective 23.2.5 because the requirement for subdivision to recognise natural environments lacks clarity of purpose and does not express any tangible outcome. In addition, the term 'natural environments' is not a defined. The purpose statement in Chapter 20 Natural Environments states that it relates to Significant Natural Areas, Notable Trees, peat lakes, wetlands and peat lake catchments. However, for certainty a definition should be included. Otherwise, the term 'natural environment' could be interpreted to apply to a broad range of environments that have a degree of 'naturalness'.	Delete Objective 23.2.5; or in the alternate, amend as follows: Subdivision occurs in a manner that recognises natural environments and recognises and provides for the protection of historic heritage. Add a definition of 'Natural environments' as follows: Natural environments: Means Significant Natural Areas, Notable Trees, peat lakes, wetlands and peat lake catchments.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.16	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.2 Objectives and Policies: Subdivision	Oppose	The submitter opposes to Policy 23.2.5a because it is inconsistent with the direction in Section 6 of the Act to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Either delete Policy 23.2.5a or amend to give effect to Section 6 of the Act.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.17	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables		The submitter opposes reference to archaeological and cultural sites under activity tables 23.3a. clause (xi).	Amend rule 23.3a (xi) to read: Any subdivision of an allotment within a archaeological and cultural site , or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.18	25.2 Earthworks and Vegetation Removal	25.2.4 Rules – General Standards	Oppose	The submitter opposes to 25.2.4.3 clause (b) because the standard imposes maximum foliage to be removed and maximum thickness of any branch or root that may be cut. Significant natural areas are protected due to ecological and biodiversity values and the area as a whole, rather than single trees per se.	Delete rule 25.2.4.3.b.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.19	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.2 Controlled Activities – Matters of Control		The submitter opposes matters of control within 1.3.2 clause E(b) (i)-(iii). The submitter considers the provision for Mana Whenua representation of on-site monitoring a third-party condition that is unreasonable and may result in compliance issues should the third party not wish to undertake monitoring. The submitter considers E(b) (ii) unclear. The submitter considers E(b) (iii) unclear if it needs to be demonstrated that an authority has been applied for or approved. In addition, they consider this to be a duplication of Heritage NZ requirements.	Delete subclauses E(b) (i)-(iii) and add a protocol provision for the accidental discovery of kōiwi, archaeology and artefacts of Māori origin.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.20	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	The submitter partially supports Appendix 1.3 Assessment Criteria - 1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-complying Assessment Criteria, clause D3 because greater clarity is necessary to make it clear that the values to be protected in significant natural areas do not for example relate to a single tree, but rather to ecological and biodiversity values.	Amend D3 to separate the relevant criteria for notable trees and significant natural areas.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.21	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter states that the term 'natural environments' is not a defined and it could be interpreted to apply to a broad range of environments that have a degree of 'naturalness'.	Add a definition of 'Natural environments' as follows: Natural environments: Means Significant Natural Areas, Notable Trees, peat lakes, wetlands and peat lake catchments.
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.22	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Oppose	The submitter opposes reference to archaeological and cultural sites under activity tables 23.3b. clause (xi).	Amend rule 23.3b (xi) to read: Any subdivision of an allotment within a archaeological and cultural site, or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C
Cordyline Holdings Limited - Rachel Dimery	458.23	Chapter 23 Subdivision	23.3 Rules Activity Status Tables	Oppose	The submitter opposes reference to archaeological and cultural sites under activity tables 23.3c. clause (xi).	Amend rule 23.3c (xi) to read: Any subdivision of an allotment within a archaeological and cultural site, or containing a Scheduled Historic Heritage building or structure identified in Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedules 8A, 8B and 8C
Fraser McNutt Giulie & Pat Garvey - 7 Radnor Street, Hamilton CBD	459.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street as a built heritage item (H276) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove H276, 7 Radnor Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Fraser McNutt Giulie & Pat Garvey - 7 Radnor Street, Hamilton CBD	459.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the Discretionary Activity status for the demolition of B ranked built heritage items.	Amend the activity status for Rule 19.3.1. I. <i>Demolition of any structure or building ranked B</i> by deleting the Discretionary Activity status and replacing it with a Restricted Discretionary Activity status.
Fraser McNutt Giulie & Pat Garvey - 7 Radnor Street, Hamilton CBD	459.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3a(ii) Historic Pattern as stated in the inventory for H276.	Remove H276, 7 Radnor Street form Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.
Fraser McNutt Giulie & Pat Garvey - 7 Radnor Street, Hamilton CBD	459.4	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3b Physical/ Aesthetic/ Architectural Qualities as stated in the inventory for H276.	Remove H276, 7 Radnor Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Fraser McNutt Giulie & Pat Garvey - 7 Radnor Street, Hamilton CBD	459.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 7 Radnor Street, and the assessment of the building in section 3e Archaeological Qualities as stated in the inventory for H276.	Amend the level of significance stated for Archaeological Qualities in the inventory for H276, 7 Radnor Street from 'unknown' to 'none'.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers John Higgins and Gabriella Bakk Higgins	460.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of the dwelling at 58A Lake Crescent as a built heritage item (H230) on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove H230 from Schedule 8A Remove Heritage Item notation H230 over 58a Lake Crescent from the Planning Maps.
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Tom Andrews	461.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	<p>The Submitter opposes the two provisions 19.3.1(d), reasons for the submission are:</p> <p>Owners of heritage buildings and sites are already invested in the management and upkeep of the buildings and sites to a minimum standard, with which comes expense and effort. The need to obtain resource consent for a building on a site or to erect a fence places further encumbrances and hardships on owners. Small structures such as fences and garden sheds should be permitted as obtaining resource consent for what is generally such minor items is time consuming and expensive.</p> <p>Managing the effects of such small structures would be better dealt with via design guidelines rather than regulation. For example, fences 'in keeping' and accessory buildings/structures up to a specific GFA (say 30m2) (like garden sheds) should be permitted.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 19.3.1d to read:</p> <p>Accessory buildings or new buildings <u>up to a maximum of xxx (perhaps 30m2)</u> within any scheduled site ranked A. D <u>P</u></p> <p>(Change the activity status from Discretionary to Permitted).</p> <p>And, consider implementation of design guidelines for owners of heritage items, which may include paint colour, design of/height of fencing etc.</p>
Feathers Planning - Louise feathers Tom Andrews	461.2	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.1 Built Heritage (Buildings and Structures)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the activity status as a Discretionary Activity for the construction of accessory buildings or new buildings and/or fences within any scheduled sites ranked A and considers design guidelines are adequately for managing effects for smaller scale buildings and structures. This is because the submitter concerns the associated costs and time required for preparing and obtaining a resource consent.	<p>Amend the activity status for Rule 19.3.1 (o) from Restricted Discretionary Activity* to Permitted Activity.</p> <p>And, consider implementation of design guidelines for owners of heritage items, which may include paint colour, design of/height of fencing etc.</p>
WITHDRAWN	462.1					.
Renee and Tim Beere	463.1	General	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the provisions and controls under Special Residential Zone - Claudelands West under the Operative District Plan already protect the characters of the area as well as the buildings, trees, and reserves within the area. The submitter notes there are houses in the area that have been able to merge modern and traditional living together, maintaining the character of the area. Any infill developments within the area should be with suitable cladding, design with adequate off street parking provided.	Retain the Special Residential Zone - Claudelands West.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Renee and Tim Beere	463.2	General	General	Support in part	The submitter suggests infill or intensification developments should be encouraged within central city area, along Victoria Street, Anglesea Street, Knox Street and Mill Street, including redevelopments existing buildings within these areas to meet the latest building requirements and are of earthquake prone. Developments within this area should be encouraged to retain the existing building facades as it is important for the protection of historic heritage. The quality of the residential housing should include a mixture of mid to high range representing the land value as opposed to cheap high density boxes. Removing resource consent costs and reducing development contributions can be used as incentives to encourage developments within the central city area.	That Council encourages developments within central city area, including refurbish existing housing stock available in the city for residential development while retaining historical character.
Renee and Tim Beere	463.3	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports developments, including multi-units developments, within Historic Heritage Area, provided that developments within the area should be keeping in style with the characteristics of the area and be with suitable cladding, design with adequate off street parking provided.	Allows for developments of houses and multi-units development that are keeping in same or similar characteristic of the area.
Renee and Tim Beere	463.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support	The submitter supports developments, including multi-units developments, within Historic Heritage Area, provided that developments within the area should be keeping in style with the characteristics of the area and be with suitable cladding, design with adequate off street parking provided. Discretionary activity status could be suitable given that there would be a set of guidelines to adhere to and that can be taken from the Special Character rules already in place.	Allows for developments of houses and multi-units development that are keeping in same or similar characteristic of the area.
Renee and Tim Beere	463.5	General	General	Support	The submitter supports the uses of water conservation requirements for new buildings outside of central city area and suggests using financial incentive, discounted development fees, to encourage developers to meet such criteria.	Encourage developers and builders to meet water conservation requirements including lessening pressure on drain systems, and recycling water use on site when building in newly opened industrial areas, through discounted development fees.
Renee and Tim Beere	463.6	General	General	Support	The submitter supports encouraging development within central city area and supports relevant changes to transportations on supporting mode-shifts, supporting cycling, e-scooters and other forms of transport modes. The submitter also acknowledges quality public transports are essential to reduce private car uses.	Not particularly states but expresses supports of developments within central city area, along with transport improvements.
Derek Burrough	464.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is opposed to the assessment for Marnane Terrace not being classified as a Historic Heritage Area and requests that the street be reassessed.	Reassess the classification of Marnane Terrace as Historic Heritage Area.
John and Christine Versluys	465.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter opposes the scheduling of their dwelling at 17 Beale Street as a built heritage item (H155) on Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	Remove H155, 17 Beale Street from Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Elaine McDonnell	466.1	Appendix 9 Schedule 9C	cSNA	Support	<p>The submitter have been maintaining the gully area of 25 Howell Avenue (part of cSNA, C23) by planting native trees, however, finds it difficult financially and physically to keep maintaining.</p> <p>"One major problem is the continual invasion of pest plants - ivy, jasmine, tradescantia, artillery plant - most of which come from neighbouring properties."</p>	Seeks the support from HCC to remove invasive weeds and some advice from HCC staff.
Kim Gerrand	467.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Are, HHA19, and requests the extent of the HHA is widened to include the following streets bec:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wye Street • Torrington Avenue • Avon Street, and • part of Norton Road 	Extend the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA 19 to include Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Avon Street and part of Norton Road.
Ashley Richard King	468.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19, and seeks the inclusion of the following streets into the HHA because they are part of the historic heritage area and the homes have historic values, and are part of the historic housing block of Frankton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wye Street, • Torrington Avenue, • Avon Street, • part of Norton Road, and • All of Taniwha Street. 	Extend the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19 to include Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Avon Street, Norton Road (North), and all of Taniwha Street.
Lorrae Clare Taylor	469.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA 19, and seek the inclusion of the following streets because they are part of the historic heritage area, the homes have historic values, and are part of the historic housing block of Frankton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wye Street, • Torrington Avenue, • Avon Street, • part of Norton Road, and • All of Taniwha Street. 	Extend the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19 to include Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Avon Street, Norton Road (North) and all of Taniwha Street.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Gregory Blair Gerrand	470.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19, and seeks the inclusion of the following streets because they are part of the historic heritage area and have historic values and are part of the historic housing block of Frankton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wye Street, • Torrington Avenue, • Avon Street and • part of Norton Road added. 	Extend the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19 to include Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Avon Street and part of Norton Road.
Margaret Louise Sale	471.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support	<p>The submitter supports the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19 and seeks the inclusion of the following streets into the HHA because of their heritage values and connection with the existing HHA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wye Street, • Torrington Avenue, • Avon Street, • all of Taniwha Street and • part of Norton Road (Mill Street end & part of Dudley Ave) 	Extend the Marire Avenue, Parr Street and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, HHA19 to include Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, Avon Street, all of Taniwha Street and part of Norton Road (Mill Street end & part of Dudley Ave).
Margaret Louise Sale	471.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the manner with which fencing has been considered during the assessment of potential HHA areas, questioning - why were fences at a certain height a mark against supporting if it is or is not a historic house. Some of these fences may not be historic but in this modern age they are/were erected to prevent arson, burglary and damage to these houses and ourselves which in today's world is running riot throughout the world.	No specific relief sought.
Margaret Louise Sale	471.3	Appendix 9 Natural Environments	9-1.1 STEM Method of Evaluation	Oppose	Then there is the question of the trees. My trees may not be old in terms of the house but they are homes to the birds and bees, especially our native Rewarewa tree, at a guess is nearing 1/2 the height of the Stadium lights.	No specific relief sought.
Dion Merson and Kirstyn Beuzeval	472.1	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitters oppose the scheduling of 13 Cardrona Road as a built heritage item (H171) in Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.	<p>Removal of all reference to H171, 13 Cardrona Road from Volume 2, Appendix 8, Schedule 8A: Built Heritage.</p> <p>In the alternative: Delete all rules that restrict activities that can be done to and on Built Heritage.</p>
Mary Teresa Dowdall	473.1	Chapter 20 Natural Environments	Significant Natural Areas		<p>The submission only includes some words as below:</p> <p>"Significant Natural Areas"</p> <p>"Sorry for delay, due to illness."</p>	No Relief Sought.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.1	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of understanding and studies regarding the historical legibility of Frankton as a significant part of the city.	Undertake a review of the historic heritage of Frankton and seek amendments in the PC9 reports in terms of Frankton history and the background of our area, as part of Frankton.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.2	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the criteria used for identifying Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 is primarily based on character elements, including Street Frontage Treatments. The submitter also disagrees on the six criteria have been assessed on an equal basis without any weighting of criteria, because this would appear to unbalance an assessment process that is very visual and focus on street views, rather than historic heritage based. It is also unclear how historic heritage has included historic values and the degree of historical research that supports the heritage valuing. Assessment ratings should allow for ranges of building and land use types and a pattern that aligns with historical values. There should be assessment valuing of heritage values	Seek for a more comprehensive understanding and definition of historic area as 'historic place' rather than street and façade for the historic areas, with setting and context as part of a historic area, with rules [and definitions] for setting and context. Also seek for integration of the heritage review of historic items and historic areas.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.3	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the criteria used for identifying Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9 is primarily based on character elements, including Street Frontage Treatments. The submitter also disagrees on the six criteria have been assessed on an equal basis without any weighting of criteria, because this would appear to unbalance an assessment process that is very visual and focus on street views, rather than historic heritage based. The submitter opposes that the Historic Heritage Areas Assessment is lacking specific identification of historic elements, such as historic fencing, historic garages and historic concrete walls, within each Historic Heritage Area.	Seeks a finer identification of heritage items within the proposed extended Marire St, Parr St and Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area which includes a review includes any historic items such as historic garages, workshops and old concrete fencing; and seek a review includes any historic items such as historic garages, workshops and old concrete fencing.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.4	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	General	Support in part	The submitter considers the main commercial block of Frankton, dating from the 19th century to 20th century, has been identified for heritage review and potential historic area status for many years, and is part of the agreed Frankton Community Plan. Remaining heritage of the famous railway town is not identified and continues to be demolished.	Seek heritage identification of High Street and Commerce Streets so that here is a historic Frankton railway town historic area within Hamilton City.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.5	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8D: Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter supports in principle of the recognition of Taniwha Street, Parr Street and Marire Street Historic Heritage Area, however opposes that the extent of such area. Taniwha Street, Parr Street, Norton Road and Torrington Street and Wye Street all have early mass housing examples present a significant group of building company cottages by the builders of one of the significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton. The submitter considers that the area compliments the other Frankton housing suburb of the same period, the Railway Village, and is in the submitter's view at least of the same historic heritage value as the area of houses of Claudelands West.	Seek to includes a wider area as shown in the submission within the extent of the proposed Frankton historic area of Marire Street, Parr Street and part Taniwha Street Historic Heritage Area, in particular to include all of Taniwha Street, Wye Street, Torrington Avenue, part Avon Street and more of Norton Road in the Historic Heritage Area.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.6	1.1 Definitions and Terms	1.1.2 Definitions Used in the District Plan	Oppose	The submitter considers the definition of Historic Heritage Area under Plan Change 9 is more aligned with the meaning of character rather than historic heritage values. The submitter considers Historic Heritage Areas should represent groupings of interrelated, but not necessarily contiguous, places or features that collectively have heritage value. Historic Heritage Area should also include a range of buildings across zones.	Review and amend the definition of Historic Heritage Area to be consistent with the assessment criteria for historic heritage resources and sufficiently distinct from the definition of 'character'.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.7	1.3 Assessment Criteria	1.3.3 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Assessment Criteria	Support in part	Make the assessment criteria for Historic Heritage Areas the same as for Built Heritage for greater consistency in the plan and for alignment with the WRPS and the RMA in relation to historic heritage.	Seek that Assessment Criteria for Historic Heritage Areas are the same as for Historic Heritage Items [Buildings and Structures] for consistency in the plan and with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the RMA.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.8	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value under Plan Change 9. The submitter consider Former NZR Office holds historic heritage values that should be scheduled as built heritage under Appendix 8A.	Include Former NZR Offices Frankton as built heritage items in Schedule 8.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.9	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the lack of provisions and controls for sites and properties adjacent to Historic Heritage Areas under Plan Change 9. The submitter is concerned that inappropriate development on adjoining sites will significantly detract from the heritage qualities of the area. And to reduce the impact of development and extreme contrast particularly of Frankton East proposed historic area.	Seek rules in Chapter 19 that provide a buffer between single storey heritage areas and new developments within a Historic Heritage Area, and adjacent properties to the Historic Heritage Area, that makes new neighbouring developments are sympathetic in scale.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.10	General	General	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protection of historic heritage under Plan Change 9 but wants more supports from Council for property owners, including heritage assistance, potential rates relief, reduced consent fees, and significant improved funding of the Hamilton City Council Heritage Fund.	Increased support for Historic Heritage owners including heritage assistance, potential rates relief, reduced consent fees, and significant improved funding of the Hamilton City Council Heritage Fund, including for the proposed historic heritage area properties.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.11	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	8-3 Assessment of Historic Heritage Areas	Oppose	The submitter opposes the housing themes identified in the Historic Heritage Area Assessment in relation to railway housing and considers the theme for inclusion in Plan Change 9 and Chapter 19 should be amended to reflect Waikato's earliest and largest house building company Ellis and Burnand, who were Waikato based and were one of the two significant early prefabrication factories in Hamilton.	Amend the housing themes identified in the HHAs with 'railway suburbs' amended to 'railway suburb' and to include "and early builder housing [Ellis and Burnand and others]". This is workers housing.

Submitter	Sub No.	Chapter/ Appendix	Sub-section	Oppose/ Support	Summary of submission	Relief/ Decision Sought
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.12	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	Historical Heritage Areas		The submitters seek the provisions of "Design guidelines" to support HHA.	Seek the provisions of "Design guidelines" to support HHA.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.13	Chapter 7 Central City Zone	Downtown Precinct	Support in part	The submitter supports in part Policy 7.2.6. i: Developments within the historic heritage area are required to be sympathetic to the heritage values; but seek that it be accompanied with a Heritage Impact Assessment, with a supporting rule and framework that supports this	Seek the accompany with a Heritage Impact Assessment and a supporting rule and framework for Policy 7.2.6.i.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.14	Chapter 19 Historic Heritage	19.3.2 Historic Heritage Areas	Support in part	The submitter is concerned that the proposed provisions and controls do not protect heritage values for Historic Heritage Areas cohesively, in particular for additions and alteration, and establishment of accessory buildings on sites within Historic Heritage Area could potentially be visually intrusive, or of an inappropriate scale thereby adversely affect the historic heritage values of the area.	Seek the provisions of rules that new building work within a HHA is visually at the similar scale, height and character of existing historic heritage in order to retain integrity and authenticity of the HHA.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.15	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Oppose	The submitter supports the intention of protecting historic heritage and the introduction of additional built heritages. The submitter however raises concerns on the lack of identification and assessment of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value under Plan Change 9 within Frankton area.	Seek inclusion in Appendix 8 Historic Heritage of a broader range of commercial, industrial, railway, and residential buildings, structures and sites of significant historic heritage value, particularly of Frankton, and request review of Frankton community heritage, and inclusion in Schedule 8. This including significant Frankton historic heritage buildings in the historic main commercial streets, identified by the Waikato Heritage Group.
Margaret Louise Sale Frankton East Residents Group	474.16	Appendix 8 Historic Heritage	Schedule 8A: Built Heritage (structures, buildings and associated sites)	Support in part	The submitter supports the intent of Plan Change 9 to identify and protect Hamilton's historic heritage items and areas; however would like to have additional buildings and structures to be scheduled as built heritage. This is because the histories of the Frankton block is distinctive with a large number of early twentieth century bungalows and a few villas, and is a suburb of working class houses. The submitter states that it also contains a significant number of 1920s homes and includes a collection of prefabricated Ellis and Burnand [E & B] houses, and use of its components, that are regionally important. The submitter considers that the Bell Bird dairy on the corner of Norton Road and Taniwha Street is a rare 1920s dairy in Hamilton.	The submitter seeks the inclusion of individual Frankton houses, Bell Bird dairy and workshops, and Ellis and Burnand houses in Appendix 8A scheduling with comprehensive review of historic heritage.